Dictionary
of the
Apostolic Church

Dictionary
# of the
Apostolic Church

EDITED BY

JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF

JOHN A. SELBIE, D.D.

AND

JOHN C. LAMBERT, D.D.

VOLUME II

MACEDONIA—ZION

WITH

INDEXES

New York: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS
Edinburgh: T. & T. CLARK
1918

Messrs. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, have the sole right of publication of this
DICTIONARY OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH in the United States and Canada.

AUTHORS OF ARTICLES IN THIS VOLUME

ADAM (D. S.), M.A., B.D.
Professor of Systematic Theology and Church History in Ormond College, Melbourne, Australia.

Union with God.

AGATE (LEONARD DENDY), B.A. (Cantab.), M.A. (Manchester).
Curate of Warton, Lancashire; author of *Luther and the Reformation.*

Metaphor.

ALLWORTHY (THOMAS BATESON), M.A. (Camb.), B.D. (Dublin).
Director of Religious Education in the Diocese of Ely; Founder and First Warden of S. Anselm's Hostel, Manchester.

Narcissus, Phœbe, Quartus, Rufus, Sosipater, Tertius, and other articles.

BANKS (JOHN S.), D.D.
Late Professor of Theology in the Wesleyan Methodist College, Headingley, Leeds; author of *A Manual of Christian Doctrine.*

Nazarene, Way (The).

BATIFFOL (PIERRE), Litt.D.
Chanoine de Notre-Dame de Paris et prélat de la Maison du Pape, Paris; éditeur de *Tractatus Origenis de libris scripturarum* (1900), *Les Odes de Salomon* (1911); auteur de *L'Eglise naissante et le Catholicisme* (1908), *La Paix constantinienne et le Catholicisme* (1914).

Polycarp.

BECKWITH (CLARENCE AUGUSTINE), A.B., A.M., S.T.D.
Professor of Systematic Theology in Chicago Theological Seminary; author of *Realities of Christian Theology*; departmental editor of the *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge.*

Palsy, Physician, Plague, Poison, Sickness, Tree of Life.

BERNARD (JOHN HENRY), D.D. (Dublin), Hon. D.D. (Aberd.), Hon. D.C.L. (Durham).
Archbishop of Dublin; sometime Archbishop King's Professor of Divinity, Dublin, and Dean of St. Patrick's Cathedral; afterwards Bishop of Ossory.

Spirits in Prison.

BOYD (WILLIAM FALCONER), M.A., B.D. (Aberd.), D.Phil. (Tübingen).
Minister of the United Free Church of Scotland at Melrose.

Mary, Matthew, Scythian, Synzygus, Tribes, Tyrannus, and other articles.

BUCHANAN (JAMES ROBERTSON), M.A., B.D.
Minister of the United Free Church at Culross; Examiner in Hebrew to the United Free Church of Scotland.

New Jerusalem.

BULCOCK (HARRY), B.A., B.D.
Minister of the Congregational Church at Droylsden, Manchester.

Mourning, Murmuring, Simplicity, Virtue, Woe.

BURN (ANDREW E.), D.D.
Vicar of Halifax and Prebendary of Lichfield; author of *An Introduction to the Creeds* (1899), *Niceta of Remesiana* (1905), *The Apostles' Creed* (1906), *The Nicene Creed* (1909), *The Athanasian Creed* (1912).

Praise, Prayer, Psalms, Spiritual Songs, Thanksgiving, Worship.

CARLYLE (ALEXANDER JAMES), M.A., D.Litt., F.R. Hist. Soc.
Lecturer in Economics and Politics at University College, Oxford.

Poor, Wealth.

CASE (SHIRLEY JACKSON), M.A., B.D., Ph.D.
Professor of New Testament Interpretation in the University of Chicago; author of *The Historicity of Jesus, The Evolution of Early Christianity*; managing editor of *The American Journal of Theology.*

Peter, Peter (Epistles of), Seed, Theudas, Tribute.

CLARK (P. A. GORDON).
Minister of the United Free Church at Perth.

Name, Possession, Python, Soothsaying, Sorcery, Surname.

CLEMENS (JOHN SAMUEL), B.A., B.D., Hon. D.D. (St. And.).
Governor of the United Methodist College, Ranmoor, Sheffield.

New Moon, Passover, Pentecost, Right, Sabbath, Slave, Unrighteousness.

Cobb (William Frederick), D.D.
Rector of the Church of St. Ethelburga the Virgin, London; author of *Mysticism and the Creed* (1914).
Mnason, Nicolaitans, Phygelus, Sodom and Gomorrah.

Cooke (Arthur William), M.A.
Minister of the Wesleyan Methodist Church at Oxton, Birkenhead; author of *Palestine in Geography and in History*, *The Land of Israel and of Christ*.
Medes, Mesopotamia, Parthians.

Cowan (Henry), M.A. (Edin.), D.D. (Aberd.), D.Th. (Gen.), D.C.L. (Dunelm).
Professor of Church History in the University of Aberdeen; Senior Preacher of the University Chapel; author of *The Influence of the Scottish Church in Christendom*, *John Knox*, *Landmarks of Church History*.
Onesimus, Philemon, Philemon (Epistle to).

Cruickshank (William), M.A., B.D.
Minister of the Church of Scotland at Kinneff, Bervie; author of *The Bible in the Light of Antiquity*.
Mantle, Penny, Shoe, Street, Talent, Tent, Thigh, Wall.

Davies (Arthur Llywelyn), M.A.
Warden of Ruthin, North Wales; formerly Simcox Research Student, Queen's College, Oxford.
Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.

Dimont (Charles Tunnacliff), B.D. (Oxon.).
Principal of Salisbury Theological College; Prebendary of Salisbury; Chaplain to the Bishop of Salisbury.
Martyr, Witness, Work.

von Dobschütz (Ernst), D.Theol.
Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the University of Breslau.
Philo of Alexandria.

Donald (James), M.A., D.D. (Aberd.).
Minister of the Church of Scotland at Keith-hall and Kinkell, Aberdeenshire.
Nation, People, Proselyte, Stranger.

Dow (John), M.A. (St. And.).
Minister of the United Free Church at Montrose.
Mark (John).

Duncan (James Walker), M.A.
Minister of the United Free Church at Lassodie, Dunfermline.
Midian, Pharaoh, Red Sea, Shechem, Sinai, Zion.

Dundas (William Harloe), B.D.
Rector of Magheragall, near Lisburn.
Power, Principality, Throne.

Emmet (Cyril W.), M.A.
Vicar of West Hendred, Berks; author of *The Eschatological Problem in the Gospels*, and of articles in *Faith and the War* and *Immortality*.
Romans (Epistle to the).

Falconer (Robert Alexander), M.A., LL.D., D.Litt., C.M.G.
President of the University of Toronto.
Timothy, Timothy and Titus (Epistles to), Titus.

Faulkner (John Alfred), B.D., M.A., D.D.
Professor of Church History in Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N.J.
Salutations.

Feltoe (Charles Lett), D.D.
Rector of Ripple, near Dover; sometime Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge; author of *Sacramentarium Leonianum*, *The Letters and other Remains of Dionysius of Alexandria*.
Matthias, Place (His Own), Steward.

Fletcher (M. Scott), M.A. (Sydney), B.Litt. (Oxon.), B.D. (Melbourne).
Principal of Wesley College, University of Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.
Preaching, Reading, Shadow, Substance, Teaching.

Franks (Robert Sleightholme), M.A., B.Litt.
Principal of the Western College, Bristol; author of *The New Testament Doctrines of Man, Sin, and Salvation* (1908).
Mercy, Obedience, Patience, Ungodliness.

[Principal Franks is the author of **Beloved, Godliness, Hope, Humility** in vol. i. His name was accidentally omitted from the list of authors in that volume.]

Frew (David), D.D.
Minister of the Church of Scotland at Urr.
Pilate (Pontius), Silas or Silvanus.

Garvie (Alfred Ernest), M.A. (Oxford), D.D. (Glas.).
Principal of New College, London; author of *The Ritschlian Theology*, *Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus*, and other works.
Sin.

Gordon (Alexander Reid), D.Litt., D.D.
Professor of Hebrew in M'Gill University, and of Old Testament Literature and Exegesis in the Presbyterian College, Montreal; author of *The Early Traditions of Genesis*, *The Poets of the Old Testament*.
Old Testament, Quotations, Scripture, Tradition, Trial-at-Law.

Grant (William Milne), M.A.
Minister of the United Free Church at Drumoak, Aberdeenshire; author of *The Religion and Life of the Patriarchal Age*, *The Founders of Israel*, *The Judges and Kings of United Israel*.
Pillar, Tattlers, Wisdom.

Gray (George Buchanan), D.Litt., D.D.
Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis in Mansfield College; Speaker's Lecturer in Biblical Studies in the University of Oxford.
Psalms of Solomon.

Grieve (Alexander James), M.A., D.D.
Principal and Professor of Systematic Theology in the Scottish Congregational Theological Hall, Edinburgh.
Presence.

Groton (William Mansfield), S.T.D.
Professor of Systematic Divinity, and Dean of the Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Philadelphia.
Mystery.

HANDCOCK (P. S. P.), M.A.
Member of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law; Lecturer of the Palestine Exploration Fund; formerly of the Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities in the British Museum; author of *Mesopotamian Archæology*, *Latest Light on Bible Lands*.
Olive, Palm, Scorpion, Serpent, Vine, Wheat, and other articles.

HOOKE (SAMUEL HENRY), M.A. (Oxon.), B.D. (Lond.).
Professor of Oriental Languages and Literature in Victoria College, Toronto.
Paradise, Parousia, Resurrection, Sea of Glass.

JAMES (JOHN GEORGE), D.Lit., M.A.
Author of *Problems of Personality*, *Problems of Prayer*, *The Coming Age of Faith*, *The Prayer-Life*.
Offence, Rapture, Sleep, Trance, Vision.

JORDAN (HERMANN), Ph.D.
Professor der Kirchengeschichte und Patristik an der Universität Erlangen.
Writing.

KIRKPATRICK (ROGER SANDILANDS), B.D.
Minister of the Church of Scotland at Yarrow.
Sacraments.

KOHLER (KAUFMANN), Ph.D.
President of Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Proseuche, Sanhedrin, Shepherd, Synagogue.

LAKE (KIRSOPP), M.A. (Oxford), D.D. (St. And.).
Professor of Early Christian Literature in Harvard University.
Theophilus.

LAMBERT (JOHN C.), M.A., D.D.
Late of Fenwick, Kilmarnock; author of *The Sacraments in the New Testament*.
Man of Sin, Michael, Mind, Pattern, Restitution, Soul, Spirit, Type, Uncorruptness.

LAW (ROBERT), D.D. (Edin.).
Professor of New Testament Literature in Knox College, Toronto; author of *The Tests of Life: A Study of the First Epistle of St. John*, *The Emotions of Jesus*, *The Grand Adventure*.
Majesty, Mortify, Pre-existence of Christ, Triumph, Unity, World, Worldliness.

LEWIS (THOMAS), M.A. (Lond.), B.D (St. And.).
Principal of the Memorial College, Brecon, Wales; Member of the Theological Senate, and of the Theological Board, of the University of Wales.
Persecution.

LIGHTLEY (JOHN WILLIAM), M.A., B.D.
Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature and Philosophy in the Wesleyan College, Headingley, Leeds.
Philosophy, Science, Stoics.

LOFTHOUSE (WILLIAM F.), M.A.
Professor of Philosophy and Old Testament Language and Literature in the Wesleyan College, Handsworth, Birmingham; author of *Ethics and Atonement*, *Ethics and the Family*.
Repentance, Will.

MACKENZIE (DONALD), M.A.
Minister of the United Free Church at Tain; Assistant Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Aberdeen, 1906–1909.
Philippians (Epistle to the), Self-Denial, Soberness, Temperance, Virgin, Widows.

MACLEAN (ARTHUR JOHN), D.D. (Camb.), Hon. D.D. (Glas.).
Bishop of Moray, Ross, and Caithness; author of *Dictionary and Grammar of Vernacular Syriac*; editor of *East Syrian Liturgies*.
Marriage, Miracles, Only-Begotten, Ordination, Passion, Roman Law in the New Testament, Sign, Transfiguration, Translation.

MAIN (ARCHIBALD), M.A. (Glas.), B.A. (Oxon.), D.Litt. (Glas.).
Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of St. Andrews.
Minstrel, Pipe, Trump.

MALDEN (R. H.), M.A.
Principal of the Clergy School, Leeds.
Oracle, Ordinance, Utterance, Vow, Word.

MARGOLIOUTH (DAVID SAMUEL), M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A.
Fellow of New College, and Laudian Professor of Arabic in the University of Oxford; author of *Mohammed and the Rise of Islam*, *Mohammedanism*, *The Early Development of Mohammedanism*.
Sirach, Wisdom of Solomon.

MARSH (FRED. SHIPLEY), M.A.
Sub-Warden of King's College Theological Hostel, and Lecturer in Theology, King's College, London; formerly Tyrwhitt and Crosse Scholar in the University of Cambridge.
Thessalonians (Epistles to the).

MARTIN (A. STUART), M.A., B.D.
Formerly Pitt Scholar and Examiner in Divinity in Edinburgh University, and Minister of the Church of Scotland at Aberdeen; author of *The Books of the New Testament*.
Perseverance.

MINGANA (ALPHONSE), Ph.D.
Semitic Palæographer in the John Rylands Library; Lecturer in Arabic to the University of Manchester.
Odes of Solomon.

MOE (OLAF EDVARD), Dr. Theol.
Professor of Theology in the Church Theological Faculty of Christiania.
Moses.

MOFFATT (JAMES), D.Litt., Hon. D.D. (St. And.), Hon. M.A. (Oxford).
Professor of Church History in the United Free Church College, Glasgow; author of *The Historical New Testament*, and other works.
Righteousness, Sibylline Oracles, War.

MONTGOMERY (W. S.), B.D.
Minister of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland at Ballacolla, Queen's County.
Prison, Punishment, Rod, Scourging Stocks, Stoning, Thongs.

MOSS (RICHARD WADDY), D.D.
Professor of Systematic Theology in Didsbury College, Manchester.
Melchizedek, Priest.

MOULTON (WILFRID J.), M.A., B.D. (Cantab.).
Professor of Systematic Theology in the Wesleyan College, Headingley, Leeds; author of *The Witness of Israel.*
Will.

MUIRHEAD (LEWIS A.), D.D.
Minister of the United Free Church at Broughty-Ferry; author of *The Times of Christ, The Terms Life and Death in the Old and New Testaments, The Eschatology of Jesus.*
Numbers.

NICOL (THOMAS), D.D.
Late Professor of Biblical Criticism in the University of Aberdeen; Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 1914.
Predestination, Rejection, Reprobate, Schoolmaster, Tutor.

NIVEN (WILLIAM DICKIE), M.A.
Minister of the United Free Church at Blairgowrie; formerly co-examiner in Mental Philosophy in the University of Aberdeen.
Nazirite, Pharisees, Sadducees, Scribe.

PATRICK (JAMES), B.D., B.Sc.
Minister of the United Free Church at Edinburgh; formerly Examiner in Divinity to the University of St. Andrews.
Oil, Ointment.

PLATT (FREDERIC), M.A., D.D.
Professor of Systematic and Pastoral Theology in the Wesleyan College, Handsworth, Birmingham; author of *Miracles: An Outline of the Christian View, Immanence and Christian Thought.*
Propitiation, Ransom, Reconciliation, Sacrifice.

PLUMMER (ALFRED), M.A., D.D.
Late Master of University College, Durham; formerly Fellow and Senior Tutor of Trinity College, Oxford; author of 'The Gospel according to S. Luke' in *The International Critical Commentary*, and other works.
Minister, Ministration, Pastor, Teacher.

POPE (R. MARTIN), M.A. (Cantab. and Manchester).
Minister of the Wesleyan Methodist Church at Keswick; author of *Expository Notes on St. Paul's Epistles to Timothy and Titus*, and other works.
Meekness, Pride, Prophecy, Self-examination, Tongues (Gift of), Vanity, Vengeance, Voice, Waiting, Watching.

REID (JOHN), M.A.
Late Minister of the United Free Church at Inverness; author of *Jesus and Nicodemus, The First Things of Jesus, The Uplifting of Life*; editor of *Effectual Words.*
Novice, Preparation, Profession, Promise, Young Men, and other articles.

ROBERTS (JOHN EDWARD), M.A. (Lond.), B.D. (St. And.).
Minister of the Baptist Church at Manchester; author of *Christian Baptism, Private Prayers and Devotions, The Lord's Prayer.*
Sergius Paulus, Simon Magus, Sosthenes, Stephanus, Titus Justus, Zenas.

ROBERTSON (ARCHIBALD THOMAS), M.A., D.D., LL.D.
Professor of Interpretation of the New Testament in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.; author of *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, and other works.
Master, Mediation, Perdition, Security, Treasure.

ROBINSON (GEORGE L.), Ph.D., D.D., LL.D.
Professor of Biblical Literature and English Bible in M'Cormick Theological Seminary, Chicago.
Mount, River, Rock, Sea, Sepulchre, Ship, Supper, Wing.

ROBINSON (HENRY WHEELER), M.A. (Oxon. and Edin.).
Professor of Church History and of the Philosophy of Religion in the Baptist College, Rawdon; sometime Senior Kennicott Scholar in the University of Oxford; author of 'Hebrew Psychology in Relation to Pauline Anthropology' in *Mansfield College Essays, The Christian Doctrine of Man, The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament.*
Man, Mouth, Tongue, Woman.

VON SCHLATTER (ADOLF).
Professor of New Testament Introduction and Exegesis in the University of Tübingen.
Paraclete.

SHAW (JOHN MACKINTOSH), M.A.
Professor of Apologetics and Church History in the Presbyterian College, Halifax, N.S.
Resurrection of Christ.

SIDNELL (HENRY CARISS JONES), B.A., B.D. (London).
Minister of the Wesleyan Methodist Church at Halifax.
Marks, Reproof, Restoration of Offenders.

SLATER (JOHN WHITE), B.D.
Minister of the United Free Church at Scone.
Prize.

SMITH (SHERWIN), M.A., B.D.
Minister of the Wesleyan Methodist Church at York.
Pollution, Profane, Purification, Strangled.

SOARES (THEODORE GERALD), Ph.D., D.D.
Professor of Homiletics and Religious Education, and Head of the Department of Practical Theology in the University of Chicago, Ill.
Regeneration.

SOUTER (ALEXANDER), M.A., D.Litt.
Regius Professor of Humanity and Lecturer in Mediæval Palæography in the University of Aberdeen; formerly Professor of New Testament Greek and Exegesis in Mansfield College, Oxford; author of *A Study of Ambrosiaster, The Text and Canon of the New Testament, A Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament.*
Nero, Province, Roads and Travel, Roman Empire, Rome, Trade and Commerce, Vespasian, and other articles.

SPOONER (WILLIAM ARCHIBALD), D.D.
Warden of New College, Oxford; Hon. Canon of Christ Church, Oxford; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Peterborough.
Manæan, Nicolas, Philip the Evangelist, Stephen, and other articles.

STALKER (JAMES), M.A., D.D.
Professor of Church History in the United Free Church College, Aberdeen; author of *The Life of Jesus Christ, The Life of St. Paul, Imago Christi, The Preacher and his Models.*
Paul.

STEVENSON (MORLEY), M.A.
Principal of Warrington Training College; Hon. Canon of Liverpool; author of *Handbook to the Gospel according to St. Luke, The Spiritual Teaching of 'In Memoriam'*; joint-editor of *The Prayer-Book Dictionary.*
Moon, Schism, Star, Sun, Vessel, Wandering Stars.

STEWART (GEORGE WAUCHOPE), M.A., B.D.
Minister of the Church of Scotland at Haddington (First Charge); author of *Music in the Church.*
Officer, Potentate, Prince, Queen, Sabaoth, Tetrarch.

STONE (DARWELL), D.D.
Principal of Pusey House, Oxford.
Salvation.

STRACHAN (ROBERT HARVEY), M.A. (Aberd.), B.A. (Cantab.).
Minister of the Presbyterian Church at Cambridge.
Saint, Sanctification.

STRAHAN (JAMES), M.A., D.D.
Professor of Hebrew and Biblical Criticism in the Magee Presbyterian College, Londonderry; Cunningham Lecturer; author of *Hebrew Ideals, The Book of Job, Life of Andrew Bruce Davidson.*
Macedonia, Melita, Nazareth, Pergamus, Samaria, Temple, and other articles.

STRONG (ROBERT), M.A., B.Litt.
Minister of the United Methodist Church, London.
Man-Stealers, Murder, Robbers of Churches, Robbery, Stealing.

TASKER (JOHN G.), D.D.
Principal and Professor of Church History and Apologetics in the Wesleyan College, Handsworth, Birmingham.
Mysticism, Natural, Nature, Perfect, Religion.

TOD (DAVID MACRAE), M.A., B.D. (Edin.).
Minister of the Presbyterian Church of England at Huddersfield; formerly Hebrew Tutor and Cunningham Fellow, New College, Edinburgh.
Truth, Unbelief.

VOS (GEERHARDUS), Ph.D., D.D.
Charles Haley Professor of Biblical Theology in the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church at Princeton, N.J.
Peace, Pity, Wicked.

WADDY (P. STACY), M.A. (Oxford and Sydney).
Headmaster of the King's School, Parramatta, Australia; Fellow of St. Paul's College, University of Sydney.
Zeal.

WALKER (DAWSON), M.A., D.D.
Professor of Biblical Exegesis in the University of Durham; Principal of St. John's Hall, Durham.
Reformation, Remnant, Reproach, Reputation, Respect of Persons, Rest, Reward, Token.

WARFIELD (BENJAMIN BRECKINRIDGE), D.D., LL.D., Litt.D.
Charles Hodge Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology in the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church at Princeton, New Jersey.
Redemption.

WATKINS (CHARLES H.), D.Th.
Minister of the Baptist Church at Liverpool; Lecturer in the Midland Baptist College and University College, Nottingham; author of *St. Paul's Fight for Galatia.*
Neighbour, Oath.

WATSON (WILLIAM), B.D., D.Litt.
Minister of the Church of Scotland at Oyne; Examiner in Biblical Criticism and Hebrew in the University of St. Andrews; Assistant to the Professor of Hebrew and Oriental Languages in the University of St. Andrews, 1907–1909.
Suffering, Temptation, Torment, Tribulation.

WILLIS (JOHN ROTHWELL), B.D.
Canon of St. Aidans, Ferns, and Rector of Preban and Moyne, Co. Wicklow.
Son of Man, Tithes.

WORSLEY (FREDERICK WILLIAM), M.A., B.D.
Sub-Warden of St. Michael's College, Llandaff; author of *The Apocalypse of Jesus.*
Market-Place, Mercury, Moloch, Rephan, Superstitious, Unknown God.

ZENOS (ANDREW C.), D.D., LL.D.
Professor of Historical Theology in the M'Cormick Theological Seminary, Chicago.
Time.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

I. General

App. = Appendix.
Arab. = Arabic.
art., artt. = article, articles.
A.S. = Anglo-Saxon.
Assyr. = Assyrian.
AT = Altes Testament.
AV = Authorized Version.
AVm = Authorized Version margin.
Bab. = Babylonian.
c. = *circa*, about.
cf. = compare.
ct. = contrast.
ed. = edited, edition.
Eng. = English.
Eth. = Ethiopic.
EV, EVV = English Version, Versions.
f. = and following verse or page.
ff. = and following verses or pages.
fol. = folio.
fr. = fragment, from.
Fr. = French.
Germ. = German.
Gr. = Greek.
Heb. = Hebrew.
Lat. = Latin.
lit. = literally, literature.
LXX = Septuagint.
m., marg. = margin.
MS, MSS = Manuscript, Manuscripts.
n. = note.
NT = New Testament, Neues Testament.
N.S. = New Series.
OT = Old Testament.
pl. = plural.
q.v., *qq.v.* = *quod vide*, *quæ vide*, which see.
Rhem. = Rhemish New Testament.
rt. = root.
RV = Revised Version.
RVm = Revised Version margin.
Sem. = Semitic.
sing. = singular.
Skr. = Sanskrit.
Syr. = Syriac.
Targ. = Targum.
tr. = translated, translation.
TR = Textus Receptus, Received Text.
v. = verse.
v.l. = *varia lectio*, variant reading.
VS, VSS = Version, Versions.
Vulg., Vg. = Vulgate.

II. Books of the Bible

Old Testament.

Gn = Genesis.
Ex = Exodus.
Lv = Leviticus.
Nu = Numbers.
Dt = Deuteronomy.
Jos = Joshua.
Jg = Judges.
Ru = Ruth.
1 S, 2 S = 1 and 2 Samuel.
1 K, 2 K = 1 and 2 Kings.
1 Ch, 2 Ch = 1 and 2 Chronicles.
Ezr = Ezra.
Neh = Nehemiah.
Est = Esther.
Job.
Ps = Psalms.
Pr = Proverbs.
Ec = Ecclesiastes.
Ca = Canticles.
Is = Isaiah.
Jer = Jeremiah.
La = Lamentations.
Ezk = Ezekiel.
Dn = Daniel.
Hos = Hosea.
Jl = Joel.
Am = Amos.
Ob = Obadiah.
Jon = Jonah.
Mic = Micah.
Nah = Nahum.
Hab = Habakkuk.
Zeph = Zephaniah.
Hag = Haggai.
Zec = Zechariah.
Mal = Malachi.

Apocrypha.

1 Es, 2 Es = 1 and 2 Esdras.
To = Tobit.
Jth = Judith.
Ad. Est = Additions to Esther.
Wis = Wisdom.
Sir = Sirach or Ecclesiasticus.
Bar = Baruch.
Three = Song of the Three Children.
Sus = Susanna.
Bel = Bel and the Dragon.
Pr. Man = Prayer of Manasses.
1 Mac, 2 Mac = 1 and 2 Maccabees.

New Testament.

Mt = Matthew.
Mk = Mark.
Lk = Luke.
Jn = John.
Ac = Acts.
Ro = Romans.
1 Co, 2 Co = 1 and 2 Corinthians.
Gal = Galatians.
Eph = Ephesians.
Ph = Philippians.
Col = Colossians.
1 Th, 2 Th = 1 and 2 Thessalonians.
1 Ti, 2 Ti = 1 and 2 Timothy.
Tit = Titus.
Philem = Philemon.
He = Hebrews.
Ja = James.
1 P, 2 P = 1 and 2 Peter.
1 Jn, 2 Jn, 3 Jn = 1, 2, and 3 John.
Jude.
Rev = Revelation.

III. Bibliography

AGG = Abhandlungen der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften.
AJPh = American Journal of Philology.
AJTh = American Journal of Theology.
ARW = Archiv für Religionswissenschaft.
AS = Acta Sanctorum (Bollandus).
BJ = Bellum Judaicum (Josephus).
BL = Bampton Lecture.
BW = Biblical World.
CE = Catholic Encyclopedia.
CIA = Corpus Inscrip. Atticarum.
CIG = Corpus Inscrip. Græcarum.
CIL = Corpus Inscrip. Latinarum.
CIS = Corpus Inscrip. Semiticarum.
CQR = Church Quarterly Review.
CR = Contemporary Review.
CSEL = Corpus Script. Eccles. Latinorum.
DB = Dict. of the Bible.
DCA = Dict. of Christian Antiquities.
DCB = Dict. of Christian Biography.
DCG = Dict. of Christ and the Gospels.
DGRA = Dict. of Greek and Roman Antiquities.
DGRB = Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography.
DGRG = Dict. of Greek and Roman Geography.
EBi = Encyclopædia Biblica.
EBr = Encyclopædia Britannica.
EGT = Expositor's Greek Testament.
ERE = Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics.
Exp = Expositor.
ExpT = Expository Times.
GAP = Geographie des alten Palästina (Buhl).
GB = Golden Bough (J. G. Frazer).
GGA = Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen.
GGN = Nachrichten der königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen.
GJV = Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes (Schürer).
Grimm-Thayer = Grimm's Gr.-Eng. Lexicon of the NT, tr. Thayer.
HDB = Hastings' Dict. of the Bible (5 vols.).
HE = Historia Ecclesiastica (Eusebius, etc.).
HGHL = Historical Geography of the Holy Land (G. A. Smith).
HI = History of Israel (Ewald).
HJ = Hibbert Journal.
HJP = History of the Jewish People (Eng. tr. of *GJV*).
HL = Hibbert Lecture.
HN = Historia Naturalis (Pliny).
ICC = International Critical Commentary.
ISS = International Science Series.
JA = Journal Asiatique.
JBL = Journal of Biblical Literature.
JE = Jewish Encyclopedia.
JHS = Journal of Hellenic Studies.
JPh = Journal of Philology.
JPTh = Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie.
JQR = Jewish Quarterly Review.
JRS = Journal of Roman Studies.
JThSt = Journal of Theological Studies.
KAT^2 = Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament^2 (Schrader, 1883).
KAT^3 = Zimmern-Winckler's ed. of the preceding (a totally distinct work), 1902–03.
KIB = Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek.
LCBl = Literarisches Centralblatt.
LNT = Introd. to Literature of the New Testament (Moffatt).
LT = Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah (Edersheim).
MGWJ = Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums.
NGG = Nachrichten der königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen.
NKZ = Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift.
NTZG = Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte (Holtzmann and others).
OED = Oxford English Dictionary.
OTJC = Old Testament in the Jewish Church (W. R. Smith).
Pauly-Wissowa = Pauly-Wissowa's Realencyklopädie.
PB = Polychrome Bible.
PC = Primitive Culture (E. B. Tylor).
PEF = Palestine Exploration Fund.
PEFSt = Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement.
PRE = Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche.
PSBA = Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology.
RA = Revue Archéologique.
RB = Revue Biblique.
REG = Revue des Études Grecques.
RGG = Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart.
RHR = Revue de l'Histoire des Religions.
Roscher = Roscher's Ausführliches Lexikon der griech. und röm. Mythologie.
RS = Religion of the Semites (W. Robertson Smith).
SBAW = Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften.
SBE = Sacred Books of the East.
Schaff-Herzog = The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia.
SDB = Hastings' Single-vol. Dictionary of the Bible.
SEP = Memoirs of Survey of Eastern Palestine.
SK = Studien und Kritiken.
SWP = Memoirs of Survey of Western Palestine.
ThLZ = Theologische Litteraturzeitung.
ThT = Theol. Tijdschrift.
TS = Texts and Studies.
TU = Texte und Untersuchungen.
Wetzer-Welte = Wetzer-Welte's Kirchenlexikon.
WH = Westcott-Hort's Greek Testament.
ZATW = Zeitschrift für die alttest. Wissenschaft.
ZDMG = Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft.
ZKG = Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte.
ZKWL = Zeitschrift für kirchl. Wissenschaft und kirchl. Leben.
ZNTW = Zeitschrift für die neutest. Wissenschaft.
ZTK = Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche.
ZWT = Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie.

DICTIONARY
OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH

M

MACEDONIA (Μακεδονία).—This was the land of the Macedones, a Doric branch of the Hellenic stock, who settled on the banks of the Haliacmon and Axius, above the Thermaic Gulf, and gradually extended their power over the hill-peoples in the N. and W., as well as the lowland tribes which separated them from the sea. Their enlarged country, with its 'vast plains, rich mountains, verdant prairies, extended views, very different from those charming little mazes of the Greek site' (E. Renan, *St. Paul*, Eng. tr., 1889, p. 82), was a meet nurse for a successful and conquering race. Centuries of undisturbed growth gave them a great reserve of moral as well as material strength. 'As for Macedonia, it was probably the region the most honest, the most serious, the most pious of the ancient world' (*ib.* p. 80). And ere long it had the opportunity of showing its quality. When Greece lay weakened by the mutual jealousy of her city-states and consequent incapacity for concerted action, the genius of Philip of Macedon unified and consolidated a group of free and hardy races, fostered their national spirit, and created the most effective fighting-machine known to antiquity. Entering on a splendid heritage, his greater son achieved the conquest of the world (1 Mac 1^{1-9}). Even a century later, when the Macedonians had to try conclusions with the Romans, whom in many respects they strikingly resembled, their strength and spirit were but little impaired, and 'with a power in every point of view far inferior' Hannibal was 'able to shake Rome to its foundations' (T. Mommsen, *The History of Rome*, Eng. tr., 1894, ii. 491). But the bravest armies can do little unless they are efficiently led, and at Cynoscephalæ (197 B.C.), and again at Pydna (168), the once invincible phalanx was broken at last.

The conquered nation was disarmed and divided. 'Macedonia was abolished. In the conference at Amphipolis on the Strymon the Roman commission ordained that the compact, thoroughly monarchical, single state should be broken up into four republican-federative leagues moulded on the system of the Greek confederacies, viz. that of Amphipolis in the eastern regions, that of Thessalonica with the Chalcidian peninsula, that of Pella on the frontiers of Thessaly, and that of Pelagonia in the interior' (Mommsen, *op. cit.* p. 508). No one was allowed to marry, or to purchase houses or lands, except in his own tetrarchy. The Macedonians compared the severance of their country to the laceration and disjointing of a living creature (Livy, xlv. 30).

It has been supposed that a reference to this partition is contained in Ac 16^{12}, where Philippi is described as πρώτη τῆς μερίδος Μακεδονίας πόλις, κολωνία. This cannot mean that Philippi was the first city of Macedonia reached by St. Paul, for he had landed at Neapolis. Following Blass, T. Zahn (*Introd. to the NT*, Eng. tr., 1909, i. 532 f.) therefore proposes to read πρώτης, and to paraphrase: 'a city belonging to the first of those four districts of Macedonia, *i.e.* the first which Paul touched on his journey.' But the interpretation is not plausible. Not only is the suggested detail regarding the Apostle's movements singularly flat and commonplace, but it is highly probable that the old division into tetrarchies had long ceased to have more than an antiquarian interest. For the best explanation of the difficult phrase 'the first of the district' see PHILIPPI.

In 146 B.C. Macedonia received a provincial organization, and Thessalonica was made the seat of government. Including part of Illyria as well as Thessaly, the province extended from the Adriatic to the Ægean, and was traversed by the *Via Egnatia*, which joined Dyrrhachium and Apollonia in the West with Amphipolis and another Apollonia in the East. Augustus made it a senatorial province in 27 B.C., Tiberius an Imperial in A.D. 15, and Claudius restored it to the senate in A.D. 44. In St. Paul's time it was therefore governed by a proconsul of prætorian rank.

In the Acts and the Epistles Macedonia is often linked with Achaia (Ac 19^{21}, Ro 15^{26}, 2 Co 9^{2}, 1 Th $1^{7.8}$), and as the latter term can denote only the province, it is natural to suppose that Macedonia has also its official Roman meaning. St. Paul's entry into Europe was occasioned by the vision of 'a man of Macedonia' (Ac 16^{9}). Ramsay (*St. Paul*, 1895, p. 202 ff.) has hazarded the suggestion that this man was no other than the historian of the Acts; in which case the night vision would doubtless be preceded and followed by substantial arguments by day. The theory is supposed to account for the abundance of detail, as well as the apparently keen personal interest, with which St. Luke tells this part of his story. He seems to hurry breathlessly over wide tracts of Asia Minor, until he gets St. Paul down to Troas and across the Ægean (Ac 16$^{1-11}$), after which his style of narration at once becomes leisurely and expansive (see LUKE). St. Paul founded Macedonian churches in Philippi, Berœa, and Thessalonica; to two of them he wrote letters that are extant; and all of them were conspicuous for their loyalty to, and affection for, their founder. He had happy memories of 'the grace of God in the churches of Macedonia' (2 Co 8^{1}) and of 'all the brethren in all Macedonia' (1 Th 4^{10}). He loved to re-visit his first European mission-field (Ac 19^{21} 20$^{1-3}$, 1 Co 16^{5}, 2 Co 1^{20} 2^{13} 7^{5} 8^{1} 9$^{2.4}$), and among other 'men of Macedonia' who aided and cheered him were Gaius and Aristarchus (Ac 19^{29}), Secundus of Thessalonica (20^{4}), Sopater of Berœa (20^{4}), and Epaphroditus of Philippi (Ph 2^{25}). One of the most remarkable features of all the churches of Macedonia was the ministry of women, on which see J. B. Lightfoot, *Philippians*^{4}, 1878, p. 56.

JAMES STRAHAN.

MADIAN.—See MIDIAN.

MAGIC.—See DIVINATION.

MAGISTRATE.—The word 'magistrates' in the NT is as a rule a translation either of the abstract word *αἱ ἀρχαί* (literally 'the authorities'), as in Lk 12^{11}, Tit 3^{1}, or of the cognate word, originally a participle, *οἱ ἄρχοντες*. The former term is the more general of the two, but an examination of the two passages suggests that *ἀρχαί* is an allusion to magistrates, while *ἐξουσίαι* is rather a reference to governors, if indeed we can distinguish words which had long been used by Greek-speaking Jews of the world of spirits. There is less doubt about the other equivalent, *ἄρχοντες*, which occurs in the singular in Lk 12^{58}, where the reference is clearly to two litigants going before a magistrate (corresponding to the English alderman and the Scottish bailie) in a civil case (a comparison with ‖ Mt 5$^{25f.}$ will show that Luke is more explicit).

The variety of magistrates throughout the Roman Empire was infinite. In Rome the magistrates were called *prætores* (see art. PRÆTOR). Throughout the Italian and Western communities generally the city-constitution approximated to that of Rome. In *coloniæ* it was a copy as nearly as possible. The names by which the magistrates were called varied. For example, at Arretium in Etruria (Persius, *Sat.* i. 130) and at Ulubræ in Latium (Juvenal, *Sat.* x. 102) they were called *ædiles*; an inscription at the latter place mentions also a *præfectus iure dicundo*, a special commissioner sent from Rome to try cases (see Mayor's note). At other places they were called *prætores* (cf. below), the original name of the consuls at Rome, *e.g.* at Fundi in Latium. (Horace [*Sat.* I. v. 34–36] mocks at the consequential airs and dress of one of them.) In yet other cases they were known as *duo uiri ædiles*, with *duo uiri iure dicundo* forming a board of four. They held office for one year. The competence of such magistrates was strictly defined, and higher cases were sent to Rome for trial. So in the provinces the governor had to try the most important cases, both civil and criminal, while ordinary cases were doubtless left to the judicial machinery already in existence in the province. The Romans commonly left the system current already in each country, unless it was radically bad.

St. Luke is an authority of primary value for the jurisdiction of magistrates in an Eastern town. From him we learn that in Philippi, a *colonia*, they were called *στρατηγοί* (an exact translation of *prætores*). They unknowingly transgressed the law in flogging the two Roman citizens, St. Paul and Silas, without trial. Their chagrin was all the greater as they prided themselves on their true Roman spirit. At Thessalonica St. Luke's accuracy is particularly evident, as there he applies to the magistrates a title comparatively rare throughout the Græco-Roman world, but attested for Thessalonica by a number of inscriptions—the title *politarchs* (*πολιτάρχαι*, Ac 17$^{6-8}$); this title occurs also in Egypt. At Thessalonica the rabble were hostile to the new religion, but the politarchs and the better-educated classes generally looked upon it with more favour (see also AUTHORITIES, ROMAN EMPIRE, TOWN-CLERK, etc.).

LITERATURE.—On the subject in general see T. Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsrecht*^{3}, Leipzig, 1888; A. H. J. Greenidge, *Roman Public Life*, London, 1901, chs. iv., viii., x., xi. especially; an admirable synopsis by B. W. Henderson in *A Companion to Latin Studies*^{2}, ed. Sandys, Cambridge, 1913, p. 372 f.; on the relations between Romans and non-Romans in provincial towns, see Mommsen in *Ephemeris Epigraphica*, vii. [1892] 436 ff.; on the scene at Philippi, W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, London, 1895, p. 217 ff., *JThSt* i. [1899–1900] 114 ff.; and F. Haverfield, *ib.* p. 434 f.; Thessalonian inscriptions containing the title 'Politarch' collected by E. D. Burton in *AJTh* ii. [1898] 598 ff.; for the title in Egyptian documents, see *Oxyrhynchus Papyrus*, no. 745 (iv. [1904]).

A. SOUTER.

MAGOG.—See GOG AND MAGOG.

MAGUS.—See SIMON MAGUS.

MAJESTY.—Two words are so translated—*μεγαλειότης* and *μεγαλωσύνη*. According to formation (the first from *μεγαλεῖος* = 'stately,' 'magnificent'; the second from *μεγαλο-* = 'great') they denote respectively the appearance and the fact of greatness, regal state, and regal might. On the whole, the distinction holds good in usage.

1. *μεγαλειότης*, 'magnificence,' is applied to Solomon (1 Es 1^{5}), and in the NT (by Demetrius, the silversmith) to the Ephesian Artemis (Ac 19^{27}). In 2 P 1^{16} it is used of Christ's transfiguration-glory on the mountain-top, and, with interesting coincidence, in Lk 9^{43} of the manifestation of Divine power in His healing of the demoniac boy at the mountain-foot (cf. Clement, *Ep. ad Cor.* xxiv., Ign. *ad Rom.* i.; *τὰ μεγαλεῖα τοῦ θεοῦ*, Ac 2^{11}).

2. *μεγαλωσύνη* is used in the LXX as the translation of גְּדֻלָּה or גֹּדֶל. It is applied to David (2 S 7^{21}) and to the kings of the earth (Dn 7^{27}); elsewhere to the sovereign greatness of God (Dt 32^{3}, 1 Ch 29^{11}, Ps 145$^{3.6}$, etc.). From the LXX it has passed into the vocabulary of Hellenistic Judaism (*e.g. Book of Enoch*, v. 4, xii. 3, xiv. 16), of the NT, and the Apostolic Fathers (Clement, *Ep. ad Cor.* xx., xxvii., lviii., lxi., lxiv.). In He 1^{3} 'the Majesty on high,' and in 8^{1} 'the Majesty in the heavens,' is equivalent to God Himself in His heavenly dominion (cf. *Book of Enoch*, v. 4, 'ye spake hard words . . . against His Majesty'; Clement, *Ep. ad Cor.* xxvii., 'by the word of His Majesty all things were framed together'). Most frequently it is used in doxology (Jude ^{25}, 1 Ch 29^{11}; Clement, *Ep. ad Cor.* xx., lxi., lxiv.).

ROBERT LAW.

MALICE (*κακία*).—Malice is the propensity to inflict injury upon another, or to take pleasure in his misfortunes. In early English it denoted wickedness in general (*HDB* iii. 223), but the modern meaning is found in Shakespeare, *e.g.* in Othello's words:

> 'Speak of me as I am; nothing extenuate,
> Nor set down aught in malice'
> (Act v. sc. ii. line 342).

κακία changed its connotation in much the same way. In classical Greek it was not a particular fault or vice, but that badness of nature or character (opp. to *ἀρετή*, 'virtue,' 'excellence') which is the root of all faults. Cicero discusses the point in *Tusc. Disp.* IV. xv. 34: 'Hujus igitur virtutis contraria est vitiositas. Sic enim malo quam malitiam appellare eam, quam Græci κακίαν appellant. Nam malitia certi cujusdam vitii nomen est; vitiositas omnium.' In the NT the context generally indicates that κακία is a specific fault or vice. The compound κακοήθεια ('malicious disposition') designates but one of the many elements or workings of the reprobate mind (Ro 1^{29}). Christians recall the time, before 'the washing of regeneration,' when they were 'living in malice (ἐν κακίᾳ) and envy' (Tit 3^{3}). κακία is one of the sins which the believer must resolutely put away (Eph 4^{31}, Col 3^{8}); he is not to eat the Christian passover with the leaven of malice (1 Co 5^{8}); in malice he is to be a babe (14^{20}). Without apparent cause the Revisers prefer 'wickedness' in Ja 1^{21}, 1 P 2$^{1.16}$, relegating 'malice' to the margin. Only once is the wider meaning unquestionable: the κακία of which Simon the Magian is urged to repent is no specific fault, but the deep-seated wickedness of a man who is still in the gall of bitterness (Ac 8$^{22.23}$).

JAMES STRAHAN.

MAN.—*Introduction.*—The fundamental fact for apostolic anthropology is the new value assigned to human nature by Jesus Christ, both through His personal attitude and teaching, and through His life, death, and resurrection. Jesus saw every man thrown into relief against the background of the kingly Fatherhood of God—encompassed by His mercy, answerable to His judgment. For Jesus, the supreme element in human personality was its moral content, as the supreme value in the life of men was human personality itself. This conception of human nature goes back to the Hebrew Scriptures, in which we can trace five principles, summarily stated in modern terms as follows. (*a*) Human nature is conceived as a unity; there is no dualism of body and soul as in Greek thought, and consequently no asceticism. Man becomes man by the vitalization of a physical organism (for which Hebrew has no word) by a breath-soul (*nephesh*, *rûah*); death is their divorce, and they have no separate history. (*b*) Man depends absolutely on God for his creation and continued existence; his inner life is easily accessible to spiritual influences from without, both for good and for evil. (*c*) Man is morally responsible for his conduct, because ultimately free to choose; if he chooses to rebel against the declared will of God, he will suffer for his sin. (*d*) The will of God gives a central place to the realization of social righteousness, the right relation of man to man. (*e*) In the purposes of God man has consequently a high place, as in the visible world he has a unique dignity. In the period between the OT and the NT, this conception of human nature received two important developments (cf. W. Fairweather, *The Background of the Gospels*^{2}, 1911, pp. 283–291). From the Maccabæan age onwards there is a much more pronounced individualism; along with this there is the extension of human personality into a life beyond death. Both developments are begun in the OT itself; but neither beginning is comparable in importance with the established doctrine of the time of Christ. These two developments, separately and in union, formed a most important contribution to the Christian interpretation of human nature. But its foundation was already laid in the OT, the main ideas of which Jesus liberated from the restraints of Jewish nationalism to incorporate them into a universal faith. He gave them a new religious significance by His conception of the Father. He added the purified ethical content of the prophetic teaching to the current supernaturalism of apocalyptic writers, purged of its vagaries. In His own person, He gave to man an example, a motive, and an approach to God which have made His teaching a religion as well as a philosophy. The result is seen in the Christian doctrine of man, pre-supposed by apostolic evangelism, and adumbrated in apostolic writings. Three types of this may be studied in the pages of the NT, viz. the Pauline and the Johannine (the latter in large measure a development of the former), and what may be called the non-mystical type, as inclusive of the other material (chiefly Hebrews, 1 Peter, James).

1. Pauline anthropology.—Perhaps any formal statement of St. Paul's conception of human nature is apt to misrepresent him. The data are fragmentary and occasional; the form is, for the most part, unsystematic; the interest of the writer is experiential, and his aims are practical. It is not easy to recover the full content of his thought-world. But we probably come nearest to it when we recognize that he continues the lines of OT thought indicated above, with a deepening of ethical contrast (not to be identified with Greek dualism), and, in particular, with an emphasis on the Spirit of God in Christ as the normal basis of the Christian life. This last is characteristically Pauline, and forms St. Paul's chief contribution to the present subject. Recognition of the outpouring of the Spirit of God belongs to early Christianity in general, and marks it off from the religious life and thought of contemporary Judaism (cf. W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums*^{2}, 1906, p. 458). The specifically Pauline doctrine of life in the Spirit is a legitimate development of OT ideas. But it may well have been quickened by current Hellenistic ideas of a Divine πνεῦμα (on which see H. Siebeck, *Geschichte der Psychologie*, 1884, ii. 130–160). Similar influences may have contributed to the accentuation of the ethical contrast already indicated between the pneumatic and psychic, the inner and the outer man. But the real principle of this Pauline contrast is already implicit in the OT differentiation of *rûaḥ* (πνεῦμα) and *nephesh* (ψυχή). On this side of Pauline thought, the Greek influences seem often to have been over-emphasized (*e.g.* by Holtzmann, *Neutest. Theologie*, 1897, ii. 13 ff.).

(*a*) St. Paul conceives human life as an integral element in a vast *cosmic drama*. This conception receives graphic illustration when he compares the suffering apostles with those doomed to death in the arena: 'We are made a spectacle unto the world, both to angels and men' (1 Co 4^{9}). Man plays his part before an audience invisible as well as visible; nor are those whose eyes are turned upon him mere spectators. There is arrayed against the righteous man a multitude of spiritual forces: 'our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places' (Eph 6^{12}). At the head of this kingdom of evil is Satan, 'the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the sons of disobedience' (Eph 2^{2}; cf. 2 Th 2^{9}), to whom is to be ascribed the power to work both physical (1 Co 5^{5}, 2 Co 12^{7}) and moral (1 Co 7^{5}; cf. 2 Co 11^{3}) evil. Similar to this was the general outlook of contemporary Judaism; the distinctive feature in the case of St. Paul was his faith that victorious energies for good were mediated through Christ. This conception of 'the Lord the Spirit' (2 Co 3^{18}) sprang from St. Paul's experience on the road to Damascus, by which he was convinced of the continued existence, the Divine authority, and the spiritual power of Christ. Union with Christ, thus conceived (1 Co 6^{17}), brought the Christian into a new realm of powers and possibilities. No longer dismayed by the spiritual host arrayed against him, hitherto so often victorious over his fleshly weakness, the Christian became conscious 'in Christ' that God was for him, and convinced that none could prevail against him, through the practical operation of spiritual energies within him. He must indeed be made manifest before the judgment-seat of Christ, but that thought could bring no terror to one who was already 'in Christ.' The Christian warrior (Eph $6^{10f.}$) shares in the conflict of Christ, whose final victory (1 Co $15^{24f.}$) is to be the last act of the great cosmic drama. The fact that, at its culmination, God shall be all in all (v.^{28}) is significant of the whole character of this interpretation of life. There is here no Gnostic dualism; the evil of the world is moral, not physical, in its origin, and the cosmic issues are safe in the hands of the one and only God. The way in which the cosmic forces are imagined and described betrays Jewish origin; but this ought not to prejudice the great principles involved. There can be no doubt that this whole outlook gives to man's life a meaning and a dignity which are a fit development of the high calling assigned to him in the OT.

(*b*) Because this cosmic conflict is essentially moral, its peculiar battle-field is *the heart of man.* There the cosmic drama is repeated in miniature—or rather, there the issues of the world conflict are focused. The cardinal passage is, of course, Ro 7, and this chapter, rather than the 5th, should be the point of departure for any statement of Pauline anthropology. St. Paul is analyzing his own moral and religious experience prior and up to his deliverance by the Spirit of Christ. But he does this in general terms, implying that it is substantially true for all men, since even the Gentiles have the requirements of the Law written in their hearts (2^{15}). The Jewish Law, 'whose silent rolls, in their gaily embroidered cover, the child in the synagogue had seen from afar with awe and curiosity' (Deissmann, *Paulus*, 1911, p. 64), became eloquent to St. Paul as a unique revelation of man's duty, imperfect only in the sense that devotion to it could not generate the moral energy necessary to the fulfilment of its high demands. Without such new motive power, man is helpless, for on his physical side he belongs to the realm of fleshly weakness, the antithesis to that of the Spirit to which the Law itself belongs (Ro 7^{14}). Through this weakness, he has been taken captive by Sin, conceived as an external, personalized activity (vv.$^{8,\ 23}$). Yet the *νοῦς*, or inner man, desires to obey that spiritual Law, for there is a spiritual element (*rûaḥ*) in human nature (8^{16}). St. Paul does not contemplate the case of the man who in his inmost heart does *not* desire to obey that Law, any more than the OT sacrifices provide for deliberate, voluntary sin. He is concerned with his own experience as a zealous Pharisee, eager to find the secret of morality, and discovering instead his own captivity to sin. The body of flesh is found to be, for a reason other than that of Plato's dualism, the prison-house of the soul. The actual deliverance from this death-bringing captivity St. Paul had found in the new spiritual energies which reinforced his captive will 'in Christ.' These gave him a present moral victory over his 'psychic' nature, and the promise of the ultimate replacement of this inadequate organism by a 'pneumatic' body. Sin thus lost the advantage gained by its insidious use of Law (7^{11}) and could be overcome by those who were led by the Spirit (8^{14}, Gal 5^{18}). For where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty (2 Co 3^{17}).

Several points should be particularly noticed in this generalized, yet most vivid, transcript from experience. In the first place, St. Paul does not, here or elsewhere, regard the 'flesh' (σάρξ) as essentially evil, but as essentially weak. It is therefore accessible to the forces of evil, affording to them an obvious base of operations in their siege of the inner or 'spiritual' man. If it be urged that sin is not committed until the inner man yields to the attack of sin, we must remember that the Hebrew psychology (which supplies the real content of St. Paul's Greek terms) regarded the 'flesh' (*basar*) as a genuine element in human personality, alive psychically as well as physically. The man *did* sin when the weakest part of his personality, viz. the flesh, yielded to sin. The often alleged dualism of St. Paul thus becomes the conflict between the stronger and the weaker elements in the unity of personality. Secondly, the whole of Christian character and conduct is related to the dominating conception of the Lord the Spirit. Through this conception St. Paul was able to unite two lines of OT development, viz. the experience of continuous fellowship with God which sprang from the realization of ethical ideals, and the doctrine of the intermittent and 'occasional' Spirit of God. One of St. Paul's greatest services to Christian thought has been to unite these two lines, and to unite them in Christ. The Spirit of God, acting through Christ, becomes the normal principle of Christian morality, and, consequently, of permanent fellowship with God. Thirdly, St. Paul gives no indication that actual sin is anything but what the OT religion made it—the rebellion of the human will against the Divine. In Ro 7 he recognizes no 'original sin,' no hereditary influence even, as active in producing the captivity from which the Spirit of Christ delivers. That captivity is traced to the deceitful attack made on each successive individual by sin, the *external* enemy.

(*c*) From this point of view, we may best approach what St. Paul has to say of the *racial history.* For this the cardinal passage is Ro 5^{12-21}—a passage difficult to interpret, not only because of its abrupt transitions, but even more because, in conventional theology, the later system of Augustinian anthropology has been welded into it. St. Paul is in these verses contrasting Adam and Christ as, in some sense, both unique in their influence on human history; the debatable point is, in what sense? The entrance of death into the world is clearly ascribed to Adam's sin, just as the entrance of new life is ascribed to Christ's obedience (v.^{17}). But when we read that 'through one man's disobedience the many were made sinners' (v.^{19}), we must not assume with Augustine that this refers to the *peccatum originale* handed down by the inherent *concupiscentia* of the sexual act; nor must we be influenced unconsciously by the popular science of to-day, so as to imagine that there is a reference to heredity. Here, as in the well-known saying quoted by both Jeremiah (31^{29}) and Ezekiel (18^{2})—'The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge'—it is not the biological succession of individuals that is in view, but the far-reaching conception of 'corporate responsibility,' as the protest of those two prophets makes evident enough. In their assertion of moral individualism St. Paul would have joined heartily; but his recognition of the individual relation of men to God does not prevent him from accepting the fact that the Ishmaelites were cast out in Hagar's son (Gal 4^{30}), and that the Edomites were 'hated' in Esau (Ro 9^{13}). Just as Achan's sin brought death on his whole family, since it brought them as a group under the ban (Jos $7^{24.\ 25}$), so Adam's sin brought death on the whole human race, since it constituted them 'sinners' as a group. As a matter of fact, St. Paul adds that all men *have* actually sinned, though, prior to the giving of explicit law, their sin was different in kind from Adam's wilful disobedience (Ro 5^{12-14}). But St. Paul does not connect this universality of actual sin in the race, which has justified the Divine sentence of death upon it, with the initial sin of Adam, in such a way as to make them effect and cause. Such a connexion may seem obvious to a mind prepossessed by Augustinian anthropology on the one hand, or by popular biological science on the other; but there is no proof that it was obvious to St. Paul. In fact, as we have seen, the evidence of Ro 7 is the other way. Adam's sin was, indeed, fatal to man, since it brought the Divine penalty of death upon the race; but St. Paul recognizes to the full the individual freedom and responsibility of its individual members, who followed in the footsteps of Adam. It should be noted that contemporary Jewish theology gives no sufficient warrant for ascribing a doctrine of 'original sin' to St. Paul's teachers, but only for ascribing to them the doctrine of the *yezer hara*, the evil impulse present in Adam and in successive individuals of his race, though not due to his sin (cf. F. C. Porter's essay on this subject in *Biblical and Semitic Studies* [Yale Bicentennial Publications], 1901, pp. 93–156). Men acted like Adam because they themselves had the evil heart (*4 Ezr.* iii. 26). In this way, 'every one of us has been the Adam of his own soul' (*Apoc. Bar.* liv. 19). We may reasonably conjecture, in the light of Ro 7, that this substantially represents St. Paul's position. But he has not definitely said this; in Ro 5 his interest lies in the relation not of Adam to the race, but of Adam to Christ, *i.e.*, in the antithesis of death and life, of the psychic and pneumatic orders of humanity. His point in Ro 5 is fairly summed up in 1 Co 15^{22}: 'As in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive.' The Church, as the body of Christ (1 Co 12$^{12.\ 27}$) is a new organism of life within the present general environment of death. The final redemption of the Christian will consist in the quickening of this mortal body of flesh—'the body of this death'—into a spiritual body (Ro 8^{11}, 1 Co 15^{44}), a body like that of the Risen Lord (Ph 3^{21}). Thus St. Paul looks forward to escape from the fleshly weakness of the body, not, as a Greek might have done, along the line of the soul's inherent immortality, but, as a Hebrew of the Hebrews, in the hope of receiving a body more adequate to the needs of the soul. The resurrection of the (spiritually transformed) body will create anew the unity of personality, which physical death destroys. In view of the assertion that 'flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God' (1 Co 15^{50}), we may perhaps suppose that St. Paul would postulate the original mortality of human nature, with a potential immortality lost through sin (Ro 5^{12}).

2. Johannine anthropology.—The NT enables us to trace a further development of the Pauline anthropology in that of the Fourth Gospel and the First Epistle of John. 'John,' as Deissmann has said, 'is the oldest and greatest interpreter of St. Paul'; his writings form 'the most striking monument of the most genuine understanding of Pauline mysticism' (*op. cit.* pp. 4, 90). The Johannine development is towards greater affinity with Greek thought, the Logos doctrine (cf. the parallel phenomenon in Philo) being the most notable example of it. This greater adaptation to the thought and experience of a Greek world explains the greater influence of the Johannine presentation of the gospel on the earlier theology of the Church. The more Hebrew anthropology of St. Paul had, in large measure, to wait for those thinkers of the West who culminated in Augustine. St. Paul's more subjective and individualistic outlook is, indeed, harder to realize than that broad display of great contrasts which gives to the Fourth Gospel part of its fascination for simple souls. In these contrasts we may see the emergence of the opposing realms of Jewish apocalypse (cf. Fairweather, *op. cit.* p. 295). The sense of a *present* judgment, however, constituted by the simple presence of Christ, the Light of Life in this dark world (3^{19} 12^{31}), replaces the eschatological outlook of the Synoptics.

(*a*) *The opposition of the world and God* is the primary Johannine emphasis. Interest is transferred from the Pauline struggle within the soul (*e.g.* Ro 7, Gal 5^{17}) to the external conflict which gathers around the Person of Christ. The world (a characteristic Johannine term) is the realm of darkness (Jn 1^{5} 3^{19} etc.), sin (7^{7}), and death (5^{24}, 1 Jn 3^{14}). Christ is the Light of the world (Jn 8^{12}), its Saviour from sin (1^{29} 3^{17}), and its Life (3^{16} 6^{68}). His conflict with that darkness which *is* sin, and issues in death, is continued by His Spirit (16^{8}). Sin is defined in the characteristic Pauline (Hebrew) way as 'lawlessness' (1 Jn 3^{4}); it is a voluntary act (Jn 9^{41}), and reaches its culmination in the wilful rejection of life in Christ (5^{40}; cf. 16^{9}). Thus the conflict remains essentially ethical, though it is more objectively presented. The protagonist on the side of evil is the devil, who stands behind the evil-doer as his spiritual parent (8^{44}); the world lies in his power (1 Jn 5^{19}), and he is its prince (Jn 12^{31} 14^{30} 16^{11}).

(*b*) The *spiritual transformation* of individual men from lovers of darkness (3^{19}) to sons of light (12^{36}) is conceived both biologically as a *new birth*, and psychologically as a product of *faith*; no formal attempt is made to correlate these two ways of describing the change, or to solve the problem of the relation of Divine and human factors in conversion. John specializes the Pauline idea of a 'new creation' (2 Co 5^{17}, Gal 6^{15}) into that of a new birth (Jn 3^{3}), which springs from a Divine seed (1 Jn 3^{9}). This spiritual birth (much more than a mere metaphor) is sharply contrasted with natural birth (Jn 1^{13}). The new life it initiates is ascribed to the Spirit of God (3^{6}), and is nourished sacramentally (3^{5} 6^{53}). The contrast of Spirit and flesh is not, however, dualistic in the Gnostic sense (cf. the rejection of docetic tendencies); it springs, as in St. Paul's case, from the OT contrast of their respective power and weakness, as seen in their ethical consequences (1 Jn 2^{16}). This new birth from the Spirit has its conscious side in the believer's faith (Jn 1^{12}); that there is no contradiction between the two ideas is shown by such a passage as 1 Jn 5^{1}: 'Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is begotten of God.' Such belief primarily concerns the Divine mission of Christ (Jn 12^{44} 17$^{8.\ 21}$), knowledge of which is imparted through His 'words' (6^{68}), which are themselves Spirit and life (v.^{63}). It will be seen that faith has a more intellectual content for St. John than for St. Paul, though it does not forfeit its essentially mystical character; belief in the mission of Christ marks a stage of development later than the faith of direct moral surrender to Him. The ethical emphasis is still fundamental in this Johannine conception of faith, as is shown by the recognition that 'obedience is the organ of spiritual knowledge' (7^{17}; cf. F. W. Robertson, *Sermons*, 2nd ser., 1875, pp. 94–105). The intimate relation of character and faith is further suggested by the assertion that 'Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice' (18^{37}), *i.e.*, that there is an intrinsic affinity between truth and the Truth (14^{6}).

(*c*) The product of this 'faith-birth' is *eternal life*, a term as central for St. John as 'righteousness' is for St. Paul, and one that characteristically marks St. John's more Greek and less Jewish atmosphere. This eternal life is life like Christ's (1 Jn 3^{2}), and is nourished by such a relation to Him as the allegory of the Vine (Jn 15) suggests. The peculiar mark of this life is that 'love' which St. Paul had described as the greatest amongst abiding realities: 'We know that we have passed out of death into life, because we love the brethren' (1 Jn 3[14]). In such life sin has no place as a fixed habit of character (5[18]); sin unto death (2[19] 5[16]), in fact, would show that there had been no genuine entrance into life. For single acts of sin confessed there is forgiveness and cleansing (1[9]). The issue of sin is death (Jn 8[24]), whereas Christ teaches that 'if any man keep my word he shall never see death' (v.[51]; cf. 11[25. 26]). Except for one passage (5[29]), in which the term 'the resurrection of judgment' may have become a conventional phrase, resurrection appears to be confined to the believer (6[40]), and is intended, as with St. Paul, to restore the full personality. Eternal life is already the believer's possession (1 Jn 5[13]), and the future life is really the direct development of what is begun here. In this way, faith is the victory that hath overcome the world (5[4]).

3. Non-mystical anthropology.—The apostolic writings other than those of the Pauline and Johannine group hardly supply sufficient data to make a detailed statement of their distinctive conceptions of human nature practicable. There are, however, a number of incidental references of considerable interest. The psychology of temptation as given in the Epistle of James (1[13-15]) singles out desire as the parent of sin, and makes death the natural issue of sin, in a sequence that should be compared with the fuller Pauline analysis in Ro 1. The Epistle to the Hebrews teaches that the wilful sin of apostasy after a genuine Christian experience excludes a second repentance; the appended illustration of the fruitless land suggests that those who commit this sin are incapable of repentance (6[4-8]; cf. 12[17]). The Petrine reference to 'the spirits in prison' (1 P 3[19-20] 4[5]) has afforded a basis for much speculation on the possibility of moral change after death. Of more importance than these isolated points is the general characteristic that distinguishes Hebrews, 1 Peter, and James from the Pauline (and Johannine) writings, viz. the absence of the idea of faith as involving mystical union with Christ. In the Ep. to the Hebrews, according to the underlying idea of the high priest in the OT, Christ rather represents man before God than brings the energies of God into the world. Faith in His work means confidence to approach God through Him (4[14-16] 10[19. 22]). Through Christ, according to this Epistle, the realities of the unseen world (11[1]) find their supreme substantiation; whereas, for St. Paul, Christ was primarily the source of new energy to achieve the ideal, a new dynamic within the believer who is mystically united to Him. The more objective conception of faith in the Ep. to the Hebrews (along a different line from that of the Johannine tendency noticed above) is further illustrated by the outlook in 1 Peter, where the *example* of Christ is specially emphasized (1[15] 2[21] 4[1]). This non-mystical Christianity finds its most extreme example in the polemic of St. James against faith without works (2[14-26]). The Pauline faith as a mystical energy is here apparently misunderstood and taken to be a bare intellectual assent. The presence within the NT of this more prosaic type of Christian experience is of considerable interest. It reminds us that the non-mystical temperament has its own legitimate place and can make its own characteristic contribution; indeed, the genuine mystic will probably always belong to the minority. This non-mystical background to the Pauline-Johannine anthropology is indeed more than background; it probably represents the general type of Christian ethics in the 1st century. A notable example of this may be seen in the *Didache* (*c.* A.D. 120). The first five chapters form a manual of instruction for baptismal candidates (cf. § 7, 'Having first recited all these things'), and are concerned with the moral distinctions of right and wrong in practical life—the 'Two Ways'—without a touch of Pauline 'mysticism.' This may be further illustrated from the Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, at the end of the 1st century: 'If our mind be fixed through faith towards God; if we seek out those things which are well pleasing and acceptable unto Him; if we accomplish such things as beseem His faultless will, and follow the way of truth, casting off from ourselves all unrighteousness and iniquity,' we shall be 'partakers of His promised gifts' (xxxv. 5). We have only to compare such an attitude with that underlying the moral exhortations of St. Paul in his Letters to the same Church (transformation through the Lord the Spirit) to feel the externalism of the later writer and the inwardness of the earlier. We must not, of course, forget the mysticism of Ignatius, to which must now be added that of the *Odes of Solomon*, as implying a deeper interpretation of human nature. But the Pauline anthropology can have been little understood, and in the neglect of it lay already some of the seeds of anthropological controversy in the days of Augustine and of the Reformation. Failure to understand the Pauline experience robbed the early Church of an important part of its inheritance.

Conclusion.—An exegetical survey of the apostolic anthropology must frankly recognize the existence of various problems—*e.g.* the relation of human freedom to Divine control—not only unsolved by the writers, but hardly realized by them. We must not, under the guise of 'exegesis,' read our later dogmatic or philosophical solutions into these lacunæ. But neither must we, because of their existence, under-estimate the value of the contribution made by these writers to a doctrine of human nature. Primarily, no doubt, the NT supplies data for all Christian theories rather than dogmatic solutions of the problems which Christian experience raises. But that experience, as recorded in the NT, rests on an acceptance of certain fundamental truths—on the one hand, the worth of human nature and its responsibility to God; on the other, the reality of that spiritual world which men enter through Christ. We are made most effectually to feel the far-reaching power of those truths in their simple majesty when we read the story of His life. But they are not absent from any of the pages of the NT. Indeed, its subtle fascination, its peculiar and unique atmosphere, its constant vision of a land of distances, are largely due to the presence and interaction of these truths. Even the book which reveals most clearly its debt to Jewish supernaturalism, the Apocalypse, begins with the vision of the Risen Lord amongst the golden lampstands of His Churches, and ends with the recognition of individual freedom and its momentous issues (Rev 22[11]). These truths, like their Lord in His incarnation, may seem to have emptied themselves of their universality in taking the form natural to the first Christian generation. But, like Him, they have proved their power as the perennial basis of Christian thinking. Neither the science nor the philosophy of the present day has any quarrel with them. We are happily leaving behind us the naturalism which looked on men as 'streaks of morning cloud,' which soon 'shall have melted into the infinite azure of the past' (Tyndall's *Belfast Address to British Association*, 1874). The modern interest in the psychology of religion, combined with the growing emphasis of philosophy on personality, may well become the prelude to a genuine revival of Paulinism, destined to be not less influential than that of the Reformation.

LITERATURE.—(*a*) Relevant sections of the chief works on NT Theology, *e.g.* those of **B. Weiss** (Eng. tr., 1882–83), **W. Bey-**

schlag (Eng. tr., 1895), H. J. Holtzmann (^{2}1911), J. Bovon (^{2}1902–05), G. B. Stevens (1899). (*b*) *Biblical Anthropology*: J. Laidlaw, *The Bible Doctrine of Man*^{2}, 1895; E. H. van Leeuwen, *Bijbelsche Anthropologie*, 1906; R. S. Franks, *Man, Sin, and Salvation* (Century Bible Handbooks, 1908); H. Wheeler Robinson, *The Christian Doctrine of Man*, 1911; M. Scott Fletcher, *The Psychology of the NT*, 1912. (*c*) *Special discussions of the Pauline doctrine of man, as a whole or in some of its aspects*: H. Lüdemann, *Die Anthropologie des Apostels Paulus*, 1872; J. Gloël, *Der heilige Geist in der Heilsverkündigung des Paulus*, 1888; T. Simon, *Die Psychologie des Apostels Paulus*, 1897; C. Clemen, *Die christliche Lehre von der Sünde*, 1897; H. Gunkel, *Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes*^{2}, 1899; E. Sokolowski, *Die Begriffe Geist und Leben bei Paulus*, 1903; F. R. Tennant, *Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin*, 1903; H. Wheeler Robinson, 'Hebrew Psychology in Relation to Pauline Anthropology,' in *Mansfield College Essays*, 1909; P. Volz, *Der Geist Gottes*, 1910; J. Moffatt, *Paul and Paulinism* (Modern Religious Problems, 1910); G. A. Deissmann, *Paulus*, 1911, Eng. tr., 1912.

H. WHEELER ROBINSON.

MAN OF SIN (2 Th 2^{3}; RVm **'man of lawlessness,'** substituting the better reading *ἀνομίας* for *ἁμαρτίας* of TR).—Apart from such apparent references to the subject as 2 Co 6^{15}, Col 2^{15}, St. Paul's doctrine of the Antichrist is found in the passage 2 Th $2^{1\text{-}12}$, in which he associates 'the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ' with a previous 'falling away' or apostasy (*ἀποστασία*) and the revelation of 'the man of lawlessness,' whom he also designates 'the son of perdition' (v.^{3}), 'the opponent' (*ἀντικείμενος*) of God (v.^{4}), 'the lawless one' (*ὁ ἄνομος*, v.^{8}), whose future revelation in his own time, however, is anticipated even now by a working of 'the mystery of lawlessness' (v.^{7}). The revelation of the man of lawlessness, he further says, is delayed by a restraining power which he refers to in v.^{6} as an impersonal influence (*τὸ κατέχον*) and in v.^{7} as an actual person (*ὁ κατέχων*). From the days of the early Fathers the interpretations of this passage have been exceedingly various. A good summary of the history of previous opinion is given by H. Alford (*Gr. Test.*^{5}, iii. [1871], Proleg., p. 55 ff.), but modern scholars are agreed in holding that the Apostle was speaking of an apocalypse of evil which was only a crowning manifestation of contemporary influences hostile to God and His Kingdom (v.^{7}), and of a restraining power within the knowledge of the Thessalonians themselves (v.^{6}). They are also generally agreed in the view that the two magnitudes which underlay the Apostle's cryptic language in regard to the man of lawlessness and the restrainer are to be found in Judaism and the Roman Empire as represented by its ruler. But at this point opinion divides into two exactly contradictory theories, each of which is able to point to some favouring considerations in the language used by the Apostle.

(1) According to one theory the man of lawlessness is *Roman Imperialism* with the Emperor at its head, while the restraining power is *Judaism* (for a clear and able exposition of this view see B. B. Warfield in *Expositor*, 3rd ser. iv. [1886] 40 ff.). The deification of the Emperors, and especially Caligula's attempt to set up his statue in the Temple of Jerusalem (cf. E. Schürer, *HJP* I. ii. [1890] 98 ff.), certainly afford a very direct explanation of the language of v.^{4} as to the blasphemous pretensions of the man of lawlessness. Moreover, the early history of Christianity suggests that it was part of the Divine plan that the new religion should be developed for a time under the protecting shadow of Judaism as a *religio licita*. The failure of the Roman authorities at first to distinguish the Church from the Synagogue (cf. Ac $18^{14\text{-}16}$) did shelter the former in its days of weakness from the persecuting rage of pagan Imperialism that burst upon it as soon as its separateness and its absolute claims were clearly recognized. But the objection to this theory is that it attributes to St. Paul, whose authorship of 2 Thess. may now be assumed with some confidence, an attitude to Judaism and to Rome respectively which finds no counterpart either in the Thessalonian Epistles or in any other of his writings. It was from Judaism, not from the Empire, that the opposition and persecution he had to encounter as the Apostle of Christianity invariably came (1 Th $2^{14\text{-}16}$; cf. Acts, *passim*). The philosophic historian may see in Judaism the protective sheath of the opening bud of Christianity; but it was not so that St. Paul regarded it. On the contrary, the language in which he describes its treatment of Christ and the gospel, and his denunciation of the wrath of God upon it (1 Th $2^{15\text{f.}}$), suggest that the 'mystery of iniquity' already at work (2 Th 2^{7}) was nothing else than the secret ferment of its own anti-Christian spirit. And Rome with its Emperor could hardly be the man of lawlessness to St. Paul, not only because it had not yet begun to persecute the Church, but because he sincerely respected its authority as a power ordained of God (Ro $13^{1\text{-}7}$), and did not hesitate to appeal to Cæsar himself against his Jewish enemies (Ac $25^{10\text{f.}}$).

(2) The other and more probable theory, accordingly, takes the man of lawlessness to be *anti-Christian Judaism* coming to a head in the person of a pseudo-Messiah, and the restraining power to be *the Roman Empire* personified in the Cæsar himself. It is sometimes objected that under this theory an insuperable difficulty is presented by v.^{4}, as it would be contrary to the rôle of a Jewish Messiah to sit in the Temple of God and set himself forth as God. But this is to overlook the fact that we have to do here with an apocalyptic picture coloured with the language of an OT apocalypse (cf. Dn 11^{36}) and influenced by the Antichrist tradition which had been developing in Judaism ever since the days of Antiochus Epiphanes (see art. ANTICHRIST, 1). To St. Paul as a Rabbinical scholar the portentous figure of the Jewish Antichrist, Satanic, blasphemous, and God-defying, must have been very familiar. His familiarity with it may be traced not only in the language of v.^{4}, but in the references to the Beliar-Satan conception which are present in the passage. In v.^{9} the coming of the man of lawlessness is said to be 'according to the working of Satan.' And E. Nestle has pointed out (*ExpT* xvi. [1904–05] 472) that on the evidence of the LXX and Aquila *ἡ ἀποστασία* (v.^{3}) is a rendering of Heb. בְּלִיַּעַל, *ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀνομίας* (v.^{3}) of אִישׁ בְּלִיַּעַל ('man of Belial'), and *ὁ ἀντικείμενος* (v.^{4}) of שָׂטָן. The Jewish conception of the Antichrist, not as a mere political figure but as an eschatological monstrosity in the shape of a diabolic opponent of God, St. Paul boldly transfers from the sphere of paganism in which Jewish apocalyptic had placed it, and sets down in the sphere of Judaism itself. Out of Judaism he pictured the Antichrist as coming, though there are features in his representation which imply that the sway of the man of lawlessness would extend far beyond the confines of Judaism — that he would cause an apostasy in the Church (v.^{3}), that he would break down the restraining power of the Empire (v.^{7}), that he would draw after him a deluded and perishing world (vv.$^{10\text{-}12}$). In the persistent malevolence of his own race against Christ and the gospel, the Apostle saw the mystery of iniquity working; but he conceived of that malevolence as culminating at length in the appearance of an Antichrist endowed with Satanic and superhuman qualities, who would deceive men by 'power and signs and lying wonders' (v.$^{9\text{ff.}}$; cf. Mk $13^{21\text{-}23}$), and whose hostility to the truth of God which brings salvation would reach its climax in the blasphemous claim to be himself Divine. Then Christ would return to a world now ripe for judgment, slaying the lawless one with the breath of His mouth, and bringing

him to nought by the manifestation of His coming (v.^{8}).

LITERATURE.—Besides the references given in the art., and the Literature appended to art. ANTICHRIST, see A. Sabatier, *The Apostle Paul*, Eng. tr., 1891, p. 117 ff.; B. Weiss, *Biblical Theology of the NT*, Eng. tr., i. [1882] 305 ff.; J. Moffatt, *The Historical NT*, 1901, p. 142 ff., *LNT*, 1911, p. 76 ff.

J. C. LAMBERT.

MANAEN (Heb. *Mᵉnaḥēm*).—As St. Luke prefaces his account of the Church of Jerusalem (Ac 1–5) by giving a list of the apostles who were its chiefs and leaders (1^{23}), so he prefaces his account of the Church of Antioch, and the missionary activity of which it was the centre, by a list of the most noted prophets and teachers who were connected with it: they were Barnabas, and Symeon called Niger, and Lucius the Cyrenian, and Manaen, the foster-brother of Herod the tetrarch, and Saul (13^{1}). What brought Manaen to Antioch we do not know. As foster-brother or playmate of Herod Antipas (for the Greek term bears either meaning) he must have been brought up mainly at Jerusalem. The connexion between Manaen and the Herod family seems to have been hereditary. Josephus tells (*Ant.* XV. x. 5) the story of an elder Manaen, father or uncle of the present one, a noted Essene, who made a prophecy to Herod the Great that he would become king of Judæa; and when the prophecy was fulfilled Herod treated Manaen, and the Essene sect to which he belonged, with great consideration. If, as tradition asserts, St. Luke was a native of Antioch and a resident there, he may well have known Manaen personally and have learnt from him the many details respecting the Herod family which he has introduced into both his Gospel and the Acts. Of Manaen's subsequent career we know nothing. W. A. SPOONER.

MANASSEH.—See TRIBES.

MANNA (*μάννα*).—**1.** Among the *sacra* contained in the Tabernacle the writer of Heb. mentions (9^{4}) the pot of manna, which Aaron was directed to lay up before the Lord as a perpetual memorial of the miraculous food whereby the Israelites were sustained in the wilderness (Ex 16^{33}). The Heb. text does not describe the pot as golden, but the NT writer follows the LXX, which reads *λάβε στάμνον χρυσοῦν ἕνα*. In Solomon's Temple the two tables of stone were the sole contents of the ark of the covenant (1 K 8^{9}), but the Rabbis assumed that the jar of manna was also deposited there, evidently basing their belief on the words 'before the Lord.'

2. The Message to the Church of Pergamos (Rev $2^{12\text{-}17}$) contains the promise that he who overcomes—refusing at all costs to eat things sacrificed to idols—shall be fittingly rewarded by receiving the hidden manna to eat. There is here probably an allusion to the Jewish tradition that, before the Fall of Jerusalem, the ark and its sacred contents were removed by Jeremiah and hidden in a cave of Mount Sinai (2 Mac 2^{1}), from which they were to be restored to their place at the coming of the Messiah, when all the old miracles would be repeated. 'And at that time,' says *Apoc. Bar.* (xxix. 8), 'the stores of manna shall descend again from above; and they shall eat of it in those years.' After manna had come to be named 'corn of heaven' (Ps 78^{24}), 'bread of the mighty' (78^{25}), 'heavenly bread' (105^{40}), *panis angelorum* (*4 Ezr.* i. 29), *ἀγγέλων τροφή* (Wis 16^{20}), *ἀμβροσία τροφή* (19^{21}), it was naturally regarded not merely as material nourishment but as 'spiritual food' (*βρῶμα πνευματικόν* [1 Co 10^{3}]). Like the bread of Christ's own miracles, it had sacramental value, feeding the soul as well as the body (cf. Jn $6^{31\text{-}33}$). JAMES STRAHAN.

MAN-STEALING.—See MEN-STEALERS.

MANTLE.—The word 'mantle' occurs in the RV in He 1^{12}, replacing 'vesture' of the AV. The passage is a quotation from Ps $102^{26\ (27)}$; cf. Ps 104^{6}. In both places the LXX *περιβόλαιον* is a translation of Heb. לְבוּשׁ, 'clothing.' The term is appropriate to certain over-garments of ancient peoples, which were literally cast around the body, in contrast to the under-garments, which were put on. In a more restricted sense the same term is employed in 1 Co 11^{15} to denote 'veil.'

A description of the only specific mantle occurring in the relevant section of Scripture will be found under art. CLOKE. See also art. CLOTHES.

W. CRUICKSHANK.

MARAN ATHA.—See ANATHEMA.

MARBLE (*μάρμαρος*, Lat. *marmor*; from *μαρμαίρειν*, 'sparkle,' 'glisten').—Marble is the name given to any limestone which is sufficiently close in texture to admit of being polished. It is mentioned as part of the merchandise of 'Babylon,' *i.e.* Rome (Rev 18^{12}). It began to be used there for the adornment of buildings about the beginning of the 1st cent. B.C. For a time such luxury was viewed with jealousy by stern republicans (Pliny, *HN* xxxvi. 7), but the Empire effected a great change of sentiment, and Augustus boasted, not without reason, that he 'found Rome of brick and left it of marble' (Suet. *Octav.* xxix.). 'The Emperor obtained this result, seconded by his friend and minister, Agrippa, and succeeded in leaving behind him truly a city of marble, to which the Pantheon bears sufficient witness' (Mary W. Porter, *What Rome was built with*, 1907, p. 7). While the white marble of Luna (near the modern Carrara), Hymettus, Pentelicus, and Paros was used for statuary, many varieties of coloured marble were available for architecture. See, further, art. ROME.

LITERATURE.—F. Corsi, *Delle pietre antiche*, Rome, 1845; G. P. Merrill, *Stones for Building and Decoration*^{3}, New York, 1903. JAMES STRAHAN.

MARK (JOHN).—The name appears eight times in the NT (Ac $12^{12.\ 25}$ $15^{37\text{-}39}$, Col 4^{10}, 2 Ti 4^{11}, Philem ^{24}, 1 P 5^{13}), and the consensus of opinion assigns all the references to one individual. To the Jewish name (John) was added, for use in extra-Palestinian circles, the Latin *prænomen* Mark* (cf. 'Saul—Paul'; see *CIG passim*). The son of Mary, a prominent and well-to-do member of the early Christian society (Jn $18^{16.\ 17}$, Ac 12^{12}), to whose house the brethren used to resort, Mark had easy introduction to the apostolic cabinet, and probably fell under the influence of the dominating personality of Peter. His non-aggressive temperament has carved out no clear line by which history can remember him. He shines here and there in the borrowed light of greater men and flits ever back into a tantalizing darkness. Hence conjecture has sought to find him at other points of his career, *e.g.* as the man carrying the pitcher of water, as one of the Seventy, as the young man of Mk 14^{51}. Only one personal note comes to us, and that from the 3rd century. He is termed *ὁ κολοβοδάκτυλος*† (Hippolytus, *Philos.* vii. 30). Possibly this infirmity was a natural one (cf. *Codex Toletanus*,

---

* The correct form of the name is Maarcus, Μᾶρκος, not Μάρκος, as in editions of the NT. This is clear from Greek and Latin inscriptions (cf. Blass, *Gramm. des neutest. Greichisch*^{2}, 1902, § 4. 2 (Eng. tr.^{2}, 1905).

† Several explanations of this term have been given: (1) that it means 'deserter' (Tregelles) and is applied to Mark because of his defection at Perga; but one so honourably remembered would not be so opprobriously nicknamed; (2) that Mark was a Levite and 'amputasse sibi post fidem pollicem dicitur ut sacerdotio reprobus haberetur' (*Monarchian Prologues* [*TU* xv. 1 [1896] 10]); but this is probably an inference from his kinship (*ἀνεψιός*) with Barnabas; (3) that the term is metaphorical and refers to the abrupt ending of the Second Gospel.

Preface in Wordsworth-White, *Novum Testamentum Latine*, 1889–1905, p. 171), and caused him to take habitually a secondary place throughout life, a *servus servorum dei*. He stands out successively as the assistant of Barnabas, Paul, and Peter.

1. **Association with Paul and Barnabas.**—Having displayed practical gifts probably in the famine relief work in Judæa, Mark returned to Syria with Paul and Barnabas and was chosen to journey with them (Ac 12^{25} 13^{5}). His duties may be assumed to have been not unlike those, *mutatis mutandis*, discharged by the secretary of a modern evangelistic campaign—the selection of routes, arrangement for hospitality, interviews and general detail (but cf. F. H. Chase, art. 'Mark (John)' in *HDB*). At Perga he cut himself adrift from the party—it may be because, being sensitively timid from his physical defect, he shrank from the hazardous venture across the Taurus; or, holding the narrower views of his teacher Peter concerning the Gentiles, he was out of sympathy with a campaign that had overshot its intentions; or because some filial duty called him (cf. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, 1895, p. 90). His reason certainly did not satisfy Paul. After the Jerusalem Council, when the two colleagues contemplated a return visit to their churches (Ac 15^{36}), Paul came into sharp collision with Barnabas, who wished again to take his cousin Mark with them, and they separated. Barnabas and Mark sailed for Cyprus, probably as unauthorized evangelists, while Paul with Silas left for Syria under the official benediction (παραδοθεὶς τῇ χάριτι τοῦ κυρίου ὑπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν).

2. **In Cyprus and Egypt.**—The veil is not lifted on the doings of the missionaries to Cyprus. They were among their own people there. Barnabas was apparently a native (Ac 4^{36}), and his act of self-sacrifice on behalf of the cause he served may have predisposed the honest-minded among his compatriots to listen to him with peculiar attention. Mark, too, was a Hellenist and had Cyprian blood in his veins. The prophets, according to the late and unreliable *Acts of Barnabas* (Περίοδοι Βαρνάβα), had no honour in their own country, and Barnabas suffered martyrdom. Mark may then have passed to Egypt, and traditions certainly point that way. Eusebius (*HE* ii. 16), Jerome (*de Vir. Illustr.* 8), the *Apostolic Constitutions* (vii. 46), and Epiphanius (*Hær.* li. 6) unite in their testimony on the point. Though their details will not precisely fit, we may possibly regard Mark as the founder of the Christian Church in Alexandria and as its first bishop. Jerome makes out that he died there in A.D. 62 ('Mortuus est autem octavo Neronis anno et sepultus Alexandriæ succedente sibi Anniano'). But 'the statement seems to be merely an unsound inference from the Eusebian date for the succession of Annianus' (Swete^{2}, p. xxvii) to the see of Alexandria.

3. **With Paul.**—Shall we say, then, that Mark returned from his Egyptian journey, his spurs won? He reappears in Paul's favour and serves under his direction. The Gentile Apostle commands that welcome be given him at Colossæ (Col 4^{10})—*if he come*. Is there just a touch of Paul's old distrust of Mark in the hypothetical phrase? He does not seem to have actually reached Colossæ. The lure of Egypt may have drawn him there instead. Later still he is stationed somewhere between Ephesus and Rome (2 Ti 4^{11}). Paul may have used his now trusted companion as a deputy to various churches. But particularly he had need of him often at the home base (Rome): there 'the ὑπηρέτης of the first missionary journey became the συνεργός of the Roman imprisonment' (Col 4^{11}, Philem ^{24}). The ageing Apostle needed just such personal services as Mark was specially fitted to give.

4. **With Peter.**—Assuming the genuineness of 1 Peter, we next find Mark, probably after the death of Paul, again in close touch with Peter. This apostle had helped to form Mark's early impressions by his visits to Mary's house, and claimed him by the affectionate title of son (υἱός), if indeed he was not a spiritual son (τέκνον). Now, if tradition be correct, he was destined to furnish Mark's mind with a treasure that has enriched the whole Christian Church. Peter spoke Aramaic ordinarily, and so he required an attendant who could translate easily into Greek. For this task of dragoman Mark was eminently suited. As his Latin name and Hellenistic descent implied, he was proficient in Greek as well as in Aramaic. As Peter preached Mark took mental note of his reminiscences of Jesus, and thence grew that memoir which is, or has become in expanded forms, the Second Gospel. The Fathers disagree as to how and when the compilation was made. Origen would even make Peter responsible for personal oversight of the work, but Irenæus is probably right in stating that it was after Peter's death that Mark wrote down the memoirs (cf. Menzies, *The Earliest Gospel*, p. 44 ff.).

5. **In legend.**—Later legend has been busy with the name of Mark. The most probable and earliest tradition is that already mentioned which links his name to Alexandria. A 7th cent. tradition speaks of a ministry in N. Italy, and from this springs Mark's association with Venice (notably the Church of St. Mark). Martyrologists claim him and represent him as dying a violent death by burning or by being dragged over stones. But the earliest mention of martyrdom is not of earlier date than the 4th or 5th cent. (*Acta Marci*).

The *Acts of Barnabas* profess to be written by the evangelist, but that compilation is of the 4th cent. at earliest. Attempts have been made to assign to him various books of the NT—Hebrews, the Apocalypse, Jude—but on quite inadequate grounds. A liturgy bears his name.

LITERATURE.—H. B. Swete, *Gospel acc. to St. Mark*^{2}, 1902, pp. xiii–xxviii; A. Menzies, *The Earliest Gospel*, 1901, Introduction, pp. 40–47; artt. 'Mark, St.' in *EBr*^{11}, 'Mark (John)' in *HDB*, and 'Mark' in *EBi*; T. Zahn, *NT Introd.*, Eng. tr., 1909, ii. 427 ff. For later legend cf. Molini, *De vita et lipsanis S. Marci Evangelistæ*, ed. Pieralisi, 1864; R. A. Lipsius, *Die apok. Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden*, 1883–84; T. Schermann, *Propheten- und Apostellegenden* (*TU*, 3rd ser., i. [1907]).

JOHN DOW.

MARKET OF APPIUS.—See APPIUS, MARKET OF.

MARKET-PLACE.—Market-place (Ac 16^{19} 17^{17}) is the translation of Gr. ἀγορά, which corresponds to Lat. *forum*. It was the favourite resort of the populace in a Greek city for social and political purposes. At Philippi St. Paul was taken there in order that he might be accused before the magistrates. This town being a *colonia*, the Roman custom, according to which the magistrates sat in the Forum, was followed. That St. Paul should preach in the Agora at Athens was only natural, since here he would find the greatest number of people gathered together. It was the new Roman Agora which lay to the north of the Acropolis in the Eretrian quarter. It was surrounded by porticoes of great beauty, embellished as they were by sculptures, and rich in associations dear to the heart of the Athenian. In the Stoa Basileios was the judgment-seat of the king archon; from the Stoa Poikile the Stoics received their name; and so forth. Here slaves were engaged in making purchases on behalf of their masters, students and philosophers met for conversation and discussion, and nobles lounged in easy state. It was the one place where general attention could be drawn to the new preaching.

F. W. WORSLEY.

MARKS, STIGMATA.—The word *stigma*, in addition to its literal and moral use, is employed technically in botany, anatomy, pathology, zoology, and geometry. The only uses that fall to be considered are the literal, moral, and pathological.

A στίγμα (from vb. στίζω; cf. Lat. *stimulus*, Germ. *stecken*, Eng. 'stick,' 'sting') is a mark upon the body produced by pricking, cutting, or branding. In the East such marking was very common in ancient times, and even yet cases may be found, though they are rare (Mrs. W. M. Ramsay, *Everyday Life in Turkey*^{2}, London, 1903, p. 7). The wounds were prevented from healing quickly so that broad scars might be produced. Sometimes, with the same end in view, coloured matter was rubbed into the brand-mark. These signs of ownership were impressed upon certain classes of the community.

(1) *Temple-slaves* (ἱερόδουλοι) were branded with some token of the deity worshipped. See Herod. ii. 113: ὅτεῳ ἀνθρώπων ἐπιβάληται στίγματα ἱρά, ἑωυτὸν διδοὺς τῷ θεῷ, οὐκ ἔξεστι τούτου ἅψασθαι, also vii. 233; Lucian, *de Dea Syr.* § 59, στίζονται δὲ πάντες οἱ μὲν ἐς καρποὺς οἱ δὲ ἐς αὐχένας; Philo, *de Monarch.* i. 8, ἐν τοῖς σώμασι καταστίζοντες αὐτὴν σιδήρῳ πεπυρωμένῳ πρὸς ἀνεξάλειπτον διαμονήν, οὐδὲ γὰρ χρόνῳ ταῦτα διαμαυροῦνται. Ptolemy Philopator commanded the Jews of Alexandria to be branded with an ivy-leaf, the symbol of Dionysius. See 3 Mac 2^{29}: τούς τε ἀπογραφομένους χαράσσεσθαι καὶ διὰ πυρὸς εἰς τὸ σῶμα παρασήμῳ Διονύσου κισσοφύλλῳ; cf. Rev $13^{16.\,17}$: 'And he caused all, the small and the great, and the rich and the poor, and the free and the bond, that there be given them a mark on their right hand, or upon their forehead ('in fronte, propter professionem: in manu, propter operationem' [Aug. *Civ. Dei*, xx. 9. 3]); and that no man should be able to buy or to sell, save he that hath the mark, even the name of the beast or the number of his name.' Sometimes the foreheads of the martyrs were branded with the name of Christ. Note also the references to the 'sealing' in Rev 7 14^{1}, 2 Mac 6^{7}, 3 Mac 7^{3} 14^{1} 22^{4}.

(2) *Household-slaves.*—The Greeks and Romans branded those who were re-captured after attempting to escape, and those of bad behaviour. The common method was to press upon the forehead a red-hot iron with embossed letters. This custom is mentioned by Pliny (*HN* xviii. 3), Varro (*de Re Rustica*, i. 18), Suetonius (*Calig.* xxvii.), and other classical writers. Such slaves were called στιγματίαι, *literati*, *notati*, *inscripti*, and were held in disgrace. Slaves of good character were not branded as a general rule (Pseudo-Phocyl. 212: στίγματα μὴ γράφῃς ἐπονειδίζων θεράποντα; Seneca, *de Benef.* iv. 37, 38).

(3) *Captives* taken in war were occasionally marked with the stigma of the captor.

(4) *Soldiers* sometimes bore on their bodies the name of their commander. So some Christians marked their hands and arms with the name of Christ or the sign of the cross (Deyling, *Observationes sacræ*, Leipzig, 1720–26, iii. 423–427).

The word στίγμα is used by St. Paul in Gal 6^{17} only: ἐγὼ γὰρ τὰ στίγματα τοῦ [κυρίου, TR] Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματί μου βαστάζω; Vulg.: 'Ego enim stigmata Domini Jesu in corpore meo porto'; RV 'for I bear branded on my body the marks of Jesus.' Most modern commentators hold the view that St. Paul had in mind the ἱεροδοῦλος, or Temple-slave, bearing the stigma of the deity worshipped. This custom would be well known in that part of Asia Minor, where the worship of Cybele was celebrated. A slave of this class is mentioned in a Galatian inscription (Texier, *Asie Mineure*, 1835, i. 135). Two objections to this theory have been raised. One is that St. Paul was not likely to refer to this custom because it was associated especially with the temple-women whose lives were notoriously immoral. The other is that St. Paul uses the simple form δοῦλος in his Epistles (cf. Ro 1^{1}, 1 Co 7^{22}, 2 Co 4^{5}, Gal 1^{10}, Ph 1^{1}). He does not employ the compound word ἱεροδοῦλος.

It is not likely that the Apostle had in mind the soldier, who deliberately marked himself with the name or token of his commander, as the context does not suggest any such idea, though elsewhere St. Paul manifests a liking for metaphors from military life (cf. 1 Co 9^{7}, 2 Co 10^{4}, Eph $6^{11f.}$, 1 Ti 6^{12}, 2 Ti 4^{7}). That he refers here to the refractory slave, the runaway, the deserter from the army, is impossible.

In what sense did St. Paul use the word βαστάζω? It has a variety of meanings in the NT. It is employed for the taking up of stones (Jn 10^{31}); for bearing the cross (Lk 14^{27}, Jn 19^{17}); for undertaking a matter with calmness and sufficient strength (Jn 16^{12}, Gal 6^{5}); for bearing the sentence of a judge (Gal 5^{10}); for bearing or enduring (φέρειν is the classical word generally used) (Mt 20^{12}, Ac 15^{10}, Ro 15^{1}, Gal 6^{2}, Rev $2^{2f.}$); for carrying (Mt 3^{11}, Mk 14^{13}, Lk 7^{14} 22^{10}, Rev 17, and passive in Ac 3^{2} 21^{35}); for carrying knowledge by preaching (Ac 9^{15}); for carrying on the person (Lk 10^{4}, Gal 6^{17}); for carrying the fœtus in the womb (Lk 11^{27}); for sustaining (Ro 11^{18}); for bearing away or carrying off (Mt 8^{17}, Jn 12^{6} 20^{15}). In this same chapter (Gal $6^{2.\,5}$; cf. 5^{10}) the word is used in connexion with the bearing of burdens, and probably means 'bear as a burden' in 6^{17}. There is, however, a suggestion of something more. Chrysostom's idea (*Com. in loc.*) has much to commend it: οὐκ εἶπεν, ἔχω, ἀλλά, βαστάζω, ὥσπερ τις ἐπὶ τροπαίοις μέγα φρονῶν ἢ σημείοις βασιλικοῖς; cf. 2 Co 4^{10}. No doubt he referred to the marks left upon him by the scourgings, stonings, imprisonments, privations, and toils of his missionary career (cf. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, London, 1895, pp. 107, 304). On the pages of his flesh his personal history was inscribed (see 2 Co 11^{24-28}). These stigmata proved that Christ was his Master, Commander, Owner. The metaphor was ready to his hand. In the dungeon everything suggested ownership—the marked walls, the marked chains, the marked slaves, the marked soldiers. He too was no longer his own but Another's. The servant was not a mere hireling, but a possession, made secure by the unbreakable bonds of mutual affection. It is significant that in the Epistle to the Romans, written soon after the Galatian letter, St. Paul describes himself as a δοῦλος, 'slave,' 'bond-servant' of Jesus Christ (Ro 1^{1}), distinctly adopting that title for the first time. This term is found in Phil., Tit., James, 2 Pet., Jude, 'showing that as the Apostolic Age progressed the assumption of the title became established on a broad basis' (Sanday-Headlam, *ICC*, 'Romans'^{5}, Edinburgh, 1902, p. 3).

Deissmann suggests that the stigmata were prophylactic against trouble and evil (*Bibelstudien*, Marburg, 1895, p. 266 f.), but this view is not in harmony with the spirit of the Galatian Epistle in general, and the closing passage in particular. To understand Gal 6^{17} it is necessary to note Gal $1^{8-12.\,15f.}$ $2^{19f.}$ 4^{12-20}, and compare 2 Co 4^{10}. Possibly the scars caused Lysias to conclude that St. Paul was the Egyptian bandit (Ac 21^{38}; cf. J. H. Moulton, *ExpT* xxi. [1909–10] 283–284).

Not only did the Apostle bear the physical stigmata, but he displayed also the spiritual 'marks of Jesus'—love, gentleness, humility, unselfishness (Jn 13^{35}, Ph 2^{5}, 2 Ti 2^{24}).

In the 'Age of Faith,' in reality the 'Dark Age,' many believed that the body of the Apostle bore marks resembling the wound-prints on the body of the Crucified Jesus. A similar belief prevailed with regard to St. Francis of Assisi, upon whose body the marks were impressed on 15th Sept. 1224 by a seraph with six wings. Bonaventura says, 'Jam enim propter stigmata Domini Jesu quæ in corpore tuo portas, nemo debet tibi esse molestus' (*Life of St. Francis*, 13. 4). These words were paraphrased afterwards by Aquinas as follows: 'portabat insignia passionis Christi,' but what he says subsequently proves that he did not accept the view of Bonaventura. Another very famous instance is that of St. Catherine of Siena. Altogether there are about ninety cases of stigmatization on record. It is alleged that in some cases all the marks were present; in others some were visible and the rest caused pain but produced no outward sign; in others, again, there was no visible mark at all, but local pains were felt. Occasionally the marks became visible after death. There are fewer cases of stigmatization recorded amongst men than amongst women.

Investigation has proved that some instances were fraudulent, others the result of self-mutilation (cf. Mt 19^{12}), and some owing to a kind of hysteria. But all cannot be explained, or explained away, in these ways. The influence of the mind upon the body is great and mysterious. Beaunis states that rubefaction and vesication have been produced by suggestion in the hypnotic state (*Recherches expérimentales sur les conditions de l'activité cérébrale*). In certain varieties of religious ecstasy a bloody sweat may leave a red mark upon the skin, and such marks are caused also by capillary congestion. It has been maintained that transudation of blood through an unbroken skin is an unknown and impossible phenomenon. Pathological facts probably gave rise to the belief that the stigmata of the crucified body of Jesus were seen upon some of His followers.

LITERATURE.—Artt. 'Cuttings in the Flesh' and 'Mark' in *HDB*, 'Stigmata' in *DCG*; Commentaries on Gal 6^{17}, by **H. A. W. Meyer** (^{4}1862), **H. Alford** (^{5}1871), **J. A. Beet** (1885), **J. B. Lightfoot** (^{12}1896), **W. M. Ramsay** (1899); 'Stigmatization' in *EBr*^{11} and 'Stigmatisation' in *PRE*^{3}; *Lives of St. Francis of Assisi* by **Thomas de Celano** (ed. Rosedale, London, 1904) and **St. Bonaventura** (ed. Amoni, Rome, 1888), **Mrs. Oliphant** (^{2}do., 1871), **Paul Sabatier** (Fr. ed.^{22}, Paris, 1899, Eng. tr., London, 1901, etc.); **H. Beaunis**, *Recherches expérimentales sur les conditions de l'activité cérébrale*, Paris, 1886; **P. Dearmer**, *Body and Soul: An Inquiry into the Effects of Religion upon Health*, London, 1909; *ExpT* xx. [1908–09] 485–86.

H. CARISS J. SIDNELL.

MARRIAGE.—1. Christian conception of marriage.—During the Apostolic Age the Church was both Jewish and Gentile, and its ideas on marriage had a double background in those of the OT and the heathen. The gravest danger was that the laxity of heathenism with regard to marriage should remain among the Gentile converts. In the heathen world, though the marriage ceremony was in some sort a sacred act, the marriage itself was looked on as an easily-broken contract which either party might dissolve at will. It is not surprising, therefore, that one of the earliest questions which the Corinthians put to St. Paul should be on the subject of marriage (1 Co 7^{1}). The Apostle, writing as he does to Gentiles, dwells on the fact that marriage is a remedy against sin (v.^{2}; cf. also 1 Th $4^{3f.}$, whether with most modern commentators we interpret τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σκεῦος in that passage of a man's wife, or, with G. Milligan, of the human body, for the context implies marriage), and gives many warnings against heathen impurities (Ro $1^{24\ 28}$ [idolatry and impurity inseparable] $6^{12f.}$ 13^{14}, 1 Co $5^{1.\ 9-11}$ 6^{13-20}, 2 Co 12^{21}, Gal 5^{16-24}, Eph $2^{2f.}$ 4^{17-19} ['as the Gentiles also walk'] 5^{3}, Col 3^{5-8}, 2 Ti 2^{22}). Other NT writers give like warnings (1 P 1^{14} 2^{11} $4^{2f.}$, 2 P 2^{18}, Jude $^{16.\ 18}$).

The Jews had a much higher conception of marriage than the heathen. Almost all of them were married, as is the case at the present day with practically the whole of the Christian, Jewish, and Muslim populations of the Near East—the exceptions are very few. They looked on the saying 'Be ye fruitful and multiply' (Gn 1^{28}) as a universal command. Marriage was a sacred duty and was considered most holy. 'The pious fasted before it, confessing their sins. It was regarded almost as a Sacrament. Entrance into the married state was thought to carry the forgiveness of sins' (Edersheim, *LT*^{9} i. 352 f.). Yet the Jews had not escaped from heathen contamination; not only was divorce extremely common (below, **7**), but, as frequent passages in the OT show, impurities of all kinds had to be strongly repressed. In Eph $2^{2f.}$ St. Paul does not acquit his own nation in this respect, contrasting the pronouns 'ye' (Gentiles) and 'we also' (Jews).

Our Lord greatly raised the conception of marriage, even as compared with that of the Jews of the time. It was a Divine institution, which made man and one wife to become one flesh, for God had joined them together (Mk 10^{6-9}, Mt 19^{4-6}, quoting Gn 2^{24}). The primeval marriage, the idea of which was obscured by the hardness of man's heart, was revived, and the teaching about divorce (below, **7**) was revolutionized. Nevertheless, marriage was intended only for this life, for there are no marriages in heaven (Mt 22^{30}, Mk 12^{25}, Lk 20^{35}—these passages, it is needless to say, do not teach that loved ones will be parted hereafter). Jesus chose a marriage feast for His first miracle (Jn $2^{1ff.}$). Following the Master's teaching, St. Paul insists on the holiness of marriage in Eph 5^{22-33} (cf. He 13^{4}); the quotation from Genesis is repeated (v.^{31}), and marriage is said to symbolize the union between Christ and His Church (vv.$^{23-28}$)—a metaphor drawn out in the ancient homily known as 2 Clement (§ 14: 'the male is Christ, and the female is the Church'). Hence St. Paul dwells on the love that ought to exist between husband and wife, even as Christ loved the Church (vv.$^{25.\ 28.\ 33}$; cf. Col 3^{19}). St. Peter in a corresponding passage (1 P 3^{7}) dwells rather on the honour due by the husband to his wife; and both apostles, speaking of the duty of wives to husbands in these passages, rather dwell on their subjection to their consorts [see FAMILY, § **2** (*a*)], though in Tit $2^{4f.}$ the love of the wife to the husband is mentioned as well as her subjection. In 1 Co $7^{3ff.}$ St. Paul reminds married persons that they no longer are mere individuals, but belong to one another, and must not refuse cohabitation with one another except by consent for a season.

2. Christian conception of celibacy.—We must remember that celibacy was extremely uncommon both among the Jews and among the heathen in the first ages of the Church. It was not part of the Nazirite's vow (Nu 6^{3-5}), though no doubt many Nazirites, like John Baptist (if indeed he was one of them), were celibates. And there were some, but not all, of the Essenes who preached the duty of abstinence from marriage, and admitted members to their body only after a probation of three years to test their continency (Josephus, *BJ* II. viii. 2, 7). In them we see the germ of Gnostic dualism, which taught the inherent evil of matter (Lightfoot, *Colossians*, ed. 1900, p. 85; see also his essay on this sect, p. 375 ff.). In this respect the Essenes were in direct antagonism with the Pharisees, who strongly supported marriage; but they had some influence in promoting Christian celibacy in the post-Apostolic Age. Among the heathen celibacy can hardly be said to have existed.

Our Lord, while teaching, as we have seen, the holiness of marriage, nevertheless commended celibacy for those 'to whom it is given' and who are 'able to receive it'; for so we must interpret the phrase 'which made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake' (Mt $19^{11f.}$). As St.

Paul says (1 Co 7^{7}), ‘each man hath his own gift from God, one after this manner, and another after that.’ Nowhere in the NT is marriage referred to as a state inferior to that of celibacy, however much the latter may be commended under certain circumstances to certain persons. And so, probably, we are to interpret our Lord’s words about leaving ‘house, or wife, or brethren, or parents, or children, for the kingdom of God’s sake’ (Lk 18^{29}; in ‖ Mt 19^{29}, Mk 10^{29} the best MSS omit ‘or wife’). He could not have counselled a man to desert his wife or children if he had them. J. Wordsworth suggests (*Ministry of Grace*, London, 1901, p. 207) that the words may also include leaving an unbelieving and unfaithful wife, or a temporary separation by agreement, when the husband has to go to a part of the world where he cannot take a family (1 Co 7^{5} is somewhat analogous).

In the teaching of St. Paul we notice a certain change of view between the earlier and later Epistles. (*a*) In the earlier Epistles the Apostle plainly expected that the Parousia was imminent (cf. 1 Th 4^{17}: ‘we that are alive, that are left’; 1 Co 16^{22} and perhaps 15^{51}). If that were the case, the increase of the race would not be of primary importance; and therefore, while marriage was entirely lawful (1 Co 7^{28}), and indeed imperative for those who had not the gift of continency (vv.$^{2.9}$), celibacy was encouraged. ‘It is good for a man not to touch a woman’; ‘I would that all men were even as I myself’; ‘it is good for them if they abide even as I’ (vv.$^{1.7f.}$); ‘it is good for a man to be as he is’—whether married or single (v.^{26}). Yet St. Paul does not say that celibacy is a higher state, but only that it is expedient by reason of the present distress (v.^{26}), because the time is shortened (v.^{25}), and he would have Christians free from cares (v.^{32}). The lawfulness of marriage is further emphasized by the assertion of the right to marry by St. Paul himself, ‘even as the rest of the apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas’ (9^{5}). The meaning of these words is not quite plain; Cephas certainly was married (Mt 8^{14}, Lk 4^{38}), but were all the other apostles and all our Lord’s four brethren in like case? If so, why is Cephas mentioned separately? To the last question there is no clear answer, but the whole verse seems to show, especially in view of Jewish customs (see above), that at least a majority of the apostles and of our Lord’s brethren were married, and that the married state was not inconsistent with the work of a travelling missionary. As a comment on this we have the fact that Aquila, a great Christian worker, travelled about with his wife Prisca (Ac 18$^{2.26}$, Ro 16^{3}, 1 Co 16^{19}, 2 Ti 4^{19}). (*b*) In the Epistles of the Captivity marriage is mentioned as the normal state, and nothing is said in favour of celibacy (Eph 5$^{31ff.}$, Col 3$^{18f.}$; cf. 1 P 3$^{1-7}$), while we notice also that in these Epistles little is said of the nearness of Christ’s coming (Ph 4^{5} stands alone). (*c*) In the Pastoral Epistles marriage is recommended, or as some think required, for the local clergy (1 Ti 3$^{2.4f.}$, Tit 1^{6}; see HOME), and is also advised for young women (1 Ti 5^{14} AV, RVm) or for young widows (RV). Whatever may be the force of the phrase ‘husband of one wife’ (*μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἄνδρα*) as excluding certain persons from the ministry (see below, § 5), the whole context would appear to show that St. Paul desired his local officials, the presbyters (‘bishops’) and deacons, to be, at least as a rule, married men, just as the Orthodox Eastern Church demands at the present day that her parish priests should be married, and that their wives should be alive. This does not depend on the untenable exegesis which makes *μιᾶς* the indefinite article (‘husband of a wife’), but on the word ‘husband’ and the context. There might perhaps be exceptions, of which the Apostle does not stop to speak. We must always bear in mind that it is a mistake to interpret a biblical passage with reference to the bearing that it has on later Christian practice; a disciplinary rule, by its nature, is not intended to be for all time, however suitable it may have been for the First Age. Another passage in these Epistles may also be noticed. St. Paul denounces as a heresy the prohibition of marriage (1 Ti 4^{3}); though this does not involve any change of view as compared with the earlier Epistles. In what has been here said, the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles is assumed; if this be not allowed, the alteration of the Christian view as to the expediency of celibacy between the earlier and the later periods still holds good. But no argument against the Pauline authorship must be deduced from it, for a change of view is very natural in the course of a decade or more, during which a longer experience showed that the early expectation of Jesus’ immediate return was founded on a too hasty assumption; and, moreover, the Epistles of the Captivity serve as a bridge between the earlier and the later views.

In the apostolic period we read of a few persons who led the celibate life. St. Paul himself was unmarried (1 Co 7$^{7f.}$ 9^{5}); so were the four daughters of Philip the Evangelist who ‘prophesied’ (Ac 21^{9}); St. John Evangelist was frequently known in the early Church as *ὁ παρθένος*, as in the 3rd cent. Gnostic work *Pistis Sophia*; Tertullian had already called him a ‘celibate (*spado*) of Christ’ (*de Monogam.* 17). It is not quite easy to say who are meant by the ‘virgins’ (masc.) of Rev 14^{4}. The word is interpreted by Tertullian (*de Res. Carn.* 27, referring to Mt 19^{12}) of celibates; but Swete (*Com. in loc.*) gives good reasons for thinking that it must apply to married as well as unmarried chastity, and ‘be taken metaphorically, as the symbolical character of the Book suggests. . . . No exclusion of the married from the highest blessings of the Christian life finds a place in the NT.’

In interpreting the NT it is of some importance to note the comments of those writers who immediately followed the apostles. Ignatius’ idea of celibacy (*Polyc.* 5) does not go further than our Lord’s teaching. ‘My sisters’ (he says) are to love the Lord and be content with their spouses (*συμβίοις*) in flesh and spirit; ‘my brothers’ are to love their spouses as the Lord loved the Church (cf. Eph 5^{29}). If anyone can abide in purity (*ἁγνείᾳ*, *i.e.* ‘virginity’) to the honour of the flesh of the Lord (cf. 1 Co 6^{15}), let him abide without boasting. If he boast, he is lost; and if it be known beyond the bishop (*πλέον τοῦ ἐπισκόπου*: not ‘if he be more famous than the bishop’), he is corrupted. All who marry should do so with the consent of the bishop, that the marriage may be after the Lord (cf. 1 Co 7^{39}). Thus, in Ignatius’ opinion, the bishop is to be taken into the confidence both of those who marry and of those who wish to remain celibates; in the latter case the intention must not be noised abroad. Similarly Clement of Rome (*ad Cor.* i. 38) says: ‘He that is pure (*ἁγνός*) in the flesh, let him be so, and not boast, knowing that it is Another who bestows his continence (*ἐγκράτειαν*) upon him.’ We note that both Ignatius and Clement use *ἁγνός* or *ἁγνεία* of celibacy, though they do not say that celibacy is the higher state. Hermas, on the other hand, in his *Shepherd* (*Mand.* iv. 4), describes the chastity both of the married and of the unmarried as *ἁγνεία*. The phrase of Ignatius, ‘virgins who are called widows’ (*Smyrn.* 13), has been much discussed. It can hardly mean unmarried women included in the order of widows, for Ignatius in that case would have omitted in his salutation all those who were literally widows, and such a custom is treated as unheard of by Tertullian (*de Virg. Vel.* 9); and 'virgins' is therefore probably to be interpreted symbolically as in Rev 14^{4} (above), of women who are pure in heart (see Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*^{2}, pt. ii.: 'S. Ignatius and S. Polycarp,' London, 1889, ii. 323 f.).

3. Marriage ceremonies.—The *betrothal* preceded the actual marriage by several months, but not by more than a year (Edersheim, *op. cit.* i. 354). It is referred to in 2 Co 11^{2}, where St. Paul says that he betrothed (ἡρμοσάμην, here only in the NT) the Corinthians to Christ; cf. Dt 28^{30}, Pr 19^{14}. In arranging for the betrothal, the intended bridegroom took no part, and matters were settled, as they still are in the East, by the respective parents, or, if they were not alive, by the brother or nearest relative. In the parable the father is said to make a marriage, or a marriage feast (ποιεῖν γάμον), for his son (Mt 22^{2}); so in the OT, Gn 24^{3} (Abraham and his steward for Isaac) $34^{4.8}$ (Hamor for Shechem) 38^{6} (Judah for Er), Jg 14^{2-10} (Manoah for Samson). When the father was not available, the mother sometimes acted, as when Hagar acted for Ishmael (Gn 21^{21}) or the mother for her son (2 Es 9^{47}). It is instructive to see how marriage customs, as well as others, persistently survive in the East from biblical times, and we find that among the Oriental Christians of to-day the same practice obtains (Maclean-Browne, *Catholicos of the East*, p. 144); courtship in the Western sense of the term is little known, and the courting is done by the parents. The betrothal, having been accomplished by crowning with garlands and with some ceremony (Edersheim, *loc. cit.*), was, and is, absolutely binding, and a breach of it is treated as adultery in Dt $22^{23f.}$ (ct. v.^{28}, Lv 19^{20}); this is illustrated by the position of Joseph as a betrothed husband in Mt 1^{19}. It is suggested by Plummer (*HDB* i. 326) that the woman taken in adultery (Jn 8^{4}) was betrothed, not married, as she was to be stoned, not strangled. This may be so, since stoning is mentioned in Dt 22^{24}, but not in Lv 20^{10}, which gives the death-penalty for the adultery of married persons. Yet in Ezk 16^{38-40} married adulteresses seem to be meant, and there stoning is mentioned. Strangling was a later form of execution.

The *night procession* is perhaps the principal feature of the marriage. The bridegroom goes to fetch the bride at night, as in the parable of the Ten Virgins, and brings her to his house at midnight (Mt 25^{6}), with lamps—not, according to Edersheim (ii. 455) and Trench (*Parables*, 248), with torches, as the Roman custom was. These lamps were placed in a hollow cup, affixed to a long pole. A relic of this custom is seen in the present day among the East Syrians (Nestorians), who have the procession in the daytime, but carry two unlighted candles before the bride (*Catholicos of the East*, p. 153); in their case the bridegroom does not fetch his bride himself, but sends his father or friends, whence the usual expression for 'to marry a son' is 'to bring a bride for him' (*ib.*). A reference to these lamps has been seen in 2 Es 10^{2}, but this seems to refer to the lights in the guest-room. Before the bridegroom comes, the bride makes herself ready (Rev 19^{7}) with the bath; this was the custom, and seems to be referred to in Eph 5^{25-27}. The herald going before the bridegroom and crying, 'Behold the bridegroom, come ye forth to meet him' (Mt 25^{6}), is a common feature of Eastern life, in which an expected magnate is usually preceded by such an announcement. But in the parable was the bridegroom returning with his bride to his own house, or going to fetch her? The latter view is taken by Edersheim (ii. 454 ff.), who thinks that the bridegroom was coming from a distance to the wedding in the bride's house; but the other view, held by most commentators, is much more probable. Normally the wedding is in the bridegroom's house, and in the absence of any requirement of the parable to the contrary the usual custom must be assumed. And there is an early interpretation of the meaning; the words 'and the bride' are added to Mt 25^{1} by DXΣ, Syr-sin, Syr-psh, Vulg., Arm., some Fathers, and some cursives. There is no doubt that these words are an interpolation, but their addition shows that the authorities named understood the bridegroom to be returning with his bride. It is true that in the best text she is not mentioned; but that is because she is not needed for the purpose of the parable. In a village it would be natural for some of the virgin friends of either party to await the couple outside the place of marriage; and, indeed, our own custom, by which the bridesmaids go to the door of the church to await the bride, is exactly parallel.

No *benediction* of the marriage is mentioned in the NT, though it will be remembered that the feast itself was a religious act, as was the Agape (*ERE* i. 166, 173 f.). According to Edersheim (i. 355) it was customary among the Jews for the benediction to take place immediately before the supper; a blessing was said over a cup, and presumably the bride and bridegroom drank of it. A benediction seems to be implied in Ignatius, *Polyc.* 5, where the 'consent' of the bishop is required (above, § 2); and it, with a nuptial Eucharist, is expressly mentioned in Tertullian, *ad Uxor.* ii. 8. For the present custom among Eastern Christians see *Catholicos of the East*, p. 151. The benediction, which is much overshadowed by the marriage feast, should take place among the E. Syrians in church, but in practice is usually in the house; a little consecrated earth from the martyrs' tombs and the ring are put into a cup of wine and water, and both parties drink of it. They are crowned with threads of red, blue, and white, and many prayers are said.

The *marriage supper* follows the benediction, when the bridegroom has returned with his bride; γάμος and γάμοι properly mean this (Mt $22^{8f.}$), and then come to mean marriage in general, as in He 13^{4}. The feast is given by the bridegroom's father (Mt 22^{2}) or by himself; Samson provided it, though he came from a distance, and this is said to have been the custom of the time (Jg 14^{10}). The supper was prolonged till late in the night (Lk $12^{36.38}$). The parable of the marriage of the king's son (Mt 22^{2-14}, apparently quite a different incident from that of Lk 14^{16-24}) gives an account of it. To refuse an invitation to it without good cause was counted a great insult (Mt 22^{7}), for to be bidden at all was an honour; the bidding to the marriage of the Lamb conveys a blessing (Rev 19^{9}; cf. Lk 14^{15}). Before the supper a servant goes to summon the invited guests (Mt $22^{3f.}$; cf. Est 6^{14}); and this continues to this day in the East, where the absence of clocks makes the custom necessary. At the feast the guests are arranged in order according to their rank (Lk $14^{7ff.}$). Not only is the bride arrayed in 'fine linen, bright and pure' (Rev 19^{8}), but each guest wears a wedding garment (ἔνδυμα γάμου, Mt 22^{11}); the lack of it is an insult, whether or not we are to suppose a reference to the custom of giving garments as presents by kings and great men in the East (so Edersheim, Trench)—and refusing a gift is ever a sign of contempt (cf. the story of Esau and Jacob's presents, Gn 33); in the parable no excuse is offered. The feast lasts for seven or fourteen days (Gn 29^{27}, Jg 14^{12}, To 8^{19}), and during this time all fasting is superseded (Mk 2^{19}; cf. Edersheim, i. 663). The bride and bridegroom are treated as king and queen, and are crowned (cf. above), and the bride veiled (Gn $29^{23.\,25}$: this is why Jacob did not discover Laban's fraud).

The *friend of the bridegroom* (ὁ φίλος τοῦ νυμφίου, Jn 3^{29}) is the same as the παρανύμφιος or πάροχος γάμων (Aristophanes, *Av.* 1740) of ancient Greece; he accompanied the bridegroom to fetch the bride—in Palestine, no doubt, then as now, on horseback, but formerly among the Greeks in a chariot, for πάροχος means 'one who sits beside another in a chariot' (ὄχος). The corresponding feminine is παράνυμφος, the 'bridesmaid' (in Latin *paranymphus* is a 'bridesman,' while *paranympha* is a 'bridesmaid'). The 'friend of the bridegroom,' then, was the best man; according to Edersheim (i. 148, 354 f.) his office was well known in Judæa, but did not exist in Galilee, and therefore he is not mentioned in Jn 2. But who, then, was the 'ruler of the feast' (ἀρχιτρίκλινος) in Jn $2^{9\text{f.}}$? Souter (*DCG* ii. 540) supposes that he was a steward or head waiter; but his language to the bridegroom is too familiar for this. More probably he was one of the guests (so apparently also in Sir 32^{1}), who was entrusted with the management of the feast, but did not in any way provide it himself; he compliments the bridegroom on doing this so successfully.

The *sons of the bridechamber* (Mt 9^{15}, Mk 2^{19}, Lk 5^{34}) are the bridegroom's companions (cf. Jg 14^{11}—Samson had thirty of them), or probably (Edersheim) all the guests. They may even include the bridesmaids (cf. Ps 45^{14} and the Ten Virgins of Mt 25).

After the marriage the bridegroom was excused military service for a year (Dt 24^{5}; cf. Lk 14^{20}), and also between the betrothal and the marriage (Dt 20^{7}). For bride and bridegroom see also FAMILY.

4. Monogamy, polygamy, and bigamy.—The two last are not directly forbidden in the NT, but their unlawfulness for Christians is assumed. Among the Jews polygamy had greatly decreased since the time of the patriarchs, and at the commencement of the Christian era was little practised. This was perhaps largely in consequence of Roman influence. Josephus says, indeed, that it was sometimes found among the later Jews (*BJ* I. xxiv. 2, *Ant.* XVII. i. 2 f.). He is speaking of Herod and his sons, who were not pure Jews; yet their polygamy was not condemned by public opinion. In both passages it is implied that, though an old Jewish custom, it was uncommon. In Josephus' account of the laws of Moses (*Ant.* IV. viii. 23) two wives (at a time) are mentioned; but this throws no light on the custom of the later Jews. Polygamy among Jews in the 2nd cent. A.D. is, however, mentioned by Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 134). For Christians it was inconsistent with Jesus' elevated teaching about marriage, which assumes monogamy. W. P. Paterson points out (*HDB* iii. 265^{a}) that in the OT itself the polygamy of the patriarchs is spoken of apologetically. Noah was monogamous (Gn 7^{7}); and monogamy was held to be symbolical of God's union with Israel (Hos $2^{19\text{ff.}}$), while polygamy was symbolical of idolatry. We may also notice that spiritual monogamy is emphasized by St. Paul in 2 Co 11^{2}, where 'to one husband' is emphatic; he is speaking of God's union with His Church. It should be remembered that in most or all countries where polygamy is allowed, it is not in practice very common, because only the rich can afford more than one wife. Thus at the present day the great majority of Muslims are monogamous, though their law allows them four wives and an unlimited number of concubines.*

5. Digamy.—The re-marriage of widows and widowers stands on an entirely different basis from polygamy, and, though it was disliked by many Christians in the early ages of the Church, it was regarded by all, or almost all, as permissible. St. Paul allows it to widows (Ro $7^{2\text{f.}}$, 1 Co 7^{39}), and no reproach attaches to those who practise it, though the Apostle thinks that widowhood will give greater happiness than re-marriage (1 Co 7^{40}; see above, **2**). If with RV we render νεωτέρας in 1 Ti 5^{14} 'younger widows' (AV and RVm 'younger women'), he encourages or commands digamy in some cases. 'I desire that' they 'marry, bear children, rule the household.' But it seems probable that he did not approve of 'digamy' for his local clergy, or the 'widows' who are on the Church roll, supported by the Church (1 Ti $5^{9.\,16}$). These widows must be over threescore years old, 'having been the wife of one man' (v.^{9}). This phrase, at least, is unambiguous (the participle γεγονυῖα applies both to this and to the preceding clause); it excludes bigamy, digamy, and marriage after divorce alike. The meaning of the qualification of the 'bishop' or 'presbyter,' that he 'must be . . . the husband of one wife' (1 Ti 3^{2}, so Tit 1^{6}), a qualification repeated in the case of deacons in 1 Ti 3^{12}, is on the negative side less clear; for the qualification on the positive side, see above, **2**. It has been variously interpreted as forbidding, in the case of the Christian minister, polygamy, digamy, or marriage entered upon after a divorce—which for simplicity, and so as not to complicate the issue, we may suppose to have taken place in the clergyman's heathen days—or after a separation such as that contemplated in 1 Co 7^{15} (see below, **6** (*b*)). In favour of the phrase referring to polygamy, it has been said that as the Jews sometimes practised it in the apostolic period (above, **4**), probably some Christians followed their example. But there is no evidence of Christian polygamy; and the very fact that the apostles did not find it necessary to forbid it explicitly prevents us from thinking that St. Paul merely meant that a 'bishop' or deacon must not be a polygamist. If this were the meaning, the prohibition of polygamy to the clergy would imply that it was not uncommon among the laity. We may therefore safely dismiss this view. No Christian would be allowed to be a polygamist. The other two interpretations may well be joined together, and that they give the true meaning of the phrase * is confirmed by the injunction about widows (1 Ti 5^{10}). This clearly forbids the reception on the roll of a widow who *at any time of her life* has had, by divorce, or death, or otherwise, more than one husband. It is true that a widow, and *a fortiori* a widower, may lawfully marry again (above) after the death of their spouses; but a higher standard is required in the case of the clergy. It is necessary here again to remark that a disciplinary regulation, even of St. Paul, is not intended to be a cast-iron law for all time. But that it was a desirable regulation in the Apostolic Age we can well understand, for there was a considerable prejudice against digamy; and, however unreasonable the prejudice might be, it was well not to give unnecessary offence to public opinion. This prejudice may be seen, for example, in Josephus, *Ant.* XVII. xiii. 4, where Glaphyra is reprimanded for re-marriage, in a vision, by her first husband; this was also a case of forbidden degrees, for her first and third husbands were brothers. Perseverance in widowhood was commended not only in the NT (Lk 2^{37}, 1 Co 7^{40}), but by the heathen Romans (Josephus, *Ant.* XVIII. vi. 6: Antonia, widow of Drusus). In the 2nd cent. Hermas says (*Mand.* iv. 4) that digamy is not a sin, but that a widow [or widower] who remains single is commended. So Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* iii. 12), commenting on St. Paul, says that one who re-marries does not sin, but that he does not follow the most perfect course.

---

* In the 3rd and 4th cents. the Church had some difficulty with regard to the reception of heathens who had concubines. The Church Orders do not allow Christians to keep concubines; if a man has one and desires to become a Christian he must marry her or leave her (*Egyptian Church Order*, § 41, *Ap. Const.* viii. 32 [ed. Funk], *Testament of our Lord*, ii. 2); and this is evidently the meaning of *Can. of Hippolytus*, xvi. [ed. Achelis, § 80], which says that a Christian who has lived with a single (*speciali*) concubine, who has borne him a son, must not cast her off, *i.e.* he must marry her. The clause common to these books apparently comes from their lost original, which may not improbably be assigned to Hippolytus, and be dated soon after A.D. 200. But some of these Orders say that under some circumstances a concubine of a heathen may herself be received.

* The Church Orders, if they deal with the matter at all, interpret the injunction of digamy, and some of them extend the prohibition to the minor orders (Maclean, *Ancient Church Orders*, Cambridge, 1910, p. 92). The Orthodox Eastern Church (see above, **2**) does not allow her parish priests to marry again after the death of their wives. In that case they must leave their parishes, and they usually enter a monastery. Marriage after ordination is not treated of in the NT.

Digamy in a man was much less disliked than in a woman. The 'Epiphanian' view of the Brethren of our Lord, that they were Joseph's children by a former marriage, would hardly have been possible in the 4th cent. if there had been a very strong prejudice against a widower marrying again. Third and fourth marriages were strongly reprobated in the early Church (see *ERE* iii. 493).

6. Prohibited marriages. — We may in this section discuss certain prohibitions against marriage, leaving aside for the moment the question of marriage after divorce (see 7).

(*a*) *Forbidden degrees.*—Whatever were the forbidden degrees in the OT, they appear to have remained unaltered in NT times. There are a few passages which deal with the subject. In 1 Co $5^{1-5.\ 13}$ St. Paul deals with the case of a Corinthian who took his father's wife, evidently his stepmother, not his own mother. It is not quite clear if the father was alive; if 2 Co 7^{12} refers to the same incident, as appears to the present writer the more probable supposition, he was alive; but if so, it is not clear whether he had divorced his wife and the son had married her. In any case, the inference is that even if it were only a case of marriage between a son and a stepmother it would be repugnant to the Apostle, as it would be even to the better heathen. Otherwise a heathen would have got over the difficulty by the father divorcing his wife and the son then marrying her; but the marriage or adultery of persons so closely related by affinity had shocked both Christians and heathens alike. Another case is that of Herod Antipas and Herodias his brother Philip's wife (Mk $6^{17f.}$). Here again it is immaterial whether Philip was alive or dead, or whether Herodias had been divorced; the connexion would be prohibited in any event (Lv 18^{16}): 'it is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife' (she was also niece of both her husbands). Ramsay thinks (*St. Paul the Traveller*, 1895, p. 43) that the prohibited degrees are probably referred to in the Apostolic Letter (Ac $15^{20.\ 29}$ 21^{25}), and he understands 'fornication' there to mean marriage within these degrees. Others deny this, and say that Gentile Christians had to be reminded that fidelity to the marriage bond was not a matter of indifference, and that fornication and idolatry went hand in hand. But it is not quite easy to see why this sin alone of all others is mentioned in the Letter, coupled as it is with such ceremonial injunctions as not eating things strangled or with the blood; and Ramsay's view appears to deserve greater support than it has generally received. The Letter, which is somewhat of the nature of a compromise, indicates what part of the Mosaic Law the Gentile Christians, to avoid scandal, ought to keep. The existence of prohibited degrees may be partly due in their origin to the general feeling that those of the same household, where several families (in the Western sense) lived in one house (see FAMILY), should not intermarry; and it is a striking fact that the East Syrian Christians, who have preserved the custom of several families living under one roof, have considerably extended the Table of Forbidden Degrees (*Catholicos of the East*, p. 146 f.).

The custom of the levirate does not affect this question. It was a special provision of the OT to prevent the dying out of a family (see ADOPTION). It was perhaps still practised in NT times, as it is referred to by the Sadducees, almost as if still existing, in Mt $22^{25ff.}$, Mk $12^{20ff.}$, Lk $20^{29ff.}$ (note παρ' ἡμῖν, Mt.). But at least it was obsolescent.

(*b*) *Mixed marriages.*—The Israelites in the OT had frequently been urged not to intermarry with the heathen nations, especially with the Canaanites (Dt 7^{3}; cf. Nu $25^{6f.}$, etc.); and mixed marriages were one of the great troubles of Ezra and Nehemiah in restoring the captivity of the people (Ezr $9^{1ff.}$, Neh $13^{23ff.}$, etc.). The strict Jew would, like St. Peter, think it unlawful 'to join himself or come unto one of another nation' (Ac 10^{28}). Yet there were, both in OT and in NT times, many cases of mixed marriages, of which that of Timothy's parents is a later example (Ac 16^{1}; there seems to be a reference to it in Gal 2^{3}, where St. Paul says that Titus, being a Greek, was not compelled to be circumcised—he was doubtless thinking of Timothy's circumcision, Ac 16^{3}). For OT mixed marriages in practice see Ru 1^{4}, 1 K 7^{14}, 2 Ch 24^{26}, etc., besides the alliances of the kings. In dealing with Christian marriage, St. Paul tolerates the union of Christians with heathen (or Jews?) only when it has been entered into before conversion; in such a case the parties should continue to live together if the unbelieving partner is willing (1 Co 7^{12-16}; see below, 7); the reason given is not only the well-being of the non-Christian spouse, but also that of the children (v.^{14})—'now are they holy,' words which perhaps refer to the probability that the children of one Christian parent, if not separated from the other spouse, will be brought up in the faith. Marriage between one already a Christian and an unbeliever is forbidden: 'Be not unequally yoked with unbelievers' (2 Co 6^{14}—though these words have a wider application than marriage). If a widow re-marries, it must be 'in the Lord,' *i.e.* the second husband must be a Christian (1 Co 7^{39}). St. Peter's reference to mixed marriages (1 P 3^{1}) probably deals with a marriage before conversion and is parallel with 1 Co $7^{12ff.}$. The prohibition of mixed marriages among the Jews extended to those of free men and women with slaves (Josephus, *Ant.* IV. viii. 23). There is nothing on this head in the NT.

7. Divorce.—Whatever view we take of some controverted texts, there can be no doubt that our Lord completely revolutionized men's ideas on this subject. With the heathen divorce was the easiest possible thing; it was open to a husband or to a wife to terminate the marriage at will. The Roman satirist scoffs at the woman who had eight husbands in five autumns (Juvenal, *Sat.* vi. 224 ff.). Things were not much better with the Jews, though there was a difference of opinion among the Rabbis. Some held that a man could 'put away his wife for every cause,' interpreting the 'unseemly thing' of Dt 24^{1} as anything for which he may dislike her. The great Hillel is said to have held this view, and Josephus so understood the matter (*Ant.* IV. viii. 23); this is probably what our Lord refers to in speaking of the bill of divorcement (Mt $5^{31f.}$). Others held that the husband could give his wife a bill of divorcement only if she were guilty of adultery, interpreting the 'unseemly thing' in this stricter sense (Edersheim, ii. 332 ff.).

Divorce was forbidden by our Lord, with at most one exception (Mt 5^{32} $19^{6.\ 9}$, Mk $10^{9.\ 11f.}$, Lk

16^{18}): 'what God hath joined together let not man put asunder.' St. Paul gives charge ('yet not I, but the Lord'—it is a Divine ordinance, not his private opinion) that a wife is not to depart from her husband; but that if she depart, she is to remain unmarried or else be reconciled to her husband; and 'let not the husband put away his wife' (1 Co $7^{10f.}$). And, later, he repeats that 'a wife is bound for so long time as her husband liveth' (v.^{39}).

Postponing for the moment the exceptive clauses of Mt 5^{32} 19^{9}, and therefore the signification of *πορνεία*, let us consider in detail our Lord's teaching about divorce. One who puts away his wife makes her an adulteress (5^{32}) and becomes an adulterer if he marries again (19^{9}, Mk 10^{11}, Lk 16^{18}); and a woman who puts away her husband and marries again commits adultery (Mk.); the second husband of a divorced wife commits adultery (Mt. twice, Lk.). All this is clear except the first saying. How does a wife, presumably innocent, become an adulteress because her husband divorces her? One reply (W. C. Allen, *ICC*, 'St. Matthew,' Edinburgh, 1907, p. 52; so Bengel, Alford) is that she is placed in a position in which she is likely to marry again, and a second marriage would be adultery. Lyttelton, however, suggests (*Sermon on the Mount*, p. 178) that 'adulteress' here means that the woman is placed in a different position in the eye of the law from that which she holds in the sight of God. 'According to the one she is a freed woman, not a wife; according to the other she is still a wife, still bound to her husband.'

We may now take the exceptive clauses found in both the Matthæan passages, but not in Mk., Lk., or 1 Cor., or indeed anywhere else in the NT. In Mt 5^{32} the Evangelist adds, 'saving for the cause of fornication' (*παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας*), and in 19^{9} 'except for fornication' (*εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ*), though in some MSS the text of 19^{9} is brought nearer to 5^{32}. In the first place, are these words an authentic utterance of our Lord? Are they really part of the First Gospel? (these are two quite distinct questions). The view that they are not authentic is upheld by Votaw in *HDB* v. p. 27^{b}; for the view that they are an integral part of Mt. see Plummer, *St. Matthew*, London, 1909, pp. 81, 259, and J. R. Willis in *DCG* i. 31. Votaw upholds his view by the arguments that 'the account in Mt. is secondary,' that there is a divergence between Mt. and the other Synoptists and St. Paul, that the exceptive clauses are of a statutory nature while Jesus enunciates principles rather than legislative enactments, and that in our Lord's general teaching adultery is not enough *in itself* for divorce—the Gospel urges mercy rather than justice, and leaves time for repentance (cf. the story of the woman taken in adultery, Jn $8^{3ff.}$). Of these arguments the divergence between the Evangelists seems to the present writer to be the only important one; there is no real reason for saying that the exceptive clauses do not enunciate a principle just as much as the general teaching about divorce; and with regard to the last statement, it is to be noticed that the exceptive clauses do not state that adultery in itself dissolves marriage, but that it is a legitimate cause for dissolving it. On the other hand, every known authority for the Matthæan text attests these clauses—the assimilating of the two passages in some MSS is a very natural thing for a scribe to do, and does not show that the archetype of any of our MSS lacked the clauses; and the tendency found in some writers to reject words on purely *a priori* grounds, against all MSS and VSS, is one which is justly deprecated by scholars in this country. The evidence, then, is enough to bring us to the conclusion that the words were written by the First Evangelist. But were they uttered by our Lord? It seems to be a tenable view that they are a gloss by the Evangelist, or by his authority—that Jesus gave the general principle of non-divorce without explicitly naming any exceptions; and that the first disciples understood adultery to be such an exception, and therefore the exceptive words were added as a true interpretation. If so, it does not follow that the Church in later times could add other exceptions for which the Evangelist gives no warrant. On the other hand, it is a tenable, and perhaps more probable view, that our Lord gave the exception Himself, on some other occasion than that described in Mt 19^{3} and ‖ Mk. St. Luke (16^{18}) gives the injunction as to divorce as an isolated fragment, without the context of the Pharisees' question. The fact that the First Evangelist gives the injunction twice leads us to suppose that in an authority other than Mk. he found the record of a second occasion on which our Lord taught about divorce, for otherwise why should he repeat the words? It may well be that he found there an exceptive clause. Thus the silence of the other authorities (always a doubtful argument) does not prohibit the supposition that Jesus spoke the exceptive words Himself (so Edersheim).

What then does *πορνεία* mean in the two Matthæan passages? It is distinguished from *μοιχεία* in Mt 15^{19}, Mk $7^{21f.}$, and in inferior MSS of Gal 5^{19}; cf. 1 Co 6^{9} and He 13^{4} (*πόρνοι* and *μοιχοί*). Lyttelton (*op. cit.* p. 174 ff.) makes *πορνεία* the sin of the flesh, and *μοιχεία* the breaking of the marriage bond by *πορνεία* or otherwise. According to some, *πορνεία* denotes pre-nuptial sin, and the meaning is that a man who finds himself deceived in the woman he marries may repudiate her. But as Swete points out (*St. Mark*^{2}, London, 1902, p. 218), while *πορνεία* and *μοιχεία*, when named in the same context, are to be distinguished, *πορνεία* in the exceptive clauses can hardly have the meaning assigned; in Hos 2^{5}, Am 7^{17} LXX, *πορνεύω* is used of post-nuptial sin (see also Gore, *Sermon on the Mount*, p. 73). The fact that in Mt 5^{28} our Lord teaches that *μοιχεία* can be committed by intention somewhat militates against Lyttelton's view, and shows that there is not always a very sharp distinction in the NT between the two words. We may, then, probably take *πορνεία* in the exceptive clauses to signify adultery of any kind.

If these clauses are authentic, or are true glosses, do they allow re-marriage to either party, and if so to both husband and wife? Here it is instructive to note two 2nd cent. interpretations of our Lord's words. (*a*) Hermas (*Mand.* iv. 1) says that a husband *must* put away an adulterous wife if she continue in sin; he must divorce her, but he may not himself marry again—for, if he does, he commits adultery himself; he must receive her back if she repent, and the forbidding of re-marriage is expressly said to be for this reason. So a wife should not live with an adulterous husband who does not repent; yet she may not marry again. (*b*) Justin Martyr in his Second Apology (§ 2) tells of a woman who after becoming a Christian divorced her heathen, intemperate, and unchaste husband; but he implies that she did not, and could not, marry again.

Light is thrown on the matter by the further question whether a wife could divorce her husband or only a husband his wife. Greeks and Romans allowed divorce by a wife (see Swete on Mk 10^{12}); but this was not in accord with Jewish custom (so expressly Josephus, *Ant.* XV. vii. 10, speaking of Salome, wife of Costobarus, to whom she 'sent a bill of divorce and dissolved her marriage with him'). Among the Parthians the custom obtained (*Ant.* XVIII. ix. 6, where Mithridates' wife threatens to divorce him). In the NT apparently a difference was made between the marriage of two non-Christians one of whom was afterwards converted, and that of two Christians. In the former case St. Paul recognizes the legal right of a Christian woman to leave an unbelieving husband, though he urges her not to do so if he be content to keep her (1 Co 7^{13}; see above, **6** (*b*)). And in that case the wife may re-marry; the same applies to the parallel case of a Christian husband and an unbelieving wife—the 'brother' or the 'sister' [see FAMILY] is 'not under bondage in such cases' (v.^{15}). But the general rule for married Christians is that the wife is not to depart from her husband or re-marry (v.^{10}). In Mk 10^{12} there is a clause, not found in the parallels, which forbids a wife to put away her husband and marry another. Here the scribe of Codex Bezæ (D), scandalized at the very idea of the possibility of a woman divorcing her husband, alters the phrase to 'if a woman *leave*' (ἐξέλθῃ ἀπὸ), etc.

On the whole question of re-marriage after divorce, and the interpretation of the NT teaching, there has long been a divergence of opinion between the more logical West and the less logical East. The former considers the question from the point of view of the possibility of adultery dissolving marriage; the latter from that of punishing an offence. While, then, for many centuries the West did not allow re-marriage in any case (other than in that of nullity of marriage), the East has always allowed the re-marriage of the 'innocent party.' Here we note that the Jewish law absolutely forbade the marriage of the adulterer with the adulteress (Edersheim, ii. 335); this was with a view to punishing the guilty, rather than for any theoretical cause. And the Christian East follows the same line of reasoning. Again, there is a great difference between 'blessing' a marriage, and so giving the Church's sanction to an act which she perhaps disapproves, and recognizing the existence of a valid marriage. For the Church's benediction, according to the once universal view—modified by the Council of Trent for those who receive its decrees—is not of the essence of marriage, as the consent of the parties is, but is only a solemn and edifying addition. The Church may therefore, if it sees fit, refuse to solemnize a marriage without thereby asserting that the marriage is non-existent.

Where two views are possible, the Church will do well to allow for both. This does not mean that she must necessarily allow divorce for adultery and recognize re-marriage by pronouncing her benediction on it; but only that she should keep an open mind on the subject, and that different parts of the Church may legitimately agree to differ in the regulations they make with regard to it.

LITERATURE.—A. Edersheim, *LT*^{9}, 2 vols., London, 1897; R. C. Trench, *Notes on the Parables of our Lord*^{13}, do., 1877, chs. xii., xiii.; artt. 'Marriage,' 'Divorce,' 'Bride,' 'Bridegroom,' etc., in *HDB*, *SDB*, *DCG*, and in *EBi*; artt. 'Chastity (Christian)' and 'Celibacy (Christian)' in *ERE*. For Christian marriage in the East at the present day as illustrating NT customs see A. J. Maclean and W. H. Browne, *The Catholicos of the East and his People*, London, 1892. For marriage generally see H. M. Luckock, *History of Marriage*, do., 1894; O. D. Watkins, *Holy Matrimony*, do., 1895; W. J. Knox-Little, *Holy Matrimony*, in 'Oxford Library of Practical Theology,' do., 1901. For divorce see E. Lyttelton, *Studies in the Sermon on the Mount*, London, 1905; E. Schürer, *HJP* II. ii. [Edinburgh, 1885] 123; Edersheim (as above); S. R. Driver, *Deuteronomy*^{3}, London, 1902; C. Gore, *The Sermon on the Mount*, do., 1897; C. W. Votaw, in *HDB* v., art. 'Sermon on the Mount.'

A. J. MACLEAN.

MARS' HILL.—See AREOPAGITE, AREOPAGUS.

MARTYR.—**1. The name.**—'Martyr' is given as the rendering of μάρτυς in the RV only in Rev 17^{6}. The word is used in practically the same sense in Rev 2^{13} (Antipas) and Ac 22^{20} (Stephen), but is in both passages translated '**witness.**' As Jesus is said to have 'witnessed' by accepting death (Rev 1^{5}; cf. 1 Ti 6^{13}), the expression was appropriately transferred to His followers who suffered for Him. The absolute use of μαρτυρία and μαρτυρεῖν to signify this did not become fixed until the middle of the 2nd cent. (see J. B. Lightfoot on Clem. *ad Cor.* v. in *Apostolic Fathers*, I. ii. [1890] 26).

2. The position of Christians.—Our Lord warned His disciples that active hostility would be the normal attitude of the world toward the Church (Mt 5^{11}). The Apostolic Age provided a continuous commentary on this saying. It is customary to distinguish one or two epochs in that period as moments of great persecution. But this must not obscure the truth that persecution seldom ceased altogether. In the first days of the Church this was exclusively the work of Jews. Besides the attacks mentioned in the Acts there were others to which we have only passing allusions (*e.g.* 1 Th 2^{14}, Ja 2^{6} 5^{10}, He 10^{34}). These prove that the Jews, not only of Palestine, but also of the Dispersion, were active in compelling Christians to pay for their faith by enduring legal and social oppression. The Romans did not at first discriminate between Jews and Christians, and extended to the latter the privileged toleration accorded to the former. This confusion of thought appears in the statement of Suetonius (*Claud.* 25) that Jewish disorders were provoked by 'Chrestus,' and in the notion of Lysias that St. Paul was one of the Zealots (Ac 21^{38}). But under Nero the Imperial policy changed. The mere profession of Christianity now became matter for a capital charge (see this maintained in Hardy, *Studies in Roman History*, ch. iv., as against Ramsay, in *Church in the Roman Empire*^{5}, ch. xi. sect. 7). By both people and rulers it was held to involve 'odium humani generis.' It incurred popular hatred because of the divisions which it introduced into family and social life. It became a political crime through its incompatibility with Cæsar-worship, its refusal to 'worship the image of the beast' (Rev 13^{15}), which led the Roman authorities to regard it as anarchy. No special laws were passed against it, but there were standing police orders that it should be suppressed. This policy was steadily maintained, and such a reference as that made by Pliny in his letter to Trajan (*Epp.* x. 97) concerning an unknown persecution in Bithynia twenty years before shows that there must have been much official activity against Christians of which no record survives. The NT reflects the consciousness of the change in the attitude of the government. In Acts Rome is the power which protects Christians against Jewish assault (Ac 25^{10}); in the Apocalypse Rome is drunk with the blood of the saints (Rev 17^{6}).

3. The number of the martyrs.—Later ages naturally tended to exaggerate this in order to add glory to the Church. It was held that the truest following of Christ was found among those who had been put to death for His name. Legends grew up which in time invested every member of the apostolic college with the martyr's halo (a collection of these stories may be seen in the *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, vol. xvi. [1873]). It is instructive to note that Clem. Alex. (*Strom.* iv. 9) quotes an early protest against supposing that salvation belonged to martyrs only, which is justified by citing the instances of some of the apostles who had died a natural death. But it remains true that the Biblical and other records leave the impression that great numbers of believers were slain in the 1st century. In the Jewish persecution Saul is said to have entered into every house (Ac 8^{3}), and to have searched every synagogue for Christians. The number of converts was already considerable in Jerusalem (cf. Ac $2^{41.\ 47}$ 6^{7}), so that, unless we hold (with R. B. Rackham, *Acts of the Apostles*, 1901) that he pursued Hellenists only, the list of sufferers must have been very large. Imprisonment, beating, and even death, the Romans presumably conniving, were the penalties incurred (Ac $22^{4.5.19}$). On this occasion the leaders of the Church seem to have escaped, but the next onslaught affected them specially (Ac 12). James the son of Zebedee fell, and Peter was cast into prison. These attacks left a lasting impression on the Church (cf. 1 Th 2^{14}).

Still heavier was the toll of martyrs exacted by the Roman persecutions of the 1st century. Tacitus (*Ann.* xv. 44) speaks of a *multitudo ingens* of victims in the Neronian outbreak, and to this answers the πολὺ πλῆθος of Clem. Rom. (*ad Cor.* vi.). In Rev 13^7 testimony is borne to the thoroughness with which the whole of the Empire was made to feel the effects of this policy. The same impression is conveyed by 1 P 5^{8-9}. The adversary's rage is like the fury of a lion; all over the Roman world Christians are united in a community of suffering. It is noteworthy that both Jewish and Gentile persecutors seem to have found a special object of attack in the Christian prophets, who were no doubt brought into prominence by their preaching of the gospel (cf. 1 Th 2^{15}, Rev 16^6 18^{24}). The horrors inflicted by the Roman torturers may be gathered from the two passages of Tacitus and Clement mentioned above. The victims were crucified, or, by a diabolical refinement of cruelty, clad in the skins of beasts to serve as the quarry of dogs. At nightfall they were smeared with pitch to stand as living torches in the gardens of Nero. For women there were brutalities more shameful than death.

4. The historic martyrs.—Among those who were done to death in the Jewish persecutions mentioned in the Acts the names of two only are preserved—Stephen, and James the son of Zebedee. Stephen was nominally charged with blasphemy, but the proceedings were no trial in any legal sense, and, if the Sanhedrin were ever called to account for them, they doubtless pleaded that a sudden and uncontrollable tumult had occurred. Of the martyrdom of James the account is in Ac 12^2 and in Eusebius, *HE* ii. 9, quoting Clement of Alexandria. James was beheaded, and his bearing so impressed his accuser that it converted him, and he suffered with the apostle. This must have been before A.D. 44, as in that year Herod Agrippa died. Attempts have recently been made (*e.g.* by W. Bousset, *Die Offenbarung Johannis*^{5}, 1896, pp. 47–8) to establish the allegation of Philip of Side that Papias had said that John the Apostle was slain with his brother. But if this were so, the silence of Ac 12^2 is incomprehensible. We have no reason to suppose that John died anything but a natural death. The stories of his escape from the boiling cauldron before the Latin Gate, and of his drinking poison without harm, come from Gnostic *Acta Johannis* of the 2nd century. Some years after the passion of the first James, another James, 'the Lord's brother,' was murdered (? A.D. 61). Ananus, the high priest, in the interval between the death of Festus and the arrival of Albinus, caused him to be stoned. The dramatic account of his end given by Hegesippus is preserved in Eusebius, *HE* ii. 23. A shorter and more authentic record may be found in Josephus, *Ant.* XX. ix. 1 (see J. B. Mayor, *Ep. of St. James*^{3}, 1910, p. xxxix).

In Rome the first shadow of the Neronian persecution fell upon Pomponia Græcina. The evidence of the Catacombs has made it almost certain that the 'foreign superstition' with which she was charged (Tac. *Ann.* xiii. 32) was Christianity (cf. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, I. i. 30). Her trial resulted in her acquittal (A.D. 57). Seven years later Rome was burnt, and Nero turned the popular rage against the Christians. His success cost the Church on earth the lives not only of a great host of unknown saints but also of St. Peter and St. Paul. Lightfoot points out (on Clem. Rom. *ad Cor.* v.) that the NT raises the expectation that these two would be martyrs. In Jn 21^{18} there is what is virtually a description of St. Peter's death, and in 2 Ti $4^{6ff.}$ St. Paul writes as one who knew that his end was near. That they both suffered in Rome is a constant tradition. Clement (*loc. cit.*) couples them together as 'athletes' who 'struggled to the death,' and were familiar to Roman believers. Ignatius (*ad Rom.* iv.) implies that both had been teachers of authority in Rome. Eusebius (*HE* ii. 25) collects testimonies to the same effect. He cites Dionysius of Corinth as asserting that both apostles suffered about the same time in Rome, and adds, from the Roman Gaius, a minute description of their tombs. Tertullian (*Scorp.* 15, *de Præscr.* 36) affirms that St. Peter was crucified, and Origen (*ap.* Euseb. *HE* iii. 1) says that he was, at his own request, placed on the cross head downwards. The 'Domine, quo vadis?' story is preserved in pseudo-Ambrose, *Sermo contra Auxentium.* St. Peter's death may be dated in the early days of the Neronian persecution (A.D. 64). His Epistle implies an imminent onslaught, and the tradition which puts his grave in the Vatican suggests that he was among the victims butchered there after the great fire. Eusebius (*HE* iii. 30) repeats the story of Clem. Alex. that the Apostle before his own death saw his wife led away to execution, and comforted her in a manner typical of Christian martyrs. He 'rejoiced because she had been called and was going home.' Tertullian and Origen, in the passages to which allusion is made above, name Rome as the scene of St. Paul's martyrdom, and Tertullian's expression is to the effect that he was beheaded. Jerome (*de Vir. Illustr.* v.) alleges that the two apostles died on the same day. This, though supported by the commemoration of both on 29th June, is in itself improbable and the tradition varies (cf. L. Duchesne, *Lib. Pont.*, 1886–92, i. 119).

The date of the death of Antipas of Pergamum (Rev 2^{13}) was, according to legend, in the reign of Domitian, when he was burnt to death in a brazen bull. But the phrase 'in the days of Antipas' suggests a date some years before the words were written, and Antipas was probably killed in some unknown persecution under the earlier Flavians.

Under Domitian suffered three persons whose Christianity, if not absolutely certain, is highly probable. The Emperor's own cousin, the consul Flavius Clemens, was condemned, according to Suetonius (*Domitian*, 15), 'ex tenuissima suspicione.' If Clemens was a Christian, he would be unable to take part in public functions which involved Emperor-worship. This fits in with the assertion of Dio Cassius (lxvii. 14) that he was charged with ἀθεότης, *i.e.* 'sacrilege,' and with practising 'Jewish' ways. It also explains the scornful verdict of Suetonius that he displayed 'contemptible indolence.' At the same time his wife, Domitilla, was banished to Pontia (Jerome, *Ep.* 108 [or 86], 'ad Eustochium'). With these two Dio couples M'. Acilius Glabrio as a victim of Domitian's fury. The evidence as to his religion is inconclusive. Lightfoot's denial of his Christianity (*Apostolic Fathers*, I. i. 81 n.) is questioned by Ramsay (*op. cit.* p. 261).

With Trajan we reach the last martyr of this period. It is related in Eusebius, *HE* iii. 32, that Symeon the son of Clopas, 'the second bishop of Jerusalem,' was arrested on the ground that he was descended from David, and was a Christian. After many days of torture he was crucified. With him, in the opinion of Eusebius, passed away the last survivor of the Apostolic Age.

LITERATURE.—H. B. Workman, *Persecution in the Early Church*^{3}, London, 1911 (with full bibliography); A. J. Mason, *Historic Martyrs of the Primitive Church*, do., 1905; B. F. Westcott, *The Two Empires*, do., 1909, ch. ii.; H. M. Gwatkin, *Early Church History*, do., 1909, vol. i. chs. v.–vii.; W. M. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*^{5}, do., 1897, chs. x.–xvi.; E. G. Hardy, *Studies in Roman History* (formerly, *Christianity and the Roman Government*), do., 1906; H. B. Swete, *Apocalypse of St. John*^{2}, do., 1907, Introd., sect. vii.

C. T. DIMONT.

MARY (Gr. Μαρία, Μαριαμ, Heb. מִרְיָם).—Mary, one of the commonest Jewish names for women, was derived from Miriam the sister of Moses, and very frequently used in NT times because of the sympathy felt for the beautiful Hasmonæan princess, the ill-fated wife of Herod. As it was the name borne by the mother of Jesus, it became in its Greek form, which passed into all languages, the most familiar Christian name for women. Many and varied derivations have been suggested, but it is practically certain that the names Moses, Aaron, and Miriam are all of Egyptian origin. Miriam is probably *mer Amon*, 'beloved of Amon' (cf. Mereneptah, 'beloved of Ptah').

In the NT we find several distinct persons bearing the name, although in some cases it is rather difficult to be certain that the same person is not referred to under slightly varied descriptions by the different evangelists. In all, the name is found in eight connexions, which are as follows: (1) the Virgin Mary; (2) Mary the mother of James and Joses; (3) 'the other Mary'; (4) Mary (wife) of Clopas; (5) Mary Magdalene; (6) Mary of Bethany; (7) Mary the mother of John Mark; (8) a Christian lady of Rome. It is almost certain that the same person is referred to in (2), (3), and (4). Some have identified (5) and (6), but this is extremely doubtful. Of the eight, only (7) and (8) belong properly to a Dictionary of the Apostolic Church. On the others see artt. in *HDB* iii. and *DCG* ii.

1. **Mary the mother of John Mark.**—In Ac 12^{12} we read that St. Peter, after he had been released from prison by the angel, went to the house of Mary the mother of Mark, where several members of the Church of Jerusalem had assembled to pray for his deliverance. From this notice we gather that Mary was a Christian lady residing in Jerusalem in the early years of the Apostolic Church. As John Mark was a cousin (ἀνεψιός, Col 4^{10}) of Barnabas, the companion of St. Paul on his first missionary journey, Mary was thus the aunt of Barnabas. She seems to have been a woman possessed of considerable wealth, as she was able to entertain the members of the Jerusalem Church. We cannot tell how long she remained in Jerusalem or whether she died there or not. Later writers believed that her house was situated on Mt. Zion and that it was the meeting-place of the disciples from the Ascension to the Day of Pentecost. The house was also reported to have escaped the destruction of the city by Titus and to have been used as a church at a later period (Epiphanius, *de Mens. et Pond.* 14; Cyril Jerus. *Catech.* 16). It is, however, not impossible that this Mary is identical with—

2. **The Christian lady of Rome** to whom the Apostle sends greeting (Ro 16^6), and to whom he refers as 'Mary who bestowed much labour on us.' The fact that early tradition associates Mark with Rome and that his Gospel is undoubtedly intended for Roman Christians does not make at all impossible the idea that Mary the mother of Mark moved to Rome. Evidently the Mary of Ro 16^6 had not bestowed labour on the Apostle in Rome, which as yet he had not visited at the date of writing the Epistle. If the Apostle by the reference 'who bestowed much labour on us' alludes to personal service to himself, it must have been at some place already visited, and the conclusion is unavoidable that Mary had recently settled in Rome. But it is not safe to draw any conclusion from this reference, because the reading 'you' (ὑμᾶς) is much better supported than 'us' (ἡμᾶς). In this case the Apostle may have known Mary only by reputation as a benefactress of the Roman Church, probably a woman of the type of Lydia of Ac 16^{14-15}. The way in which the Apostle refers to her implies that she was well known to those he addressed. She may have held the position of a deaconess or a 'widow' at Rome.

W. F. BOYD.

MASTER.—In the Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypse three words (κυβερνήτης, δεσπότης, κύριος) are translated 'master' in the RV. The AV has 'masters' for διδάσκαλοι in Ja 3^1, the etymological meaning of *magistri* (so the Rhem. in He 5^{12}). The RV uses 'teacher' uniformly.

1. In Ac 27^{11} the RV has 'the master' for ὁ κυβερνήτης (from κυβερνᾶν, Lat. *gubernare*, 'govern'), 'governor.' So also Rev 18^{17}. The notion is that of steersman (cf. Ezk $27^{8. 27f.}$).

2. The term δεσπότης is strictly the antithesis of δοῦλος, and signifies 'absolute ownership and uncontrolled power' (Grimm-Thayer). So we have it in 1 Ti $6^{1f.}$, a pertinent warning to the Christian δοῦλοι not to presume on the new fellowship in Christ with their δεσπόται, but to give them all the more honour and service. Christianity should make better δοῦλοι (cf. also Tit 2^9). In 1 P 2^{18} δεσπότης is in contrast with οἰκέτης; so in 2 Ti 2^{21} it is ἡ οἰκία τοῦ δεσπότου. In 2 P 2^1 Christ is called δεσπότης as One Who has purchased His servants. So also Jude^4 and possibly Rev 6^{10}, though the latter may refer to God as in the LXX (cf. Gn $15^{2. 8 \text{ etc.}}$) and Ac 4^{24}.

3. The other term, κύριος, has a wider meaning and is applicable to various relations and ranks of life, and does not necessarily suggest absolutism. The word is originally an adjective from κῦρος, meaning 'valid,' 'authoritative' (ὁ ἔχων κῦρος), and so the 'master' or 'owner.' It is applied to the 'masters' who exploited the poor girl for gain in Ac $16^{16. 19}$. It stands in opposition to δοῦλοι, as in Eph $6^{5. 9}$, Col $4^{1. 22}$. In Ac 16^{30} the jailer uses κύριοι merely as a term of respect to St. Paul and Silas. In 9^5 (22^8) St. Paul uses it in asking Jesus who He is, 'Who art thou, Lord?' It is not certain that St. Paul here meant more than respect. It is applied to God as the Ruler of the universe. κύριος used for God is translated 'Lord' (*q.v.*) (cf. Ac 17^{24}, 1 Ti 6^{15}, Rev 4^8, etc.). With St. Paul, it may be noted, κύριος usually refers to Christ (cf. Ro 1^4, Gal 6^{18}) except in the OT quotations (cf. Ro 4^8 $9^{28f.}$; but note 1 Co 3^5). The use of κύριος for Nero makes 'a polemical parallelism between the cult of Christ and the cult of Cæsar' (Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, Eng. tr., 1911, p. 353).

A. T. ROBERTSON.

MASTERS AND SERVANTS.—See SLAVE, SLAVERY.

MATTHEW (Ματθαῖος TR, Μαθθαῖος Lach., Tisch., WH).—The person bearing this name in the NT is represented as one of the twelve apostles who before his call by Christ had been engaged as a publican or custom-house officer in Capernaum. He is also called Levi (Mk 2^{14}, Lk 5^{29}), and many have supposed that he received the name Matthew after his call by Jesus, just as Simon became Peter. On the other hand, it seems to have been common in Galilee for a man to possess two names—a Greek and an Aramaic (cf. Edersheim, *LT*^{4}, 1887, i. 514). In the various lists of the apostles, Matthew's name occurs seventh in Mk 3^{18} and Lk 6^{15} and eighth in Mt 10^{3} and Ac 1^{13}. All the Synoptists narrate the story of the call of Matthew from his tax-gatherer's booth and the subsequent feast in his house which aroused the wrath of the Pharisees and led Jesus to defend Himself by the declaration: 'They that are whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick. I came not to call the righteous but sinners' (Mt 9^{9-13}, Mk 2^{14-17}, Lk 5^{27-32}). As a publican Matthew was employed collecting the toll at Capernaum on the highway between Damascus and the Mediterranean, and was no doubt in the service of Herod the Tetrarch.

Matthew is called the 'son of Alphæus' (Mk 2^{14}), and the question has arisen whether he is to be regarded as the brother of James the son of Alphæus (Mt 10^{3}, Mk 3^{18}, Lk 6^{15}, Ac 1^{13}). In the four lists of apostles, while Matthew and James occur in the same group of four, the two are not placed alongside one another as is usual with the other pairs of brothers in the apostolic band. Again, if we identify Clopas of Jn 19^{25} with Alphæus of the Synoptists (Aram. *Chalphai*; cf. 1 Mac 11^{30}), and consequently assume that James the Less of Mk 15^{40} is the son of Alphæus, it is extremely unlikely that Matthew's name would be omitted in Mk 15^{40} if he were one of the sons of Mary and the brother of James, Joses, and Salome. On the whole, it is almost certain that the two apostles were not related.

In the story of the Apostolic Church as we find it in the NT the name of Matthew occurs only once, viz. in the list of apostles in Ac 1^{13}. Probably he became a preacher to the lost sheep of the house of Israel and for the most part confined his labours to the land of Palestine. His name became associated with the First Gospel either because he was supposed to be the author or because he was the author of one of the sources on which the work was based. Eusebius makes three interesting statements regarding Matthew. He says (*HE* iii. 24): 'Matthew and John are the only two apostles who have left us recorded comments, and even they, tradition says, undertook it from necessity. Matthew, having first proclaimed the gospel in Hebrew, when on the point of going also to other nations, committed it to writing in his native tongue, and thus supplied the want of his presence to them by his writings.' Again we find in *HE* iii. 39 the famous statement of Papias quoted by Eusebius, 'Matthew composed his *logia* in the Hebrew tongue, and everyone translated as he was able.' We also find in Eusebius' review of the canon of Scripture the statement: 'The first (Gospel) is written according to Matthew, the same that was once a publican but afterwards an apostle of Jesus Christ, who, having published it for the Jewish converts, wrote it in the Hebrew' (*HE* vi. 25). These varied quotations associate Matthew with a Hebrew Gospel or collection of the Sayings of Jesus which in some way or other is connected with or incorporated in our First Gospel. Probably Matthew the ex-publican and apostle did form such a collection of the Sayings of our Lord which were wrought into a connected narrative of the Life of Christ by the First Evangelist, a Palestinian Jew of the 1st century. But for full discussion see art. 'Matthew, Gospel of,' in *HDB* and *DCG*. Unfortunately, Eusebius does not tell us what the 'other nations' were to whom Matthew proclaimed the gospel, and we have no certain knowledge of his subsequent missionary labours.

W. F. BOYD.

MATTHIAS.—Matthias (=Theodore, 'God's gift') is only once mentioned in the NT, viz. Ac $1^{23ff.}$, where his appointment by lot to fill the place of Judas among the Twelve Apostles is described. We there gather (1) that he was one of those who had 'companied with' the apostles 'all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among' them, 'beginning from the baptism of John' until the Ascension; (2) that he was antecedently the less prominent of the two put forward, his bare name only being given, while Joseph is further described by a patronymic 'called Barsabbas,' and also by a surname 'Justus' (*δίκαιος*); for, says Bengel, 'eo cognomine videri poterat præferri debere, nisi,' as he justly adds, 'postea demum hoc cognomen nactus est ut agnosceret quamvis Matthias electus esset, ipsum tamen sua laude non excidisse'; and (3) that anyhow the Lord who is *καρδιογνώστης* unerringly declared him (*ἀναδεῖξαι*) the more suitable for the apostleship. In view of these considerations, it is a good illustration of Bible methods that no further mention of him occurs in its pages. Matthias is said by Eusebius (*HE* i. 12, ii. 1) and Epiphanius (*Hær.* i. 22) to have been one of the Seventy (Lk 10^{1}), and the former authority (*HE* iii. 25), as well as Origen (*Hom. in Luc.* i.), speaks of a spurious Gospel of Matthias, on which it seems likely that the Basilidian Gnostics based their teaching (*Philos.* vii. 20; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iii. 4, vii. 13). One early tradition assigns Ethiopia as the scene of his apostolic labours, another Jerusalem; but of these the former is the better attested. There is little probability in the identification which has been suggested of Matthias with Nathanael (which means 'God-given'). For a fuller discussion of this and other points the reader should refer to *HDB*, *s.v.*

There can be little doubt that the exact method by which the lots were cast was the ancient one by which the two names were put into a vessel, which was shaken until one of them leapt out, and that was chosen: the idea of a ballot is of later date and not Scriptural (see LOTS).

C. L. FELTOE.

MEDES.—Medes are mentioned in Ac 2^{9} in connexion with the special events of the Day of Pentecost. These sojourners in Jerusalem would be descendants of Jewish settlers among the Medes, with perhaps a few Median proselytes. In Biblical times, the Medes are closely associated with the Persians, along with whom they occupied the western portion of Iran, extending north and south from the Caspian Sea to the Persian Gulf, and from the Zagros Mountains on the west to the nearer edge of the great desert separating Media and Persia from Bactriana and Sogdiana on the east. Along this western portion of Iran, Media Minor lay to the north, Media proper in the middle, and Persia to the south.

The Medes were Aryans using a cuneiform script of their own, and worshipping (after the earlier half of the 7th cent. B.C.) according to the faith of Zarathustra. Their art shows little originality or development, and their manners, simple and uncorrupted at first, quickly degenerated under foreign influence. The so-called Median Empire lasted from 647 to 550 B.C., after which date Cyrus founded the Medo-Persian dominion, in which the Persian branch, hitherto subject, became the ruling power.

A. W. COOKE.

MEDIATION, MEDIATOR.—For mediation in paganism and in the OT see W. F. Adeney's art. in *HDB*. For mediation in the Gospels see L. Pullan's art. in *DCG*. While no formal discussion of these matters occurs here, one cannot ignore the importance of a full knowledge of the OT teaching and the possible influence of the philosophy and religion of the Græco-Roman world upon the minds of the apostolic teachers of Christianity. It is easy to go to extremes in either direction. But the study of comparative religion does not dim the glory of Christ. The modern Christian rather claims that all the 'true light that lighteth every man' comes from Christ (Jn 1^{9}). One can welcome all truth that may be taken up into Christianity (cf. C. Clemen, *Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources*, 1912; H. A. A. Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions*, 1913). It is hardly likely, however, that Jesus Himself felt the influence of this non-Jewish teaching. His conception of His own sacrificial death finds its roots in the OT, and appears in the oldest form of the Synoptic Gospels (Mk 10^{45}, Mt 20^{28}; see also Mk 10^{38}, Mt 26^{28}). It may be said at once that the central place here given to the atoning death of Christ for the sins of men, emphasized also in the Fourth Gospel (1^{29} 3^{16} 12^{32}, etc.), is just that conception of the relative value of the Cross in the mediatorial work of Christ found in Acts and the rest of the NT. It is embedded in the primitive Christian tradition too deeply to be a mere theological interpretation of the apostles, read back into the thought of Christ (see J. Denney, *The Death of Christ*, 1902, and *Jesus and the Gospel*^{4}, 1913, where the writer powerfully argues that Christianity is justified in the mind of Christ). Mediation lies at the heart of all religion which assumes human sin and a righteous God who will forgive the sinner. The consciousness of sin demands a mediator to plead the cause of man with God; hence the existence of the priesthood in all religions worthy of the name. Paganism has its 'redeemer gods,' but Christianity is rooted in the OT. The head of the family was first the priest, then the patriarch of the tribe. Then the Aaronic priesthood, and in particular the high priest, exemplified the mediatorial office. There was also prophetic and angelic mediation (Ac 7^{53}, Gal 3^{19}). Mediation took the form of intercession, of covenant, or of sacrifice. Christ sums up the whole mediatorial office as prophet, priest, and sacrifice. The term 'mediator' (*μεσίτης*) or 'middleman' occurs once of Moses (Gal $3^{19f.}$) as the mediator between God and the people in the giving of the Law. The other instances all refer to Christ, 'the one mediator between God and man' (1 Ti 2^{5}), 'the mediator of a better covenant' (He 8^{6}), 'the mediator of a new (*καινῆς*) covenant' (9^{15}; *νέας* in 12^{24}). In He 6^{17} God 'interposed with an oath' (*ἐμεσίτευσεν ὅρκῳ*; here the notion of 'middleman' recedes). But the notion of mediation is far more common in the NT than the use of the word *μεσίτης* would imply. It is indeed regulative of the thought of the entire NT, as can be easily seen.

1. The Acts.—It is the living Christ, active in leading the disciples (Ac $1^{1f.}$), who meets us in the Acts. He was received up (v.^{2}), but He will come again (v.^{11}), and meanwhile His Name has power (3^{6}). Jesus is Lord (*κύριος*, $1^{6.\,21}$), and is addressed in prayer (1^{24} 7^{59}) after the Ascension. Peter on the Day of Pentecost boldly interprets Jesus as the Messiah (2^{31}) of whose resurrection from the dead they were all witnesses (v.^{32}). He is at (or by) the right hand of the Father, and is actively engaged in His Messianic work, of which the outpouring of the Holy Spirit is one evidence (v.^{33}). The death of Jesus is not an obstacle to His Messiahship. Peter does not here formulate a doctrine of the Atonement nor specifically mention the mediatorial work of Jesus, but he calls upon all the house of Israel to understand 'that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified' (v.^{36}). On the strength of the claim that Jesus is both Lord and Messiah as shown by His resurrection, Peter urges repentance and baptism in the name of Jesus Christ. This address at Pentecost, as reported by Luke, is the first formal interpretation on the part of the disciples of the significance of the work of Christ. It is too early for the full perspective to be drawn, but at heart the message is the same as we find in the later years. Jesus Christ is central in Christianity. The place of the Cross is recognized, though not fully expounded. The Lordship of Jesus the Messiah is accented as the ground for repentance. Already the reproach of the Cross was felt, and Peter justifies the suffering of Christ as part of God's purpose as shown in the prophets (3^{18}), though not excusing the sin of Christ's murderers (v.^{13}). Peter also calls Jesus God's 'servant Jesus' (v.^{13}), 'the Holy and Righteous One' (v.^{14}), 'the Prince of life' (v.^{15}), a Prophet like unto Moses (v.^{22}), the fulfilment of the covenant promise to Abraham for the blessing of all the families of earth (v.^{25}). The nearest statement to the later interpretation of redemption on the basis of the death of Christ comes in v.$^{18ff.}$, where he says, 'Repent ye therefore, and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out.' Here 'therefore' points back to v.^{18}, which presents the necessity of the sufferings of Christ, in particular His death on the cross. The clearness of Peter's conception of the power of the living Christ appears in 4^{10-12}, where he claims that the impotent man is made whole in the name of Jesus, and that Jesus is the Stone, rejected by the Jewish builders, but made the Head of the Corner by God in His Kingdom and the only hope of salvation for men everywhere (cf. 1 P 2^{4-8}). Here the mediatorial work of Christ comes out sharply, and it is astonishing to note Peter's courageous boldness before the Sanhedrin. There is thus no doubt as to the immediate interpretation of the Risen Christ as Lord and Saviour from sin. His death was not of a piece with that of Stephen and James, who died as martyrs. The death of Christ was part of God's foreseen plan (2^{23}), was predicted by the OT prophets (3^{18}), was the basis of repentance and forgiveness of sin (v.^{19}), and, with His resurrection, proved Him to be the sole hope of salvation (4^{10-12}).

The absence of the later technical terminology in these early addresses is proof of the substantial correctness of Luke's report. The reference to Is 53 ('Servant Jesus') is natural, and has the essence of Christ's mediation, though the idea is not worked out. In his address to the household of Cornelius Peter pointedly says: 'That through his name every one that believeth on him shall receive remission of sins' (Ac 10^{43}). He is also 'the Judge of quick and dead' (v.^{42}). Peter also says that the Jews 'shall be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus, in like manner as' Gentiles (15^{11}). Stephen called Jesus 'the Righteous One' (7^{52}), and died saying, 'Lord Jesus, receive my spirit' (v.^{59}). Immediately on his conversion Saul 'proclaimed Jesus, that he is the Son of God' (9^{20}). At Antioch in Pisidia St. Paul announces the heart of his message about Jesus: 'Through this man is proclaimed unto you remission of sins: and by him every one that believeth is justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses' ($13^{38f.}$). From this position St. Paul never swerved. His collision with the Judaizers (Ac 15) turned on the sufficiency of the work of Christ to save, apart from the Jewish ceremonialism. To the Philippian jailer he preached salvation through faith in the Lord Jesus ($16^{30f.}$). On the Areopagus he set forth the Risen Jesus as the Judge of the world, and urged repentance for that reason ($17^{30f.}$). At Ephesus he interpreted the preaching of John the Baptist as urging faith in Jesus as the hope of salvation (19^{4}). The elders of Ephesus he urged 'to feed the church of God' (correct text), 'which he purchased with his own blood' (20^{28}), where at once the deity of Jesus is asserted and also the atoning nature of His death.

Even Festus understood that St. Paul affirmed Jesus to be alive (25^{19}). To the Jews in Rome St. Paul spoke 'concerning Jesus' (28^{23}) and called his message 'this salvation of God' (v.^{28}), which the Gentiles at least will hear. The conception of Jesus as Mediator thus runs all through the Acts from the very beginning.

2. The Pauline Epistles.—(*a*) *The First Group* (1 and 2 Thess.).—At bottom the same conception of Christ appears here as in the later Epistles. The work of Christ comes out incidentally, but very clearly: 'For God appointed us not unto wrath, but unto the obtaining of salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that, whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him' (1 Th 5$^{9f.}$). St. Paul's whole gospel of grace is here set forth though in somewhat general terms—*τοῦ ἀποθανόντος περὶ ἡμῶν*, though WH give *ὑπέρ* in the margin. These two prepositions (*περὶ* and *ὑπέρ*) differ in etymology ('around' and 'over'), but in the Koine are sometimes used quite in the same resultant sense (Moulton, *Grammar of NT Greek*, vol. i., 'Prolegomena,' 1908, p. 105). There is no getting away from the idea that the death of Christ lies at the root of the obtaining of salvation on our part, though St. Paul does not here explain the relation of Christ's mediatorial work to our redemption. Another general phrase appears in 1 Th 1^{10}: 'Jesus, who delivereth us from the wrath to come,' *τὸν ῥυόμενον ἡμᾶς ἐκ, κτλ.* Here the historical Jesus is pictured as the present deliverer from the wrath—a complete deliverance (*ἐκ*). In 2 Th 2^{14} St. Paul says that we realize God's purpose 'through our gospel.' He does not, of course, mean to put mere creed in the place of Christ. Already we find the mystic term 'in Christ' (1 Th 4^{16}). No objective work on the part of Christ or man, no ordinance and no creed, can take the place of vital union with God in Christ, 'in sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth' (2 Th 2^{13}).

(*b*) *The Second Group* (1 and 2 Cor., Gal., Rom.).—We may still follow Lightfoot's grouping in spite of the doubt about the date of Galatians. Here the material is very rich. In 1 Co 1^{30} St. Paul sums up his idea of the mediation of Christ: 'But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who was made unto us wisdom from God, both righteousness and sanctification and redemption.' Thus Christ is shown to be the wisdom of God. St. Paul magnifies 'the cross of Christ' (v.^{17}). His message is 'the word of the cross' (v.^{18}). 'We preach Christ crucified' (v.^{23}). 'For I determined to know nothing among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified' (2^{2}). The death of Christ occupies the central place in St. Paul's message about salvation. He is aware that the Jews find it a stumbling-block and the Greeks foolishness, but he claims that it is 'God's wisdom in a mystery' (v.^{7}), little as the philosophers supposed it to be true. The blood of Christ makes an appeal for holy living. He is our passover sacrifice (5^{7}), in His name we were washed and justified (6^{11}), we were bought with a price (6^{20} 7^{23}), and owe a life of holiness to Christ. It is thus no mere mechanical notion with St. Paul, but a vital union with Christ on the basis of His atoning death on the cross. Christ died 'for the sake of' (*διά*) the weak brother, who for that reason deserves consideration (8^{11}). His death for man has glorified humanity. This intimate bond between the disciple and his Lord, the blood-bond, is set forth by the ordinances of baptism and communion in a far wider sense than was contemplated by the 'mystery-religions' and their 'redeemer-gods' (1 Co 10$^{2ff.\ 16-22}$ 11$^{24-26}$). Perhaps by *πνευματικόν* in 10$^{3f.}$ St. Paul means 'supernatural' (Denney, *Death of Christ*, p. 134 f.), but he does not teach that the ordinances impart the new life in Christ. They are symbols of the work of Christ made effective in the soul by the Holy Spirit, not the means for procuring the redemptive grace. Jesus Christ, not baptism and not the Lord's Supper, is the Mediator. St. Paul expressly places baptism on a lower plane than the gospel which he preached (1$^{15-17}$), which he could not have done if it had *per se* saving efficacy or was the means of obtaining the benefit of Christ's mediatorial work. He interprets the Supper as symbolic, picturing 'the Lord's death till he come' (11^{26}), which ye thereby 'proclaim' (*καταγγέλλετε*). The ordinances are thus preachers of the death of Christ for sinners and of the new life in Christ. The cup proclaims 'the new covenant in my blood,' as St. Paul quotes from Jesus (v.^{25}), and is to be drunk 'in remembrance of me.' The worthy celebration of the ordinance consists in discerning the body of Christ (v.^{29}) and not making a mere meal of the emblems. All believers are members of the mystical body of Christ the Head (12$^{12ff.}$). St. Paul's gospel, in short, has as its first word that 'Christ died for sins' (15^{3}). The preposition is *ὑπέρ* ('over,' 'on behalf of'). This death would have been in vain had He not risen from the dead (v.^{17}). But the resurrection of Christ is guarantee of His power to save, so that 'in Christ shall all be made alive' (v.^{22}). So then the Christian, the one in Christ (*ὁ ἐν Χριστῷ*), is victorious over sin and death 'through our Lord Jesus Christ' (v.^{57}).

In 2 Cor. St. Paul touches the very heart of his message about salvation in Christ. The challenge of the Judaizing sacramentalism called forth this passionate emphasis on the sufficiency of the redemptive and reconciling work of Christ. 'The sufferings of Christ abound unto us,' *περισσεύει τὰ παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς* (1^{5}). Here we have the notion of example rather than of redemption. St. Paul suffers as Jesus did. So as to 4^{10}, 'always bearing about in the body the dying of Jesus. His 'sufferings are killing him as they killed his Master' (Denney, *Death of Christ*, p. 139). See also 4^{6}. The face of Jesus Christ gives the knowledge of God's glory. But the *locus classicus* is 5$^{14-21}$, where the mediatorial work of Christ receives formal discussion. St. Paul is willing to be considered 'beside' himself (v.^{13}) in this matter (cf. 1 Co 1^{23}). The love which Christ has for St. Paul keeps him in love (*συνέχει*), holds him intact whatever men think of him. Knowing the love of Christ, he deliberately interprets (*κρίνω*) His death: 'One died for all, therefore all died,' *ὅτι εἷς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν· ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον* (5^{14}). We need not stop to show that *ὑπέρ* can be used where the notion of substitution is present. It is common enough in the ostraca and papyri of the Koine (Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, Eng. tr., 1911, p. 153). But see also Jn 11^{50}, where *εἷς ἄνθρωπος ἀποθάνῃ ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ* is explained by *καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ ἔθνος ἀπόληται.* See further Gal 3^{13}, to be discussed later. Suffice it to say that in 2 Co 5^{14} the *ἄρα* clause, though parenthetical, clearly means that *οἱ πάντες* died in the death of Christ and do not have to die in that sense again. Jesus therefore died in their stead. It is not here contended that this notion exhausts the meaning of the death of Christ. St. Paul himself speaks of the mystic crucifixion with Christ (Gal 2^{20}). No theory can set forth the wealth of meaning in the death of Christ, but St. Paul here places the notion of substitution to the fore. Love prompted this wonderful gift. God carries on the work of reconciliation (*καταλλαγή*). This is done 'through Christ' (2 Co 5^{18}) and 'in Christ' (v.^{19}). God offers Christ to the world as supreme proof of His love and as the ground of reconciliation. It is all 'of God' (v.^{18}), and He even made Christ to be sin on our behalf, that we might become the righteousness of God in Christ (v.^{21}). No sin actually touched Christ, but He bore our sins as the sacrifice for sin that we might go free. So then St. Paul bears the message of reconciliation to men as the ambassador of Christ. All that he has said elsewhere is in accord with this central passage. See also 8^{9}, where the voluntary poverty of Christ in place of His pre-existent state of riches in heaven was for our sakes (*διά*), that we 'through his poverty (*τῇ πτωχείᾳ*, instrumental case) might become rich.' Here the whole earthly life of Christ is brought into view, and not merely His death, as constituting the mediatorial work of the Saviour. Hence 9^{15}, where Jesus is the unspeakable gift, *ἐπὶ τῇ ἀνεκδιηγήτῳ αὐτοῦ δωρέᾳ*. St. Paul is positive about his conception of Jesus—so much so that he calls the Jesus of the Judaizers 'another Jesus,' *ἄλλον Ἰησοῦν*, and that gospel 'a different gospel,' *εὐαγγέλιον ἕτερον* (11^{4}). Only one historic Jesus in the sense of St. Paul is possible, so that he uses *ἄλλον*, not *ἕτερον*.

The aim of Galatians is to show that 'all Christianity is contained in the Cross; the Cross is the generative principle of everything Christian in the life of man' (Denney, *Death of Christ*, p. 152). The mediatorial work of Christ is set over against the legalistic bondage of the Judaizing gospel which St. Paul fiercely denounces as not 'another' (*ἄλλο*) gospel, but a 'different' (*ἕτερον*) gospel (1^{7}), in reality a complete departure from the grace of God in Christ (5^{4}). In $1^{3f.}$ St. Paul describes 'our Lord Jesus Christ, who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us out of this present evil world.' Here we have *ὑπέρ* in the text and *περί* in the margin of WH's text before *τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν*. Justification before God is obtained by faith in Jesus Christ, not by works of the Law (2^{16}). This is the truth of the gospel, the liberty in Christ as opposed to the bondage of the Law (vv.$^{3-5.\ 14f.}$), the weak and beggarly rudiments of the world ($4^{3.\ 9ff.}$). The life of faith which St. Paul now lives in Christ, 'who loved and gave himself up for me' (*ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ*), means that Christ has charge of his life, and St. Paul is in a mystic sense crucified with Christ (2^{20}). Christ did an objective work for St. Paul, but it has become effective through the subjective surrender to Christ, even identification with Him. A notable passage is 3^{13}, 'Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us.' The meaning is plain enough. He is speaking not simply for Jews, but for all. The curse that came upon Christ is death. By Christ's death He 'brought us out from under (*ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ*) the curse of the law.' We escape spiritual death because Christ received in Himself the curse of the law for sin, though He Himself had no sin. The prepositions give the same picture. Those who rely on the law are 'under (*ὑπό*) a curse.' Christ steps 'under' that curse and 'over' (*ὑπέρ*) us. Thus we are rescued 'out from under' (*ἐκ*) the curse and go free. That is the inevitable teaching of St. Paul in this passage. It presents clearly the notion of substitution. It may be remarked that *ἀντί* does not itself mean 'instead' any more than *ὑπέρ* does; that is a secondary notion with both prepositions. In the Koine it is quite common with *ὑπέρ* and is not unknown in the older Greek. In Christ Jesus therefore the blessing of Abraham comes upon the Gentiles (3^{14}). Christ is the seed promised to Abraham long before the Law (vv.$^{16-19}$). Christ is the schoolmaster, while the Law was merely the pædagogue to bring us to Christ, 'that we might be justified by faith' (v.^{24}). Through faith in Christ we become sons of God in the full sense of sonship (v.^{26}). The very incarnation of Christ, God's Son, 'born of a woman, born under the law,' made it possible for Him to redeem us from the Law and for us to receive the adoption of sons and to have the privilege of sons and heirs and say 'Abba, Father' (4^{4-6}). Christ, and Christ alone, set us free and called us for freedom ($5^{1.\ 13}$). But liberty is not licence (v.^{24}), and the Cross of Christ is the glory of St. Paul (6^{14}).

Romans gives the same interpretation of the work of Christ as we find in Galatians, though with less passion and vehemence. The wrath of God rests upon both Gentile and Jew because of sin, which consists in violation of what conscience tells one is right (1^{18}–3^{20}). The Law brought a keener sense of sin, and all the world comes under the judgment of God. The Gentile is without excuse (1^{20}), as is the Jew (2^{1}) who is first in privilege and in penalty (v.$^{9f.}$). St. Paul expounds his gospel with care in 3^{21-31}. The failure of man to obtain righteousness made plain the necessity for a revelation of God's righteousness, and this is found in the gospel and is mediated through faith in Christ ($1^{16f.}$). Real righteousness is thus apart from Law (3^{21}) and is purely of grace (v.^{24}). God 'justifies' the sinner, declares him righteous (*δικαιόω*) 'freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus,' *διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* (v.^{24}). The repetition of the article removes all ground for speculation as to St. Paul's meaning. Christ is thus the Redeemer, the Agent through whom (*διά*) redemption is secured, and it is a free gift on God's part, provided the sinner exercises faith in Christ, *διὰ πίστεως* (v.^{25}). More exactly St. Paul explains how this redemption is made possible in Christ, that we may obtain the righteousness of God (v.^{26}), 'that he might himself be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus.' On man's part God requires faith (trust), which involves repentance from sin. This we can understand as proper. But what about the death of Christ as the ground for this free offer of mercy on God's part? Here we touch the fathomless depths of God's love and elective grace (11^{33-36}). It is all 'of him, and through him, and unto him' (*ἐξ, διά, εἰς*). But St. Paul boldly puts forth the death of Christ as God's own solution of the problem: 'whom God set forth, *to be* a propitiation, through faith, in his blood' (3^{25}). The middle voice (*προέθετο*) accents the will of God in the matter. The word *ἱλαστήριον*, as Deissmann has conclusively shown from the inscriptions (*Bible Studies*, Eng. tr., 1901, pp. 124–135), means 'propitiatory sacrifice,' neuter adjective as substantive, and is not here used in the sense of 'cover' for the mercy-seat. He brands the old view as 'one of the most popular, most pregnant with results, and most baneful' of all exegetical errors (p. 124). The phrase *ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι* makes the meaning clear also. It is a propitiation in the blood of Christ, 'to show his [God's] righteousness' (3^{25}). As to *how* the death of Christ met the requirements of God's righteousness St. Paul gives us no light. We must let it go at that, save that we see the greatest love in it, in that Christ died for us while we were yet sinners (5^{6-8}). Indeed, while we were yet enemies to God (v.^{10}), He showed His love to us by not sparing His own Son (8^{32}), so that 'we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son' (5^{10}). The point here is, not that God needed to be reconciled, though He had to remain just when justifying (3^{26}), but that we were reconciled to God. Certainly we can understand to some extent the power of the appeal of the death of Christ for us while we were ungodly sinners, enemies of God. There is far more in the great mystery of Christ's death than this, but we can at least grasp something of that love for sinners that allowed the sinless Christ to be regarded as sin, and die for sinners, that they might become righteous in Christ (2 Co 5^{21}). The great passage in Rom. (3^{21-31}) stands beside that in 2 Cor. (5^{14-21}), and they concur. The rest of Romans confirms this view. In 4^{25} the resurrection of Jesus is associated with His death. If He had not risen, the Death would have been in vain. We enjoy 'peace with God through (*διά*) Jesus Christ, through whom (*δι'οὗ*) we have had our access (*προσαγωγήν*, 'introduction') by faith into this grace' (Ro $5^{1f.}$). The reconciliation is accomplished through Christ (v.^{11}). We shall obtain final salvation because Christ ever lives (v.^{10}). In some sense parallel with the relation of Adam to the race, Christ stands at the head of all who are redeemed, as the channel of life and grace (vv.$^{12-21}$). Christ mediates to the believer more grace than Adam did sin and death (v.^{20}). But this wealth of grace brings obligation to holy living, not to licence (6^{1} 7^{6}). St. Paul uses the figures of death to sin as symbolized by baptism, the new slavery to God, and marriage to Christ, to illustrate the permanence of the bond with Christ. Jesus Christ set St. Paul free from the bondage of sin and the Law (7^{25} 8^{3}). God sending His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh condemned man's sin in the flesh of Jesus (8^{3}). The absence of the article before *ἐν τῇ σαρκί* makes this interpretation probable. Christ is not merely the Mediator and Redeemer, but He dwells *in* the Christian (v.^{10}). We are *in* Christ and Christ is *in* us. We are joint-heirs with Christ (v.^{17}) and destined to be conformed to the image of the Son of God, the First-born among many brethren (v.^{29}). More than that, Jesus is now the champion of the elect and makes intercession for us at God's right hand (v.^{34}). St. Paul defies the universe to lay a charge against the elect, rescued by the death of Christ and preserved by His unchanging love (vv.$^{33-39}$). It is God's plan, and He declares us righteous. St. Paul seems to call Christ God in 9^{5}. Christ died and came to life again that He might be Lord of both the dead and the living (14^{9}). So St. Paul interprets in Romans the mystery of the ages (16^{25}).

(*c*) *The Third Group* (Phil., Philem., Col., Eph.). —We shall treat these Epistles in this order, though the position of Philippians is disputed. These are the Epistles of the first Roman imprisonment. The standpoint of Phil. does not differ essentially from that of Gal. and Romans. St. Paul here emphasizes his notion of life with Christ (1^{21}). The incarnation and death of Christ are treated as the supreme example of humility (2^{5-8}). Christ in His pre-incarnate state left a place on an equality with God for the lowliest rank among men and for the shameful death of the Cross. All this brought its consequent exaltation (vv.$^{9-11}$), and thus some light is thrown upon the philosophy of the Cross of Christ. St. Paul uses the language of the mystic to express his passionate devotion to Christ and his purpose to realize all that Christ has in store for him (3^{7-16}), 'that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, becoming conformed unto his death' (v.^{10}). The very difficulty of his language shows the wealth of meaning in his conception of his personal relation to Christ. Jesus was Mediator, but in no artificial way; rather He had gripped the whole of St. Paul's nature. Christ had become the passion of his life (*ἓν δέ*, v.^{13}). Christ is the great reality of life to him, *πάντα ἰσχύω ἐν τῷ ἐνδυναμοῦντί με.* Christ brings all good (4^{19}).

There is nothing distinctive in Philem. on the subject, though St. Paul urges Philemon to receive the converted runaway slave as a 'brother beloved' 'in the Lord' (v.^{16}). Thus Christ sets free the slaves of the world.

In Col. and Eph. St. Paul combats the heresies of incipient Gnosticism with perhaps a tinge of the current 'mystery-religions.' The horizon is wider than the Roman Empire or even the earth itself. The whole range of the universe of spirit and matter comes into view, so far as the Ancients conceived it (*τὰ πάντα*). Already in Ro 8^{19-22} 'the whole creation' is represented as being in some sense involved in sin and redemption. The Gnostic philosophy posited matter as essentially evil, and explained the Creation by the existence of subordinate æons who came in between God and matter. Christ was conceived as one of these æons. Thus the Person of Christ is forced to the front, and St. Paul interprets Christ in relation to the universe. He places Him on a par with God in nature (Col 1^{14}), and treats Christ as the Agent and Conserver of the material universe (vv.$^{15-17}$). Thus he answers the degrading view of the Gnostics. Besides, Christ is also the Head of the spiritual universe (vv.$^{18-23}$), 'that in all things he might have the pre-eminence' (v.^{18}). As Creator and Head of all things, as the fullness of God (v.^{19} 2^{9}), Christ is able to reconcile unto God all things, *καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν* (1^{20}). This peace of the universe is made possible by the blood of His Cross (1^{20}). Here the mediatorial work of Christ is lifted to the highest possible plane (cf. 1 Co 15^{24-28} for an adumbration of this conception). The triumph of the Cross is emphasized further in Col $2^{14f.}$. The Docetic Gnostics denied the real humanity of Christ, and so St. Paul mentions 'blood' and 'bodily.' The Cerinthian Gnostics separated the Christ from Jesus, and so St. Paul identifies them as one 'Christ Jesus the Lord' (v.^{6}). It is essential for the Christian to hold fast the Head (v.^{19}). The *ἐμβατεύω* of v.^{18} is now known to be used, in an inscription in the sanctuary of Claros, of the initiate 'entering in' (cf. *The Independent*, 1913, p. 376). Some of these initiates in the mystery-religions had apparently dethroned Christ from His place as Head. Christ did not do all His mediatorial work on the Cross. He will keep it up, as we have seen (1 Co $15^{25ff.}$), till the last enemy is put under His feet, when He shall deliver up the kingdom unto the Father (v.^{24}). Now He is at the right hand of God, and our life is hid with Christ in God and is doubly safe (Col 3^{1-3}). St. Paul is bold to speak the mystery of Christ (4^{3}), who is the mystery of God (2^{2}). In Eph 1^{3} every spiritual blessing is 'in Christ.' God chose us 'in him' (v.^{4}). We become sons 'through Jesus Christ' (v.^{5}). He bestowed His grace 'in the Beloved' (v.^{6}). 'We have our redemption through his blood' (v.^{7}). God purposed His will 'in him' (v.^{9}), 'to sum up all things in Christ' (v.^{10}), 'in whom also we were made a heritage' (v.^{11}), 'in whom ye also . . . were sealed' (v.^{13}). Christ is Head of the Church, which is His body (v.^{22}; cf. Col 1^{18}). This mystic body of Christ includes both Jew and Gentile, who have been made one in Christ and are drawn together by the blood of Christ, the middle wall of partition being thus broken down and both being united to God and to each other (Eph 2^{11-14}). This 'one new man' is the household of God, the holy temple of the Lord (vv.$^{15-22}$). Thus the wisdom of God is shown (3^{11}) 'according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord.' Christ is not a mere official Mediator. He is the vital Head of the living body which is growing up to the fullness of Christ (4^{12-16}). Christ loved His body, the Church (the Kingdom), and gave Himself up for it that in the end it might be without spot or wrinkle, holy and blameless (5^{25-27}). This mystery is great (v.^{32}) in regard to Christ and the Church. It is the whole mystery of redemptive love.

(*d*) *The Fourth Group* (1 Tim., Tit., 2 Tim.).—The Pastoral Epistles, which in the present writer's opinion may be accepted as genuine, do not contain anything essentially new on this theme. In 1 Ti 1^{15} we read that 'Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners.' In $2^{5f.}$ we have the famous passage, 'one mediator also between God and men, *himself* man, Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all.' Here the humanity of Christ is accented in His mediatorial work, and the word *μεσίτης* is applied directly to Jesus. But His atoning death as 'ransom for all,' *ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων*, is emphasized (note both *ἀντί* and *ὑπέρ*, to make plain the substitutionary character of Christ's death; cf. *λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν* in Mt 20^{28}). In Tit 2^{14} the voluntary giving of Christ is presented to redeem us and purify for Himself a people of His own. The reference is to His death. In Tit $3^{4\text{ff.}}$ the Pauline teaching of salvation by mercy and faith, not by works, appears, 'through Jesus Christ our Saviour.'

3. Epistle of James.—There is nothing in this book specifically on the subject, though the mediatorial work of Christ is assumed and implied in several passages. In 1^1 James terms himself 'a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ'; here the word *κύριος* is to be noted and also the fact that Christ is placed on a level with God in what may possibly be the earliest document in the NT. Still stronger is 2^1: 'Hold not the faith in our Lord Jesus, the glory'; if we accept the interpretation of Mayor and several other commentators, Christ is here the object of faith and so of worship, and *τῆς δόξης* is in descriptive apposition. 'The honourable (*καλόν*) name which is called upon you' refers to Christ. There may be a reference to the death of Christ in 5^6, though this is not certain; but the Second Coming is presented in v.^{7}. 'The Judge standeth before the doors' (v.^{9}). Though the stress in the Epistle is on the ethical side of Christianity, one notes the same doctrinal conception of Christ and His work at the basis of it all. The new birth is mentioned in 1^{18-21}.

4. Jude.—There is a positive note in Jude's Epistle, as the writer describes 'Our only Master and Lord (*τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν*), Jesus Christ' (v.^{4}). Cf. v.^{3}, 'the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints,' clearly having Jesus as 'only Master and Lord.' See also 'our Lord Jesus Christ' in v.^{17}; 'the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life' (v.^{21}), where 'eternal life' is posited in 'the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ.' In v.$^{24\text{f.}}$ we are plainly told that we can be set before the presence of God's glory 'through Jesus Christ our Lord.'

5. Epistles of Peter.—The genuineness of these Epistles cannot here be discussed, nor their 'Pauline' features. They certainly give the same view of Christ's mediatorial office as we find in St. Paul's writings. This conception of Christ's sacrificial death meets us in 1 P 1^2, 'sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ' (cf. Ex 24). The new birth comes to pass 'by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead' (1 P 1^3). The readers of the Epistle receive the end of their faith, even the salvation of their souls, 'through Jesus Christ' (1^9). 'The sufferings of Christ' were prophesied beforehand by the Spirit of Christ (v.^{11}). Redemption is not with gold, 'but with precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, even the blood of Christ' (v.^{19}). Here the point of view of the Epistle to the Hebrews (chs. 9 and 10) is approached. Christ is the Living Stone through whom the living stones in the spiritual house 'offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God' (1 P 2^5), a clear picture of the mediatorial work of Christ (cf. Mt 16^{18}). In 2^{21} we are told expressly that 'Christ also suffered for you (*ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*), leaving you an example (*ὑπολιμπάνων ὑπογραμμόν*), that you should follow his steps,' where the death of Christ is given as an example for us in suffering. But that this is not the sole idea in the atoning death of Christ we need only recall ($1^{18\text{f.}}$), not to mention the rest of the sentence in 2^{21-24}, where we read that Jesus 'did no sin' and 'his own self bare our sins in his body upon the tree, that we, having died unto sins, might live unto righteousness; by whose stripes ye were healed.' There is an evident reference to Is 53, and the substitutionary character of the death of Christ for sins is clear enough. St. Peter's own interpretation of *ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν* is thus quite pertinent. Hence it is plain what is meant in 3^{18}: 'Because Christ also died (*ἀπέθανεν*, WH, but some MSS *ἔπαθεν*) for (*περί*) sins once for all (*ἅπαξ*), the righteous for (*ὑπέρ*) the unrighteous, that he might bring you (*or* us, *ὑμᾶς or ἡμᾶς*) unto God.' This significant passage pictures Christ as both Sacrifice and Priest (cf. Hebrews). In 3^{21} baptism is given a symbolic interpretation 'through the resurrection of Jesus Christ,' and in v.^{22} the mediatorial work of Christ continues, 'who is on the right hand of God, having gone into heaven.' Christ suffered in the flesh (3^{18} 4^1). Through Jesus Christ God is to be glorified in all things (4^{11}). We are to rejoice if we become partakers of Christ's sufferings, only we must be innocent of wrong and suffer as Christians (v.$^{13\text{ff.}}$). This imitation of Christ in suffering is ennobled by the fact that Jesus has bought us by His own precious blood (cf. $1^{18\text{f.}}$ 5^{10}). St. Peter calls himself a witness of the sufferings of Christ and a partaker of the glory to be revealed (5^1).

In 2 P 1^1 the Greek text *τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* (cf. 1^{11}: *τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*) calls for the translation, 'Our God and Saviour Jesus Christ.' Thus the deity and redemptive work of Christ are presented. Cf. also 'the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ' (1^{11}), 'the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ' (v.^{16}). In 2^1 the heretics are described as 'denying even the Master that bought them.' In 3^2 Jesus is described again as 'the Lord and Saviour.' The Lord Jesus is to return for His people (ch. 3).

6. Epistle to the Hebrews.—The mediatorial work of Jesus is the distinctive note in this wonderful book. Everything turns on the peculiar qualifications of Christ in His humanity and deity to fulfil His mission as Redeemer from sin. The Jews had challenged the worth of Christianity in comparison with Judaism. They claimed the superiority of Judaism in the revelation in the OT, in the fact that this revelation was mediated through angels, in the greatness of Moses, in the glory of the Aaronic priesthood, in the promises to Israel. It was an impressive plea, and Christianity was made to appear barren beside the richness of ritual and worship present in Judaism. The reply is a striking apologetic for Christianity as in all points superior to Judaism by showing that in each of these points the former has the advantage. The revelation in Christianity comes through the Son of God as compared with the OT prophets (1^{1-3}); Christianity is mediated through the Son of God, who is superior to angels both in His Divine nature as God's Son (1^4–2^4) and in His human nature as the Son of man (2^{5-18}); Jesus is superior to Moses since He is God's Son over God's house, not a servant in the house (3^1–4^{13}); the priesthood of Christ is superior to that in Judaism (4^{14}–12^3) since Jesus Himself is a better High Priest than Aaron (4^{14}–7^{28}); He is the minister of a far better covenant (8^{1-13}); He now ministers in a better sanctuary (9^{1-12}); He offers a better sacrifice which is His own blood (9^{13}–10^{18}), and His work rests on better promises (10^{19}–12^3). The argument is masterful and complete, and furnishes the richest interpretation of the work of Christ in existence. It is a complement to the teaching of St. Paul in its emphasis (4^{14}–12^3) on the priestly work of Jesus. But for Hebrews we should have only glimpses of this aspect of Christ's mission. The wealth of material in the Epistle renders extended comments on important passages impossible. In the very first section (1^{1-3}) we see the nature of Christ's Person as the effulgence of God's glory and the very image of His substance. His work is described as universal in the cosmic relation (creation) and maintenance of the universe (cf. Col $1^{15ff.}$); but He is described at once as the Priest who made purification of sins and as He Who sits on the right hand of the Majesty on high as the Mediator between God and man. Jesus—and the writer loves the human name—is qualified for His work as the Son of God, and is thus superior to angels (1^{4} 2^{5}) by the high inheritance as Son. But His humanity likewise equips Jesus for His task. He is the representative man (2^{5-9}), fulfilling man's highest destiny 'because of the suffering of death,' which He tasted 'for every man' (v.^{9}). The Incarnation perfected the human experience of Jesus through sufferings (v.^{10}) and made Him a sympathetic High Priest as He makes propitiation (ἱλάσκεσθαι) for the sins of the people, equipped by suffering and temptation to succour the tempted (v.^{18}). Our Mediator thus has power with the Father as His Son and commands our sympathy and confidence as our Elder Brother (v.$^{11f.}$). Jesus is 'the apostle and high priest of our confession' (3^{1}). The double nature of Jesus as Son of God and Son of man makes a powerful appeal to Christians to come boldly to the throne of grace, for grace to help in time of need (4^{14-16}). Jesus, like Aaron, has both human sympathy and Divine appointment (5^{1-9}). By His obedience and suffering He became the Author of eternal salvation (v.$^{8f.}$). But Jesus is far superior to Aaron in that He is like Melchizedek (5^{10} 7^{28}). He has His priesthood unchangeable (7^{24}), 'wherefore also he is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them' (v.^{25}). Being free from sin He is the kind of Priest that sinners need (vv.$^{26-28}$). He is 'the mediator of a better covenant' (8^{6}) in that this covenant is one of grace in the heart and not mere ineffective form. So He is the 'mediator of a new covenant' (9^{15}). His sanctuary is heaven itself, 'the greater and more perfect tabernacle' (9^{11}), into which He entered once for all, having obtained eternal redemption (v.^{12}). He is both Sacrifice and High Priest (cf. W. P. DuBose, *High Priesthood and Sacrifice*, 1908). His offering is His own blood, that of the God-man, which was voluntary and so with moral value in the realm of spirit (v.$^{13f.}$). This offering was made once for all (ἅπαξ, v.^{26}) and really accomplishes cleansing from sin (10^{12-18}). He will come a second time for salvation alone (9^{28}). The blood of Jesus has given us boldness to enter into the holy place ($10^{19ff.}$). There is no other sacrifice for sin if we reject this (v.^{26}). The heroes of faith hold on to the promise of the Messiah which has come true in Christ Jesus, who is Himself the best example of faith, the Author and Perfecter of our faith (11^{39}–12^{3}). Once more the writer speaks of 'Jesus the mediator of a new covenant' (12^{24}). Christians should be loyal to Christ. He has not changed (13^{8}). He suffered without the gate that He might sanctify His own people through His own blood, and, if need be, we should be willing to leave the camp of Judaism and take our stand with Jesus, bearing His reproach (v.$^{12f.}$). God brought from the dead 'the great shepherd of the sheep with the blood of an eternal covenant, even our Lord Jesus' (v.^{20}).

7. The Johannine Epistles and the Apocalypse.—We can see clear teaching about the mediation of Christ in 1 John: 'The blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us from all sin' (1^{7}). Here we have the picture of the continuous sacrificial efficacy of the blood of Christ (cf. Hebrews). 'And if any man sin, we have an Advocate (παράκλητον) with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous' (2^{1}). He pleads our cause with the Father (cf. Ro 8^{34}). 'And he is the propitiation (ἱλασμός) for (περί) our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the whole world' (2^{2}). Here the universal aspect of the work of Christ is presented. St. John opposes the Cerinthian Gnostics who distinguished between Jesus and Christ (2^{22}; cf. $5^{1.6}$), and shows that confession of the Son brings knowledge of the Father (2^{23}). He presents also the purifying power of hope in Christ (3^{3}). The Son of God destroys the work of the devil, who sins from the beginning (v.$^{5f.}$). God showed His love for us by sending His only begotten Son into the world as a propitiation for our sins ($4^{9f.}$). The Father has sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world (v.^{14}). God abides in the man who confesses the Son (v.^{15}). The water and the blood bear witness to Jesus and His work (5^{6-8}), meaning probably the baptism and the blood. The baptism symbolizes the death and resurrection of Christ for our sins. By the Son of God we come to know the true God and eternal life (v.^{20}). Confession of the true humanity of Jesus as opposed to the Docetic Gnostics is absolutely essential ($4^{2f.}$, 2 Jn ^{7}).

The Apocalypse gives a powerful picture of the mediatorial work of Christ. He 'loosed us from our sins by his blood' (Rev 1^{5}). He will come again for judgment of the wicked (v.^{7}) and for the blessing of the redeemed (22^{20}). He was dead and is now alive for evermore, with the keys of death and Hades ($1^{17f.}$). Christ is the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, victorious and able to open the seals of the book, because He is also as a Lamb standing, as though He had been slain (5^{5-7}). Here the power of Christ is lodged in His atoning death. With His blood He purchased men of every land and nation (v.$^{9f.}$), who worship Jesus as God. Those arrayed in white robes in heaven have been washed in the blood of the Lamb ($7^{13f.}$). Thus, as in Hebrews, Jesus is both Sacrifice and Priest. The Lamb is the Shepherd to guide unto fountains of water of life (7^{17}). The Lord was crucified in spiritual Sodom and Egypt (11^{8}). Christ is Conqueror at last, for the kingdom of the world is become the Kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ (v.^{15}). Because of the blood of the Lamb the accuser of our brethren is cast down by the authority of Christ ($12^{10f.}$). The Lamb that has been slain has a book of life written from the foundation of the world (13^{8}). The victors sing the song of Moses and of the Lamb ($15^{2f.}$). The Lamb shall overcome, for He is Lord of lords and King of kings (17^{14}). The Lamb will have His marriage supper, and the Bride is the company of those redeemed by His blood ($19^{7ff.}$ $21^{9f.}$). As Victor His garments are sprinkled with (or dipped in) the blood of His enemies (19^{13}). In the New Jerusalem the Lord God the Almighty and the Lamb are the temple (21^{22}). The Lamb is the lamp, and only those are there whose names are written in the Lamb's book of life ($21^{23.27}$). Jesus is the Root and Offspring of David, the bright and morning Star (22^{16}). He offers the water of life freely to all who will drink (v.^{17}).

See also artt. ATONEMENT, PRIEST, PROPITIATION, RANSOM, RECONCILIATION, REDEMPTION, SACRIFICE, SALVATION, SAVIOUR.

LITERATURE.—See books on NT Theology by W. F. Adeney (1894), W. Beyschlag (Eng. tr., 1895), J. Bovon (^{2}1902–05), D. F. Estes (1900), H. J. Holtzmann (^{2}1911), G. B. Stevens (1899), B. Weiss (Eng. tr., 1882–83); A. B. Bruce, *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, 1894, *The Humiliation of Christ*, 1876; D. Somerville, *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, 1897; H. A. A. Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions*, 1913; W. M. Ramsay, *The Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day*, 1913; W. P. DuBose, *The Gospel according to St. Paul*, 1907; works on the Atonement by J. M. Campbell (1907), R. W. Dale (^{7}1878), J. Denney (1903), J. Stalker (1908); works on Hebrews by A. B. Bruce (1899), F. Delitzsch (Eng. tr., 1868–70), M. Dods (*EGT* iv. [1910]), W. P. DuBose (*High Priesthood and Sacrifice*, 1908), G. Milligan (1899), A. Nairne (*The Epistle of Priesthood*, 1913), B. F. Westcott (1889).

A. T. ROBERTSON.

MEEKNESS. — Meekness was hallowed as a Christian virtue by the beatitude of Mt 5^{5}, though it is not improbable that our Lord's use of the phrase 'the meek' implied the semi-technical connotation of the OT, where they are the godly remnant, often oppressed and nearly always obscure, in opposition to 'the rich,' the men of violence and pride, who dominated the society of Israel in the ages of warfare, defensive and offensive. Christ's own character (Mt 11^{29}) was the immortal witness of His sympathy with the saint, who was downtrodden, misunderstood, and persecuted, and who endured contradiction with courage and patience. 'Christ Himself is the Christian law,' and His moral pre-eminence was the ground of His claim to human obedience; but in calling upon the race to take His yoke, He speaks as One 'meek and lowly of heart,' *i.e.* as One who had Himself mastered self-will, especially in the form of 'the restless desire for distinction and eminence,' and had subordinated His nature to the love which seeketh not its own, but the things of others (cf. J. R. Seeley, *Ecce Homo*^{11}, 1873, ch. xv.). Thus, the meekness which He blessed and taught by His own conduct was the self-conquest which rendered Him indifferent to the glamour of external conditions such as wealth, ease, fame, and sovereignty, by which even the greatest minds have been dazzled; and further, it was opposed to the spirit of resentment, hatred, and pride, which is often the product of contumely, pain, unjust suffering, and obscurity. For the application of this principle to slavery in the Christian economy of life, see art. SLAVE, SLAVERY.

In apostolic literature the word 'meekness' (*πραΰτης*, also found in the form *πραότης* or *πρᾳότης*, and *πραϋπάθεια*, only in 1 Ti 6^{11} and Ign. *ad Trall.* viii. 1) is of frequent occurrence. St. Paul uses it eight times and the Apostolic Fathers about a dozen. In 1 Co 4^{21} it is linked with 'love,' and indicates the forgiving spirit which has abandoned stern measures; in 2 Co 10^{1} with *ἐπιείκεια*, and is used of Christ in a memorable phrase; in Gal 5^{23} it is one of the fruits of the Spirit and in 6^{1} is applied to the kindly treatment of an offender; in Eph 4^{2} the context suggests the gentleness of patience (cf. Col 3^{12}, 2 Ti 2^{25}, and Tit 3^{2}). In Ja 1^{21} it refers to the attitude of humble receptivity, and in 3^{13} is a quality of Christian 'wisdom.' In 1 P 3^{15} it is united with *φόβος* as a safeguard against the calumny with which the opponents of Christianity pursued the believer.

In 1 Clem. xxi. 7 and xxx. 8 we find it allied with *ἐπιείκεια* (cf. Diog. vii. 4), and in lxi. 2 with *εἰρήνη*; in *Ep. Barn.* xx. 2 it stands side by side with *ὑπομονή* (cf. *Did.* v. 2). In Ign. *ad Trall.* iii. 2 it is described as 'the power of the bishop,' and later on, in iv. 2, as the weapon which is to destroy the ruler of this world (cf. *ad Polyc.* ii. 1 and vi. 2). Hermas (*Mand.* v. ii. 6) links it with *ἡσυχία* (cf. 1 P 3^{4} and 1 Clem. xiii. 4, where the corresponding adjectives are used, the former being defined by Bengel as *mansuetus*, 'one who does not cause disturbance,' the latter as *tranquillus*, 'one who bears calmly the disturbances of others') and (*ib.* XII. iii. 1) with *πίστις*.

Thus, it would appear that the ideas of patience under injury, the forgiving spirit, peaceableness of disposition and life, and gentleness toward the erring enter into the use of the word in apostolic and sub-apostolic literature.

R. MARTIN POPE.

MELCHIZEDEK. — The original meaning was probably 'My king is Zedek'; but the name is interpreted ideally in He 7^{2}, where it is taken to mean 'king of righteousness,' and at the same time, because of Melchizedek's rule over Salem (= 'peace'), 'king of peace.' Thus the personal and the official titles point to the actual character of the man. The typical hero, first righteous and therefore self-governed and blessed with the tranquillizing consciousness of the presence of God, appears to the writer as an anticipation of Him in whom alone righteousness and peace are completely realized both in His own person and life and in His gifts to men. Thereupon the writer proceeds to develop the comparison in the interest of his conception of the supreme and permanent priesthood of Jesus Christ.

1. The original source of the story is Gn 14^{17b-20}, of which the literary history is still uncertain. It is not an integral part of any of the principal documents, though the chapter as a whole has a few affinities with P. At present the only safe conclusion is that it comes from an independent source, of which the special characteristics cannot yet be determined. Nor is there any real evidence of a lack of historicity. The combination of kingly and priestly offices in one person, who was invested with a sacred character as a descendant of a deity, was a not unusual feature of government in the primitive ages (see J. G. Frazer, *Lectures on the Early History of the Kingship*, 1905, p. 29 ff.), and may well have prevailed among the Canaanite tribes. Yet the writer of Hebrews need not be regarded as a witness to the historicity of the narrative, or as concerning himself with such a question. He treats Melchizedek ideally rather than historically, and interprets the picture preserved in Genesis without committing himself to any opinion as to its literal or biographical accuracy. His object is not to confirm nor to question the narrative, but to work out a conception of priesthood which he found in the priestly archives of his nation; and in so doing he makes at least as much use of the silences of Scripture as of the assertions. Accordingly, B. F. Westcott (*Hebrews*, 1889, p. 199 f.) takes him as pronouncing no judgment on the historical problems, but as eliciting the typical and abiding value of the story.

2. Immediate source of the exposition.—The writer need not be conceived as going back through Ps 110^{4} to the original tradition in Gn 14 and working upon it independently; for there is sufficient reason to believe that the narrative had for a couple of centuries engaged the attention of some of the religious leaders of the people, and in the interpretation an interesting development may be traced. 'God Most High' (He 7^{1}) is a phrase of frequent occurrence in the Apocrypha (for the passages see E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath, *Concordance to the LXX*, 1892 ff.), especially in Ecclesiasticus; and the title 'priest of the Most High God' was revived by the Maccabæan princes, whilst John Hyrcanus (137–105 B.C.) combined in himself the triple functions of prophet, priest, and king (see Josephus, *Ant.* XIII. x. 7, *BJ* I. ii. 8; and R. H. Charles, *Book of Jubilees*, 1902, p. lxxxviii, *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 1908, p. li ff., with references there cited). Evidently the Melchizedek tradition was considered as pointing to the Maccabæan leaders (cf. J. Skinner, *Genesis*, 1910, on 14^{20}), in whose period Ps 110 may have undergone its final liturgical revision. The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* is a Palestinian book; but Philo is a witness for the prevalence of a similar interest in the ancient story in Egypt. He argues in favour of an identification of Melchizedek with the Logos, whose priesthood, however, is viewed as a symbol of the action of reason in bringing righteousness and peace to men (Mangey, i. 103, 533, ii. 34). The thought in Hebrews is clearly an advance, parallel in part to that between the Philonic and the Johannine Logos, but confronting the reader with a religion instead of a philosophy, and with a supreme personal Helper instead of with a dubious process of reasoning.

3. Significance in Hebrews.—The apparent object of the writer was to mark the adequate and final character of the priesthood of Jesus Christ. As a person He is compared with Melchizedek, whose order of priesthood was confessedly above that of Aaron (*q.v.*); while in regard to priestly acts and functions His efficiency and freedom from limitations are exhibited in comparison with the necessary defects of the Aaronic office. More particularly three features in the story of Melchizedek are singled out. (*a*) He was king as well as priest, and as priest-king he possessed the endowments of righteousness and peace, and was able to impart them with royal bounty. (*b*) He was dissociated from all the relations of time, neither qualified by priestly descent for his office, nor interrupted in its discharge by death (He 7^{3}). (*c*) Accordingly, through these timeless and regal qualities his priesthood becomes unique, incomparably above all Aaronic and Levitical institutions, and with nothing like it in human history until the Incarnate comes upon the stage and takes to Himself a Priesthood in which He admits no peer, and of which eternal and superabundant adequacy is the note (see PRIEST).

4. Later developments.—In the patristic literature of our period no objection appears to have been taken to the use of the story in Hebrews, though its classification among the alleged theophanies was early and had probably already begun. On the other hand, the Jewish writers adopt an interpretation of their own, either through dislike of the teaching in Hebrews, or in substitution for its application to John Hyrcanus, which had been discredited by the collapse of his influence before the end of his reign. Shem was identified with Melchizedek in early parts of the Talmud and Targums (*Nedarim*, 32*b*, *Sanhedrin*, 108*b*, *Targ. Jonathan*), and the narrative was taken to mean that the priesthood was transferred to Abraham, while the rest of the descendants of Shem were excluded. Another tradition distinguishes Shem from Melchizedek, but associates them in the work of transferring the body of Adam to Jerusalem. The story survives with many embellishments in the Ethiopic *Book of Adam*; and only for its beginnings, with mixed Jewish and Christian influences at work upon it, can a place be allowed within our century.

R. W. MOSS.

MELITA (Μελίτη).—Melita, now Malta, is an island in the Mediterranean, 47 miles S. of Sicily, 17 miles long, 9 miles broad, and 95 square miles in area. Its excellent harbours, together with its position in the track of ships sailing east and west, gave it commercial importance from very early times. Occupied by Phœnician settlers (Diod. v. 12), it was long under the power of the Carthaginians, who surrendered it to the Romans in the Second Punic War, 218 B.C. (Livy, xxi. 51), after which it was annexed to the province of Sicily. The identity of Malta with the island on which St. Paul was shipwrecked on his voyage to Italy (Ac 28^{1}) was formerly disputed, but is now universally admitted. The case for another Melita on the Dalmatian coast—the modern *Meleda*—was presented by Padre Georgi, a Dalmatian monk who was a native of the island (1730), and by W. Falconer in his *Dissertation on St. Paul's Voyage* (^{3}1872). The theory was examined and refuted by James Smith in his admirable monograph on *The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul* (^{4}1880). It was based on two groundless assumptions: (1) that 'the Adria' through which St. Paul's ship drifted must have been the modern Adriatic, or Gulf of Venice, whereas the term is known to have included in the Apostle's time the whole expanse of sea between Sicily, Italy, Greece, and Crete (Adria); and (2) that the N.E. hurricane, which threatened to drive the ship upon the African quicksands, must have veered completely round and sent her northwards through the Strait of Otranto; an essential point, which the passenger St. Luke, whose narrative is the most vivid and instructive account of a voyage and wreck that has come down from antiquity, could not have failed to mention.

All the facts are in harmony with the theory that 'St. Paul's Bay' in Malta was the scene of the shipwreck. (1) If the E.N.E. wind, known to present-day sailors as the 'Gregalia' or 'Levanter,' continued to blow day after day, as it often does in the late autumn, the ship, having been laid to on the starboard tack (*i.e.* with her right side to the wind) to avoid being swiftly driven to the African coast, would move in the exact direction of Melita at the mean rate of 1½ miles an hour, covering the distance from Clauda—about 480 miles—in a little over 13 days (Ac 27^{27}). The nautical problem is worked out by Smith (p. 125 f.). (2) Driven in the direction indicated, the ship could not enter St. Paul's Bay without passing within a quarter of a mile of the low rocky point called Koura, and it was the ominous roar of the waves breaking on this headland—a sound at once detected by practised ears—that led the sailors to surmise that some land, which they could not see in the stormy night, was 'nearing' them (v.^{27}; *προσάγειν* is one of the many nautical terms which St. Luke heard the crew use; B* has *προσάχειν* = *resonare*). (3) At the first indication of danger, orders were given to heave the lead, and the successive measurements of 20 and 15 fathoms (v.^{28}) exactly correspond to modern soundings taken at the entrance of the bay. (4) As the rapid shoaling proved that not a moment was to be lost, four anchors were cast from the stern, not, according to the usual practice, from the bow, for in that case the ship would have swung round from the wind, and either have wrecked herself in so doing, or at any rate have put herself in the worst position for grounding on the following day. The anchors could not have held in the hurricane except in a bottom of extraordinary tenacity, and the *Sailing Directions* state that 'the harbour of St. Paul . . . is safe for small ships, the ground, generally, being very good; and while the cables hold there is no danger, as the anchors will never start' (Smith, p. 132). (5) On attempting at daybreak to beach the ship, the sailors came unexpectedly upon 'a place where two seas met' (*τόπον διθάλασσον*, v.^{41}), which probably means (though there are other explanations of the difficult expression) the narrow channel between the little island of Salmonetta, on the western side of the bay, and the mainland. *διθάλασσος*, 'two-sea'd,' was a term commonly used to describe the great Bosporus (Strabo, II. v. 12), and St. Luke notes the fact that the ship met her fate at the end of a miniature Bosporus. (6) When she grounded herself on a bank covered with water too deep for wading, 'the prow struck' (v.^{41}). This fits the conditions exactly, for the nearest soundings to the mud indicate a depth of 3 fathoms, which is what the corn-ship would draw; and the bottom which she struck is 'of mud graduating into tenacious clay, into which the fore part would fix itself and be held fast, whilst the stern was exposed to the force of the waves' (Smith, p. 144). (7) The only physical feature that is now missing is the sandy or shingly beach (*αἰγιαλόν*, v.^{39}), but there are indications that a creek (*κόλπον δέ τινα*) 'must at one time have had a beach which has been worn away, in the course of ages, by the wasting action of the sea' (Smith, p. 247).

The scene of the wreck was about 8 miles N.W. of Valetta, and 5 miles N. of Medina, or Citta Vecchia, the old capital. The local tradition on the subject is certainly ancient, either dating back to the event itself, or resting on early and reasonable conjecture. The earliest maps of Malta, made in the 16th cent., contain the *Cale di S. Paolo*. To the Hellenist Luke the kind-hearted natives of the island were 'barbarians' (28^{4}), a term which does not imply that they were savages, but merely that they did not speak Greek. They belonged to the highly civilized Phœnician race, of which the Carthaginians were a branch. The educated men in the island, of course, knew Greek, and bilingual inscriptions, in Greek and Punic, come down from the 1st century. St. Paul and his company spent three months in Melita, and Publius, the *πρῶτος*, or chief man, of the island, who was subject to the prætor of Sicily, treated them with marked respect (vv.$^{7.\ 10}$). That *πρῶτος* was an official designation is proved by a Greek inscription bearing the name of Prudens, a Roman knight, *πρῶτος Μελιταίων καὶ Πάτρων*, and by a Latin one containing the words 'Municipii Melitensium primus omnium.' The fact that no snakes (v.^{3}), either venomous or harmless, are now found in Melita is accounted for by the increase of the population and the cultivation of the soil. St. Paul's further labours in Melita, apart from certain acts of healing (vv.$^{8.\ 9}$), are left unrecorded by the historian, whose mind and pen hurry on to Rome. And one other fact which tells decisively against the Dalmatian Melita is the call which the *Dioscuri* made at Syracuse on the way to Puteoli (v.^{12}). There was a tradition, referred to by Chrysostom (*Hom.* 54) that St. Paul's stay at Melita resulted in the conversion of the inhabitants. The Maltese have attached the name of San Paolo to a church (1610) and a tower near the bay, and they drink out of the '*Ayin tal Razzal*, or Fountain of the Apostle.

LITERATURE.—Albert Mayr, *Die Insel Malta im Altertum*, 1909; W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*^{5}, 1900, p. 314 f.; W. J. Conybeare and J. S. Howson, *St. Paul*, 1865, ii. 421 f.; R. L. Playfair, in Murray's *Handbook to the Mediterranean*^{3}, 1890. JAMES STRAHAN.

MEN-STEALERS.—The word occurs only once in the NT—in the First Epistle to Timothy (1^{10}), where the writer includes the term in his list of those for whom the Law is intended. 'A law is not intended for a righteous man but for the lawless and unruly . . . for men-stealers (*ἀνδραποδισταῖς, plagiariis* [Vulg.]).' That kidnapping was regarded as a serious offence by the Hebrews is clear from the definite statements in Ex 21^{16} ('and he that stealeth a man . . . he shall surely be put to death') and in Dt 24^{7} ('if a man be found stealing any of his brethren of the children of Israel . . . then that thief shall die'). By the time of this Epistle, however, the term had less special colour and could describe that subtler form of man-stealing by which one man is made the victim of another's will and the instrument of his selfishness.

R. STRONG.

MERCURY.—'Mercury' (Ac 14^{12} RV; AV 'Mercurius,' RVm 'Gr. *Hermes*'), like 'Jupiter' (*q.v.*), is used as the Greek equivalent of some local Lycaonian god. Hermes 'is the name of a Greek god (corresponding to the Roman Mercury) whose origin and real character are perhaps more difficult to define than is the case with any other Greek deity' (Ramsay, *EBr*^{9} xi. [1880] 749). He was the accredited messenger between gods and men. Besides this he was the god of social intercourse, and hence came to be regarded as the personification of cleverness; that he should then be regarded as the patron of thieves was but a step. He is also spoken of as conducting the souls of the departed to their last home—an idea inherited from the Vedic mythology. Because of his connexion with the wind he is generally represented as wearing winged shoes. St. Paul, however, was dubbed 'Hermes,' 'because he was the chief speaker,' which reminds us that this deity was thought of as the god of eloquence. The statue of the god by Praxiteles in the Heraion at Olympia conceived him as possessing peculiar beauty and grace, which accords ill with the traditional portrait of the Apostle. The fact is that the Lycaonians were so wrought upon by the miracle that had been performed, and so delighted at the eloquence of St. Paul, that they did not stop to consider such details.

F. W. WORSLEY.

MERCY (*ἔλεος, οἰκτιρμός*).—*Ἔλεος* means properly 'a feeling of sympathy,' 'fellow-feeling with misery,' 'compassion.' In the sense of God's pity for human woe, which manifests itself in His will of salvation, *ἔλεος* is found not infrequently in the apostolic writings (cf. Ro 9^{23} 15^{9}, 1 P 1^{3}, Jude ^{21}, 2 Ti $1^{16.\ 18}$). It is found joined with *ἀγάπη* in Eph 2^{4}, with *μακροθυμία* in 1 Ti 1^{16}, and with *χάρις* in He 4^{16}. We find the group, grace, mercy, peace, in the greetings of 1 Ti 1^{2}, 2 Ti 1^{2}, 2 Jn ^{3}; mercy and peace together in Gal 6^{16}, Jude ^{2}.

The verb *ἐλεέω* is found in a similar sense in Ro $9^{15.\ 16}$ 11^{30-32}, 2 Co 4^{1}, 1 Ti $1^{13.\ 16}$, 1 P 2^{10}. It is also found of the mercy of man towards his fellow (Ro 12^{8}, 1 Co 7^{25}, Ph 2^{27}).

οἰκτιρμός also means 'compassion,' 'pity,' 'mercy,' and with the adj. *οἰκτίρμων* and the verb *οἰκτείρω* is used both of God's compassion for men and of men's compassion for one another. In the NT *οἰκτιρμός* is mostly used in the plural, conformably to the Heb. רַחֲמִים, which it translates in the LXX. Cf., for *οἰκτιρμός* with reference to God, Ro 12^{1}, He 10^{28}. In 2 Co 1^{3} God is called 'the Father of mercies.' *οἰκτιρμός* is used of human pity in Col 3^{12}; cf. *οἰκτίρμων* (of God) Ja 5^{11}, *οἰκτείρω* (of God) Ro 9^{15}.

In the sub-apostolic writings the usage is parallel. 1 Clem. is specially fond of both *ἔλεος* and *οἰκτιρμός* (cf. ix. 1, xviii. 2, xxii. 8, xxviii. 1, l. 2, lvi. 5, xx. 11, lvi. 1). In Polyc. *Phil.* we have 'mercy' (*ἔλεος*) and 'peace' in the introduction.

In conclusion, it may be pointed out that the doctrine of the Divine mercy is an OT rather than a NT doctrine. In the OT it is represented by the ascription to God of the following attributes: '(*a*) tender compassion, *raḥămîm*, etc., for man's misery and helplessness; (*b*) a disposition to deal kindly and generously with man, *ḥanan*, etc.; (*c*) the divine affection and fidelity to man, on which man may confidently rely, as he would on the loyalty of his tribe or family, *ḥeṣedh*' (W. H. Bennett in *HDB* iii. 345). Bennett points out that the NT use of the corresponding terms is neither frequent nor characteristic, and is only a faint reflexion of OT teaching. 'The great ideas represented in OT by *raḥămîm*, *ḥanan*, *ḥeṣedh*, and their cognates, are mostly expressed in NT by other terms than ἔλεος, *οἰκτιρμοί*, etc. One might almost say that *ḥeṣedh* covers the whole ground of *χάρις, ἔλεος, εἰρήνη* (but see Hort on 1 P 1^{2}), and implies the NT doctrine of the Divine Fatherhood.'

LITERATURE.—H. Cremer, *Bibl.-Theol. Lexicon of NT Greek*^{3}, Eng. tr., 1880, p. 248 f.; W. H. Bennett in *HDB* iii. 345 f.

R. S. FRANKS.

MERCY-SEAT (*ἱλαστήριον, propitiatorium*).—The mercy-seat was the cover of the Ark (*q.v.*) of the Covenant in the Holy of Holies. It was sprinkled with the blood of the victim slain on the annual Day of Atonement (He 9^{5}). 'Mercy-seat' is admitted on all hands to be an imperfect translation of the Greek word, being rather, like Luther's *Gnadenstuhl*, equivalent to *θρόνος τῆς χάριτος* (He 4^{16}). It is also frequently contended that *ἱλαστήριον*, which is the LXX rendering of כַּפֹּרֶת, is itself a mistake. In the view of Rashi and Kimchi, followed by many Christian scholars, the Heb. word means no more than a literal 'covering' (so RVm in Ex 25^{17}, etc.). Ritschl maintains that in both the OT and the NT *ἱλαστήριον* designates 'the piece of furniture over the ark of the covenant in the holy of holies'

(*Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*^{3}, ii. [1889] 168). Nowack (*Heb. Archäologie*, 1894, ii. 60 f.) also gives the word a material sense, regarding it, however, as denoting a kind of penthouse (*Schutzdach, Deckplatte*) for the ark. But the analogy of the Arabic *kaffārat* seems to justify Lagarde (and many others) in holding (1) that the LXX has rendered the original quite accurately, and (2) that ἱλαστήριον means 'the propitiating thing,' or 'the propitiatory gift.' Wherever the word is used by Philo (*de Vit. Mos.* iii. 8, *de Profug.* 19, *de Cherub.* 8, etc.) this is the meaning indicated by the context, and recently discovered inscriptions (W. R. Paton and E. L. Hicks, *The Inscriptions of Cos*, 1891) prove that ἱλαστήριον ordinarily bore this sense in the early Imperial period (cf. Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* xi. 355 [Reiske]).

With such a connotation the word lies at the heart of St. Paul's gospel (Ro 3^{25}). When he depicts Christ Jesus as set forth to be a ἱλαστήριον (or his word may be an adj., ἱλαστήριος), it is scarcely possible that he conceives the Messiah as a 'mercy-seat,' or 'covering of the ark,' sprinkled with blood—His own blood. The figure is inappropriate and unintelligible. But the Apostle's thought is at once apparent and impressive if he represents Christ as a Propitiatory. The exact shade of meaning which may thereafter be detected in the word—whether 'the means of propitiating,' or 'the propitiatory gift,' or 'the propitiatory One'—is of less importance. What is essential is the large and luminous idea of atonement. The Pauline teaching and the Johannine are here in agreement, each emphasizing the same central thought. Christ as the ἱλαστήριον (propitiatory) is the ἱλασμός (propitiation) for our sins (1 Jn 2^{2}).

LITERATURE.—P. de Lagarde, *Uebersicht über die im Aram., Arab. und Heb. übliche Bildung der Nomina*, Göttingen, 1889; H. Cremer, *Bibl.-theol. Wörterbuch*^{8}, Gotha, 1895, p. 474 ff.; G. A. Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, Eng. tr., 1901, p. 124 ff., also art. in *EBi*.

JAMES STRAHAN.

MESOPOTAMIA.—Mesopotamia is referred to in Ac 2^{9}, where it is evidently the well-known district between the rivers Euphrates and Tigris with which the name is generally associated, and also in Ac 7^{2}, where it is roughly parallel with 'the land of the Chaldæans' in v.^{4}. The name 'Mesopotamia' represents the Hebrew *Aram-Naharaim* in the OT, which is usually rendered 'Aram of the two rivers,' but is more correctly *Aram Naharim* or *Naharin*, *i.e.* 'Aram of the river-lands' (*EBi* i. 287). Mesopotamia reached, on the north, to the plains beneath the Masius range of hills. To the south its limits were about where Babylonia begins, at the so-called Median Wall, which runs from a little below Is (Hit), on the Euphrates, to a point just above Opis (Kadisiya), on the Tigris. It thus formed a deep triangle with the apex to the south and the base along the foot of the northern mountains. The country fell steadily from 1,100 ft. in the north to 65 ft. at its southern extremity, and consisted for the most part of a single open stretch of steppe-land.

The river Chaboras (Khabur), entering the Euphrates from the east near Circesium, marks off the three divisions of Mesopotamia—(*a*) the northern tracts on its west side, (*b*) the similar tracts to east of it, and (*c*) the steppe-land stretching away south to the Median Wall. As to (*a*), the north-western tracts bore the name of Osrhœne, or Orrhœne, in Seleucid times, and the chief city of the district was Urfa, the Edessa of the Greeks and Romans. To the south of Urfa lie the ruins of Harran, and along the western bank of the Habor stretched Gauzanitis, the Hebrew Gozan, to which Israelites were deported by the king of Assyria (2 K 17^{6}). As to (*b*), the principal city of the north-eastern region was Nisibis, a busy trading centre and a place of frequent conflict between Roman and Persian armies. As to (*c*), the southern region of Mesopotamia contained several cities of importance. Among these may be mentioned Corsothe, Anatho, and Is (on the Euphrates), and Atræ and Cænæ (on the Tigris). Along the banks of the two rivers, in this southern country, was a belt of cultivated land, outside of which the conditions were (for the most part) those of the Syrian Desert.

Mesopotamia was constantly being crossed and traversed by armies and caravans in ancient times, and was repeatedly a scene of conflict between the nations of the West and of the Farther East. In the earliest times, its history was closely bound up with that of Babylonia on the south. The Babylonians held predominance for long periods, influencing the civilization to a very considerable extent. At the same time, the land lay open to Syria and Arabia, whose tribes were constantly breaking across its borders. From the Tel-el-Amarna tablets and certain Egyptian tribute-lists, it appears that a non-Semitic people, called Mitani, occupied the district of Naharin between 1700 and 1400 B.C. Harran was probably their capital city. After the Mitani supremacy, the country fell under the rule of the Assyrian kings, and in the 10th cent. B.C. seems to have become part of Assyria proper. When the Assyrian power declined, Mesopotamia was overrun (as it had been more or less all along) by Aramæan hordes from the west and south.

LITERATURE.—*EBi* iii. 3050–3057; H. Winckler, *History of Babylonia and Assyria*, Eng. tr., 1907.

A. W. COOKE.

MESSIAH.—See CHRIST, CHRISTOLOGY.

METAPHOR.—Metaphor has been defined as 'the figure of speech in which a name or descriptive term is transferred to some object different from, but analogous to, that to which it is properly applicable' (*OED*, *s.v.*). Again, 'in metaphor a word in the sentence to be expressed is replaced by a word denoting an object in some respect similar; frequently it is an abstract word which is replaced by a concrete' (L. E. Browne, *The Parables of the Gospels*, p. 2). Simile, on the other hand, is used simply of explicit comparison, often introduced in English by either 'like' or 'as.' A parable is an extended simile, and an allegory an extended metaphor. It is only in modern languages that the various forms of figurative speech have become sharply distinguished. Thus the Greek παραβολή in the NT means not only 'parable' but 'comparison' (He 9^{9}), and in Lk 4^{23} the proverb or adage 'Physician, heal thyself,' is called παραβολή. Likewise the Heb. מָשָׁל means not only 'parable' but 'by-word,' 'similitude'; and it is used more generally still of ethical maxims, didactic poems, or odes. But, though definitions differ slightly, the meaning of the English 'metaphor' is now generally standardized.

According to König, 'Metaphor springs from the putting together of comparable instances of the material and visible and the ideal spheres' (*Stilistik, Rhetorik, Poetik in Bezug auf die biblische Litteratur komparativisch dargestellt*). Thus he does not agree with W. Reichel, who in his *Sprachpsychologische Studien* (1897, p. 179) says: 'There is really no essential difference between actual and metaphorical designation.' 'According to my view,' says König, 'there is still an essential difference in method of expression when the sphere of existence of both ideas that appear in the subject and predicate is the same, and when it is different.'

König divides metaphor into four classes: (1) both ideas are in the inanimate sphere, such as the association of joy with light, and sorrow with darkness; (2) an idea is taken from the inanimate sphere to the animate, *e.g.* the term 'Rock' applied to God (frequently in the Psalms and elsewhere in the OT); (3) both ideas are in the animate sphere, *e.g.* the comparison of a man to a lion, bear, panther, dog or swine, serpent, eagle, raven, etc.; (4) an idea is transferred from the animate sphere to the inanimate, *e.g.* 'the tops of the mountains' (Heb. 'heads'), and the 'face of the waters' (Gn 1^2). Closely connected with the last is the idea of personification: *e.g.* inanimate objects are bidden hearken to the word of God, as in Is 1^2, 'Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth.'

Not only are there no parables outside the Synoptists, but the use of metaphorical language is both more complicated and more extended. We still have the familiar conceptions drawn from everyday life—sowing, reaping, and harvest, animals and birds, the seasons, light and darkness, life and death—but as the scene shifts from the hillsides of Nazareth and the streets of Jerusalem to the busy cities of the Græco-Roman world with their ceaseless and varied activity, there are many phrases and metaphors in the Acts, the Epistles, and the Apocalypse which could hardly have fallen from the lips of our Lord Himself. Many of these expressions, too, have since so become part of ordinary theological language that we do not always at first see that they are metaphors at all.

It will be convenient to divide the metaphors under discussion as follows:—

- I. New Testament:
    - (1) Acts.
    - (2) Pauline Epistles.
    - (3) Epistle to Hebrews.
    - (4) Catholic Epistles.
    - (5) Revelation.
- II. Early Christian literature to A.D. 100:
    - (1) Agrapha.
    - (2) 1 Clement.
    - (3) Odes of Solomon.
    - (4) Didache.

I. *IN THE NT.*—**1. Acts.**—Not many metaphors are found in Acts; such as there are have mostly a Jewish flavour and are not remarkable. 2^{37}: 'they were pricked in their heart' (*κατενύγησαν τὴν καρδίαν*; cf. Gn 34^7 LXX *κατενύχθησαν οἱ ἄνδρες*; Plutarch, *de Tranquill. Animi*, xix. [without prefix]). 5^{33} 7^{54}: 'were cut to the heart' (the Gr. *διαπρίειν* means 'to saw through,' used literally in Aristophanes, metaphorically particularly in late and ecclesiastical Greek). 7^{51}: 'Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears' (cf. Lv 26^{41}, Jer 6^{10} 9^{26}). 12^1: 'Herod the king put forth his hands' (this can fairly be called a metaphor; cf. Polyb. III. ii. 8, *ἐπιβάλλειν χεῖρας τοῖς κατ' Αἴγυπτον*). 17^{27}: 'if haply they might feel after him.' *ψηλαφᾶν*, 'to grope,' is also found metaphorically in Polybius. This idea, like that in 17^{28}, 'in him we live, and move, and have our being,' may have come from contemporary philosophy. St. Paul like Stoic teachers 'had a profound disbelief in the power of men to find God for themselves' (P. Gardner in *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, 1909, p. 400 f.). 19^{20}: 'So mightily grew the word of the Lord.' 20^{29}: 'grievous wolves shall enter in' (men represented as beasts—a striking metaphor). 26^{14}: 'kick against the goad.' *κέντρον* is also used metaphorically in 1 Co $15^{55.56}$ of the 'sting' of death.

2. St. Paul's Epistles.—It is obvious that in no writer of the NT is metaphor more important than in St. Paul. 'A Hebrew of the Hebrews' who had sat at the feet of Gamaliel, a student who had absorbed much of the intellectual culture of the Greek world of his day, and a citizen of the Roman Empire, it is not surprising that all the sides of his personality have left their mark on his language. Sometimes his metaphors are plain and straightforward: sometimes he passes imperceptibly from what is metaphor to what is not, weaving ideas into and out of one another in a way possible only for one who combined in such a rare degree spiritual freshness and intellectual subtlety. 'One of the most striking characteristics of St. Paul is a sort of telescopic manner, in which one clause is as it were drawn out of another, each new idea as it arises leading on to some further new idea' (Sanday-Headlam, *Romans*^{5}, p. lx ff.). Hence his metaphors become changed almost in the same sentence, while the thought is being developed. Some of his simple metaphors, however, claim consideration first.

(1) *The way.*—1 Th 1^9: 'What manner of entering in (*ὁποίαν εἴσοδον*) we had unto you,' *εἴσοδον* being used of the act (as in 1 Th 2^1), rather than of the means, of entering (He 10^{19}, 2 P 1^{11}). 1 Th 2^{12}: 'that ye should walk worthily of God.' Christianity is called *ἡ ὁδός*, 'the way' (Ac 9^2, etc.), a metaphor which, as Milligan says (*Epp. to Thess.*, *ad loc.*), though found in classical Greek, is Hebraistic and is characteristic of the LXX. The same idea appears again in *κατευθύναι τὴν ὁδὸν ἡμῶν*, 'direct our way' (1 Th 3^{11}; cf. Lk 1^{79}, 2 Th 3^5).

(2) *The athletic ground.*—This is obviously a metaphor which would appeal to Greeks. Ph 1^{30}: 'having the same conflict which ye saw in me and now hear to be in me.' 1 Ti 6^{12}: 'Fight the good fight of faith' (this would also come under 'Warfare') (cf. 1 Th 2^2, He 10^{32}): the words *ἄθλησις*, *ἀθλεῖν*, 'contest,' 'to take part in a contest,' are obviously borrowed from the athletic ground; likewise *ἀγών*, 'conflict,' has not our sense of 'agony' at all but was simply used of the games, though the word appears metaphorically in Thuc. iii. 44. 1 Co 9^{24-27}: 'Know ye not that they which run in a race run all, but one receiveth the prize? . . .' Gal 2^2: 'lest by any means I should be running or had run in vain' (the metaphor here might almost equally well be taken from the 'Way'). The same thought is in Ph 2^{16}: 'that I did not run in vain, neither labour in vain' (cf. Epictetus, *Diss.* iv. 4. 30: *ἐλθὲ ἤδη ἐπὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα, δεῖξον ἡμῖν τί ἔμαθες, πῶς ἤθλησας*; 'Come now to the conflict, show us what thou hast learned, how thou hast contested'). In 2 Th 3^1, 'that the word of the Lord may run and be glorified' is a curious mixed metaphor in the typically Pauline style—one thought quickly passing into another.

(3) *Warfare.*—The athletic games lead on naturally to warfare. 2 Co $10^{3.4}$: 'For, though we walk in the flesh, we do not war according to the flesh (for the weapons of our warfare are not of the flesh, but mighty before God to the casting down of strongholds).' In Eph 6^{11-18} the metaphor is sustained, and in the beautiful phrases 'the helmet of salvation,' 'the sword of the spirit,' 'the shield of faith' it is both elaborated and interpreted (cf. also 1 Co 6^7, 1 Th 5^8). In Ro 13^{12}: 'let us therefore cast off the works of darkness and let us put on the armour of light,' the metaphor of warfare is combined with that of light and darkness—equally beautiful and equally Pauline. This idea is found in Is 11^5 59^{17}, Wis 5^{17-20}. For further metaphors drawn from warfare, see also 1 Ti 1^{18}, 2 Ti 2^3.

(4) *The family.*—1 Th 2^{17}: 'But we, brethren, being bereaved of you for a short season . . .' (*ἀπορφανίζω*, however, is used so widely that, as Milligan says, the metaphor can hardly be pressed). Another instance of this would be 1 Th 2^7, where the text is uncertain, 'But we were babes in the midst of you, as when a nurse cherisheth her own children' (for *νήπιοι*, 'babes,' some MSS read *ἤπιοι*, 'gentle'; but the former reading seems to fit in better with the context).

(5) *Building* is a favourite Pauline metaphor.

Ro 1^{11}: 'to the end ye may be established,' *i.e.* strengthened or built up. 1 Th 3^{2}: 'to establish you and to comfort you.' 1 Ti 6^{19}: 'laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on the life which is life indeed' (here the metaphor is changed in the same sentence from 'building' to 'grasping'). 2 Ti 2^{19}: 'Howbeit the firm foundation of God standeth . . .' Cf. too 1 Co 14^{4}: 'He that speaketh in a tongue edifieth (lit. 'buildeth up') himself.'

(6) *The sea.*—Perhaps St. Paul's frequent voyages suggested to him nautical metaphors. Thus, 1 Ti 1^{19}: 'holding faith and a good conscience; which some having thrust from them made shipwreck concerning the faith.' The Greek ναυαγέω is used literally in 2 Co 11^{25}: 'thrice I suffered shipwreck.' The word is also used metaphorically in Plutarch, Demosthenes, and Æschines.

(7) *Mirror.*—1 Co 13^{12}: 'For now we see in a mirror darkly.' The significance of this would have been more apparent to an ancient than it is to a modern reader, for ancient mirrors were always of polished metal, and thus their reflexion was imperfect. According to Jewish tradition, Moses saw in a clear mirror but all the prophets in a dark one. Again, in 2 Co 3^{18}: 'with unveiled face reflecting, as a mirror, the glory of the Lord.'

(8) *First-fruits.*—1 Co 15^{20}: 'But now hath Christ been raised from the dead, the firstfruits of them that slept.' 'On the morning of the 16th of Nisan, probably the very morning of the Lord's Resurrection, the first ripe sheaf of the harvest was offered to God. It was the consecration of the whole harvest to Him. So the Resurrection of Christ was the pledge of the Resurrection of all in union with Him' (Goudge, *in loc.*).

(9) *Clothing.*—1 Co 15^{53}: 'For this corruption must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality.'

(10) *Horticulture.*—Ro 11^{24}: 'For, if thou wast cut out of that which is by nature a wild olive tree, and wast grafted contrary to nature into a good olive tree: how much more shall these, which are the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree?'

(11) *Law.*—'It is unquestionable that various legal metaphors, such as adoption, inheritance, tutelage, slavery, manumission, were consecrated by him to the high office of conveying his doctrine and facilitating its comprehension by heathen minds, impoverished of spiritual conceptions and strangers to the novel truths he proclaimed' (W. S. Muntz, *Rome, St. Paul and the Early Church*, 1913, p. 48). This point has been elucidated by Deissmann in *Light from the Ancient East*, Eng. tr., p. 326): 'Among the various ways in which the manumission of a slave could take place by ancient law we find the solemn rite of fictitious purchase of the slave by some divinity. The owner comes with the slave to the temple, sells him there to the god, and receives the purchase money from the temple treasury, the slave having previously paid it in there out of his savings. The slave is now the property of the god; not, however, a slave of the temple, but a protégé of the god.' St. Paul refers to this in Ro 6^{17}, Gal 4$^{1-7}$ 5^{1}, 1 Co 6^{20} 7^{23}, etc. 'St. Paul's predilection for this whole group of images would be most beautifully accounted for if we knew him to have been previously acquainted with the Greek form of our Lord's deeply significant saying about the *ransom* (Mk 10^{45}=Mt 20^{28}). . . . But when anybody heard the Greek word λύτρον, "ransom," in the first century, it was natural for him to think of the purchase-money for manumitting slaves' (p. 331 f.). Papyri of the 1st cent. A.D. have been discovered granting remission of debt. Cf. Philem ^{18}. In Col 2^{14} there is some reference to an ancient custom, but exactly what is uncertain.

(12) *Miscellaneous metaphors.*—An interesting passage is 2 Co 5^{4}: 'For indeed we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened; not for that we would be unclothed, but that we would be clothed upon, that what is mortal may be swallowed up of life.' There is here a double metaphor of *house* and *garment*. The explanation of the abrupt transition may be found 'in the image, familiar to the Apostle, both from his occupations and his birth-place, of the tent of Cilician haircloth, which might almost equally suggest the idea of a habitation and of a vesture' (A. P. Stanley, *Corinthians*^{2}, 1858, p. 427). σκῆνος means a 'hut, tent,' and then the *body* as the tabernacle of the soul.

Thence we pass to another metaphor—that of swallowing up (the Greek καταπίνω is also used metaphorically by Aristophanes). This passage is a further instance of St. Paul's method of developing one metaphor out of another.

1 Co 7^{9}: 'it is better to marry than to burn'—the metaphor is obvious.

Tit 1^{12}: 'Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, idle gluttons' (lit. 'bellies')—a quotation from Epimenides. For the comparison of men to beasts see also 2 P 2^{22}. The metaphor of the sow is based on an apophthegm of Heraclitus (Wendland, quoted by Clemen in *Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources*, Eng. tr., p. 50).

So far the Pauline metaphors we have been considering have been simple and of fairly obvious interpretation. We must now pass to some less clear aspects of his figurative language, and this will take us rather deeper into his theology. 'The reader who passes from the early traditions of the life of Jesus to the letters of the apostle Paul feels himself at once in another atmosphere. A bewildering variety of ideas is suggested to him. Speculations of theology and philosophy, glimpses of Deity and hints of various modes of causation, large conceptions of Providence and Creation, strange and indistinct forms of Law and Sin and Death half persons and half powers, quasi-magical notions attached to particular material media, are all blended with the impassioned emotion with which the writer contemplates the love which prompted the Father to send forth his Son, and the love which moved the Son to forsake his high estate and give himself for men' (J. E. Carpenter in *HJ*, Suppl., 1909: 'Jesus or Christ,' p. 238 f.). This view of the Apostle's theology, though not always expressed so well or so clearly, is at the back of the minds of many modern critics of St. Paul. But is it not safer to say that St. Paul merely drew on contemporary philosophy and speculation when searching for metaphorical expressions wherein to convey the spiritual truths he so earnestly desired to emphasize?

A crucial passage is Ro 8^{38}: 'For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us . . .' 'St. Paul held that there was a world of spirits brought into being like the rest of creation by Christ.' 'It is quite in the manner of St. Paul to personify abstractions' (Sanday-Headlam, *Romans*^{5}, *ad loc.*). Now, if St. Paul really believed the creatures which he enumerates to have a spiritual existence in the heavenly spheres, we are brought at once into the region of mystical theology; if he is merely personifying for the sake of rhetorical effect, we are simply dealing with metaphors. St. Paul certainly believed in the existence of angels, but how did he regard sin and death? Sin is to him something more than an act or acts of transgression, more even than a state; it is a power, at least half personified in the mind of the Apostle. Thus his language in Ro 5^{12}, 'as through one man sin entered into the world and death through sin,' and v.^{14}, 'death reigned from Adam until Moses,' is something more than metaphor. Sin and Death even if not persons are at least powers with objective existence. (The close connexion between Sin and Death had appeared before St. Paul—first perhaps in Sir 25^{24}—and was frequent in Jewish Apocalyptic.) But St. Paul passes quickly from what is metaphorical to what is not: thus in 1 Co 15^{54} (quoting Is 25^{8}): 'Death is swallowed up in victory'; in the mind of the Apostle, Death may be half personified, but victory hardly. Frequently it has to be left open what exactly St. Paul does mean. He does not define his terms; and his theology, here as elsewhere, is generally implicit rather than explicit. 'In ancient literature it is hard to distinguish between a person and a personification. Animistic ideas lie deep in the naïve, popular consciousness' (H. A. A. Kennedy, *St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things*, 1904, p. 108 n.).

With these facts in view, we must now consider a few specially difficult and obscure passages.

1 Co 10^{4}: 'And the rock was Christ.' St. Paul has just been referring to the passing of the Israelites through the sea. He says the Israelites 'ate the *same* spiritual meat' and 'drank the *same* spiritual drink.' It is more usual to conceive of the Jewish sacraments as *types* of the Christian. St. Paul refers to the Rabbinic legend that the rock followed the Israelites during their march. 'Wherever the Tabernacle was pitched, the princes came and sang to the rock, "Spring up, O well, sing ye unto it," whereupon the waters gushed forth afresh' (*HDB*, art. 'Rock,' iv. 290). It has been remarked: 'We must not disgrace Paul by making him say that the pre-incarnate Christ followed the march of Israel in the shape of a lump of rock!' (quoted by Findlay in *EGT*, *ad loc.*). But (1) it seems clear from elsewhere that St. Paul believed in the pre-existence of Christ (Ro 8^{3}, 2 Co 8^{9}); (2) St. Paul seems to follow his custom of personification. Sometimes water is personified in that it is made to speak; cf. Is 55^{1-3}, Wis 11^{4}, Sir 24^{19-21}, Rev 22^{17}. Philo also (*Quod deterius potiori*, p. 31 [Mangey, i. 213]) calls the Divine Wisdom a rock, and makes it the same as the manna. E. A. Abbott (*Son of Man*, p. 649) has taken these passages in support of the conception of speaking waters. Meanwhile the other aspect of the metaphor is shown in the idea of God as a Rock (because He remains faithful and abides). 'As in Ro 9^{5} St. Paul affirms of Christ that He "is over all, God blessed for ever," so here he identifies Him with the "Rock of Ages" (Is 26^{4} RVm)' (Otton, *loc. cit. infra*). It seems as if St. Paul, taking the Rabbinic legend, without necessarily accepting it as literal truth, blended with it the ideas of the 'speaking waters,' the manna, and the everlasting rock of Isaiah. All this is again linked up with baptism and the eucharist—the only place in the NT where the two great Christian sacraments are mentioned together. Again we see St. Paul's intellectual subtlety used as a vehicle of spiritual truth.

For further discussion of the 'Rock' see **E. A. Abbott**, *The Son of Man*, 1910, p. 648; **Robertson-Plummer**, *1 Corinthians*, p. 201; *HDB*, art. 'Rock'; **G. W. Otton**, in *Interpreter*, x. [1914] 435–439; **G. G. Findlay**, in *EGT*, '1 Cor.,' 1900, *ad loc.*; **H. St. J. Thackeray**, *Relation of St. Paul to Contemp. Jewish Thought*, p. 210; **K. Lake**, *Earlier Epp. of St. Paul*, 1911, p. 213; **C. Clemen**, *Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources*, p. 218; see also below, II. 3.

Gal 4^{3}: 'held in bondage under the rudiments (RVm 'elements') of the world.' 4^{9}: 'how turn ye back again to the weak and beggarly rudiments' (RVm 'elements'). Col 2^{8}: 'after the rudiments (RVm 'elements') of the world.' The difficulty here is the exact significance of *στοιχεῖα*, 'elements': it meant in classical Greek (1) a letter or syllable (Plato): in the Bible only in He 5^{12}; (2) a shadow of a sundial (in Aristophanes): non-Biblical; (3) element (or ground stuff)—Plato, Philo, Josephus, Wis 7^{17}; then specially the stars and planets; then, as every element has its deity, (4) divine spirit, demon or genius. In Gal. it may be (1) rudiments of religion; (2) physical elements; (3) the attendant deities of the physical elements. It is probably (3), and only if it were (1) would it really be a metaphor.

See for *στοιχεῖα*, **C. W. Emmet**, *Galatians*, 1912, *ad loc.*; **J. B. Lightfoot**, *Galatians*^{5}, 1876, *ad loc.*; **C. Clemen**, *Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources*, pp. 106–110.

Col $2^{18.\,19}$: a very difficult passage, where the text too is uncertain. It is related in idea to the last. 'Let no man rob you of your prize by a voluntary humility and worshipping of the angels, dwelling in the things which he hath seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind, and not holding fast the Head, from whom all the body, being supplied and knit together through the joints and bands, increaseth with the increase of God.' To the student of metaphors no passage could be more interesting—first comes the metaphor of robbing, then the reference to angel-worship, the second metaphor of dwelling in things seen (or not seen), the third metaphor of being puffed up, the fourth metaphor of holding fast the Head, blended with the fifth of Head and body.

But the crux really is *ἃ ἑώρακεν ἐμβατεύων* (so ℵ* ABD* 33* 314 424** L [vt. $^{d\,m}$] Boh. Eth. Mcion. Tert. Orig. etc.) or *ἃ μὴ (οὖν) ἑώρακεν* (ℵ^{c}CD$^{b.\,etc.}$ GH [Lvt ^{g}vg] Syr. [vg hl] Aeth. Chr. etc.

Some have proposed slightly to emend the text and, dividing the letters differently, read: *ἀέρα κενεμβατεύων*, 'vainly treading the air' (or 'stepping on emptiness')—a suggestive metaphor; but there is no necessity to emend. According to Moulton (*Grammar of NT Greek*, 'Proleg.,' 1908, p. 239), *μή* is 'indisputably spurious,' so we must follow the first reading. This has been elucidated by Ramsay (*Teaching of St. Paul in Terms of the Present Day*, 1913, p. 288): 'Among a series of very interesting inscriptions from the Sanctuary of Apollo of Klaros was one which instantly arrested attention: it contained the verb "entered" (*ἐνεβάτευσεν*), describing the performance of some act or rite in the mystic ritual.' The Colossians knew the word in the mysteries. 'As a quoted word, it causes a certain awkwardness in the logical sequence; but when we take it as quoted and put it within inverted commas, we understand that it is like a brick imbedded in the living well of Paul's words' (p. 299).

3. Epistle to the Hebrews.—He 3^{2}: 'In all his [God's] house.' *οἶκος* in the Gospels is used of the Temple, here of the people of God (cf. 1 P 4^{17}, 1 Ti 3^{15}). 4^{12}: The word of God is living, and active, and sharper than any two-edged sword (*δίστομον* is lit. 'double-mouthed'). That it 'pierces even to the dividing of soul and spirit' means that it penetrates to the very depths of a man's being. 5^{12}: 'such as have need of milk' (cf. 1 P 2^{2}, 1 Co 3^{1-5}). Young students were called 'sucklings' by the Rabbis. 6^{4}: 'and tasted of the heavenly gift.' The idea of 'tasting' divine things is from the OT. $6^{7.\,8}$: 'the land which hath drunk the rain . . . receiveth blessing': cf. Plut. *de Educ. Puer.* iii. and Eurip. *Hecuba*, 590–6; the idea is 'the free and reiterated bestowal of spiritual impulse' (Marcus

Dods in *EGT*, *ad loc.*). 6^{19}: 'anchor of the soul': ἄγκυρα is used metaphorically in Soph. fr. 612: μητρὶ παῖδες ἄγκυραι βίου, 'children are anchors of life to their mother.' 7^{22}: Jesus is the 'surety of a better covenant'; cf. St. Paul's legal metaphors (in his case drawn mostly from slavery). 10^{13}: 'the footstool of his feet' (cf. Ps 110^{1}). 10^{22}: our hearts are sprinkled from an evil conscience. 12^{1}: 'cloud of witnesses,' 'the race.' 12^{15}: 'root of bitterness.' 12^{29}: 'Our God is a consuming fire' (cf. Dt 4^{24} 9^{3}). 13^{15}: 'the sacrifice of praise' is the 'fruit of lips.' 13^{20}: the familiar Johannine metaphor of the 'shepherd of the sheep.'

4. Catholic Epistles.—(*a*) The *Epistle of James* is peculiarly interesting: traditionally, and in the opinion of many modern critics, the work of James, the Lord's brother, it shows many parallels with the Synoptic Gospels. 'The love of nature, the sympathy in all human interests, the readiness to find "sermons in stones and good in everything" must have characterized the child Jesus and coloured all His intercourse with His fellows from His earliest years. It is interesting, therefore, to find the same fondness for figurative speech in the Epistles of His brothers, St. James and St. Jude' (Mayor, *Ep. of St. James*^{3}, p. lxii). Thus Ja 1^{15}: 'The lust, when it hath conceived, beareth sin: and the sin, when it is fullgrown, bringeth forth death.' The same metaphor is found in Ps 7^{14} and in Philo (ed. Mangey, i. 40, 149, 183). 1^{17}: 'The Father of lights, with whom can be no variation, neither shadow that is cast by turning'; cf. Mal 4^{2}, Ps 27^{1} 36^{9}), Is $60^{1.\,19.\,20}$, 1 Jn 1^{5}, Wis 7^{26}; also *Test. Abr.* (ed. M. R. James, p. 37) (where the archangel Michael is called 'Father of all lights'), Philo (ed. Mangey, i. 579, 637), and Plato (*Rep.* vi. 505, vii. 517). Sometimes St. James, in his symbolical language, reminds us of the Synoptists. The remarkable passage $3^{5\text{-}12}$ contains several metaphors; most striking is v.^{6}: the tongue 'setteth on fire the wheel of nature and is set on fire by hell.' The wheel, catching fire from the glowing axle, is compared to the wide-spreading mischief done by the tongue. γένεσις (tr. 'nature') means (1) birth; (2) creation; (3) the seen and temporal as opposed to the unseen and eternal; the 'wheel' means either the incessant change of life or (if the wheel is at rest) the circle of life. Other metaphors are 4^{14} 5^{2}, etc.

(*b*) *1 and 2 Peter.*—1 P 1^{2}: 'sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ.' 1^{13}: 'girding up the loins of your mind.' $2^{6.\,7}$: 'chief corner stone.' 2^{25}: 'shepherd of your souls.' The same metaphor appears again in $5^{2.\,3.\,4}$: 'flock of God,' 'chief Shepherd.' 5^{13}: 'Babylon' may be either literal or metaphorical: probably the former. 2 P 1^{8}: 'unfruitful.' $1^{13.\,14}$: 'tabernacle' (cf. 2 Co 5^{1}). 1^{19}: 'and the day-star arise in your hearts.' 2^{3}: 'make merchandise of you.' 2^{17}: 'springs without water.'

(*c*) *The Johannine Epistles* have not many metaphors—those there are are of course conceived of as are those in the Fourth Gospel, *e.g.* the dwelling on light in 1 Jn 1. In 4^{1}: 'prove the spirits, whether they be of God,' πνεύματα do not seem to be personified. 4^{18}: 'perfect love casteth out fear.' In 1 Jn 2^{18} and 2 Jn ^{7} we have mention of the Antichrist (see below under 'Revelation'). The phrase, 'Even now have there arisen many antichrists,' seems to show that the word is taken generally and metaphorically for false teachers.

(*d*) *Jude* has resemblances sometimes to James, sometimes to Revelation (cf. Jude ^{9} with Rev 12^{7}). In v.^{6} that the angels are 'kept in everlasting bonds' is to be taken literally, not metaphorically. In vv.$^{12.\,13}$ we have a string of metaphors: the wicked are called 'hidden rocks,' 'shepherds that without fear feed themselves,' 'clouds without water,' 'autumn trees without fruit,' 'wild waves,' 'wandering stars.' v.^{23}: 'snatching them out of the fire' (cf. Zec 3^{2}).

5. Revelation.—Metaphor in Revelation raises peculiar difficulty. Though elsewhere in the NT metaphors are frequent and not always sharply defined, here in an Apocalypse they are so much part and parcel of the whole book that, short of discussing them in detail along with allied problems of interpretation, the only possible course in a short article is to make a few brief generalizations. Ordinary metaphors shade off into theological and (occasionally) mythological conceptions, so that we cannot separate one from the other. But it is necessary to state briefly the method of interpretation of the Apocalypse without which the metaphors, as everything else in it, are obscure. This seems to be done satisfactorily only if we pursue concurrently several different lines of interpretation: (1) the contemporary-historical (reference to events of the writer's own day); (2) the eschatological (the foretelling of the end of all things under symbolic imagery); and (3) the mythological (particularly in ch. 12); also (4) the author undoubtedly had visions wherein he saw spiritual things portrayed; and (5) it is difficult to leave out of account the existence of sources. The danger of interpretation is not so much to refuse to see metaphor, as to see it where it is really not present at all: many things which to some critics have seemed only 'crude symbols' of spiritual truth were probably to the writer literal truth of things he had seen—none the less real because he had seen them not with his bodily eyes but with the eye of faith in a vision. How far this was so must remain uncertain, but the point must not be overlooked entirely. 'No scene in the great Christian Apocalypse can be successfully reproduced upon canvas; "The imagery . . . is symbolic and not pictorial" (Westcott)' (Swete, *Apocalypse*^{2}, p. cxxxviii). But because we cannot pictorially conceive of a thing, we have no right simply to say it is a metaphor.

As an illustration of the difficulty of interpretation in this book we may take the conception of Antichrist, mentioned only by name in the Epistles of St. John. Here an ancient Babylonian myth, which has passed through various stages and has left traces in the OT, and which is referred to in 2 Th 3, is taken over by the Apocalyptist. The beast in Rev 13 and 17 is somehow Antichrist, though he may also stand for Nero and Domitian. Can we say that the term 'beast' is a 'metaphor' standing for a Roman Emperor? The value we attach to the Apocalypse is dependent on whether we think it substantially a divine vision vouchsafed to the Seer of Patmos or a mere interesting congeries of symbols. But a question of terminology shades off indistinctly into one of theology and interpretation.

For Antichrist see **W. Bousset**, *The Antichrist Legend*, Eng. tr., 1896; **H. B. Swete**, 'Antichrist in the Province of Asia,' in *Apocalypse of St. John*^{2}, pp. lxxviii–xciii; **A. E. Brooke**, *Johannine Epistles*, pp. 69–79.

II. *IN EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE TO A.D. 100.*—**1. Agrapha.**—(*a*) Oxyrhynchus Logion 5 (No. 30 in *HDB* v., art. 'Agrapha'): ἔγειρον τὸν λίθον κἀκεῖ εὑρήσεις με, σχίσον τὸ ξύλον κἀγὼ ἐκεῖ εἰμί, 'Raise the stone and you will find me, cleave the wood and there am I.' The metaphor means that we shall find our Lord in the ordinary occupations of daily life. (*b*) Saying quoted in Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i. 28. 177 (No. 58 in *HDB*): γίνεσθε δὲ δόκιμοι τραπεζῖται, τὰ μὲν ἀποδοκιμάζοντες, τὸ δὲ καλὸν κατέχοντες, 'Show yourselves approved money-changers, rejecting some but keeping what is good' (*τραπεζίτης* in the NT only in Mt 25^{27}). Origen, *in Johann.* xix. 7, also quotes *δόκιμοι τραπεζῖται γίνεσθε*; and it is quoted elsewhere. Cf. the other Oxyrhynchus Logion (3) (No. 28 in *HDB*), 'and I found all men drunken and none was athirst among them. And my soul is pained for the sons of men because they are blind in their heart and see not, poor and they know not their poverty.' In another fragment we have: 'Jesus saith, Who are they that draw us into the Kingdom, if the Kingdom be in heaven? Verily I say unto you, The birds of the heaven, and every creature that is under the earth and in the earth and the fishes of the sea, these are they that draw you' (see Grenfell-Hunt, *Sayings of Our Lord*, 1897, and *New Sayings of Jesus*, 1904).

2. 1 Clement.—viii.: *ἐὰν ὦσιν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἐὰν ὦσιν πυρρότεραι κόκκου, καὶ μελανώτεραι σάκκου*, 'if your sins reach from earth to heaven and are redder than scarlet and blacker than sackcloth . . .' (a reminiscence of Is 1^{18}). xxx.: *ἐνδυσώμεθα τὴν ὁμόνοιαν*, 'let us clothe ourselves with concord.' xxxiii.: *ἐν ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς πάντες ἐκοσμήθησαν οἱ δίκαιοι*, 'All righteous men have been adorned with good works.' xxxvii.; Christians are compared to soldiers; the metaphor is sustained throughout the chapter. lvii.: *κάμψαντες τὰ γόνατα τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν*, 'bending the knees of your hearts.' *ἔδονται τῆς ἑαυτῶν ὁδοῦ τοὺς καρπούς*, 'they shall eat the fruits of their way.'

3. Odes of Solomon.—These are full of beautiful and striking metaphors, of which the following are instances. i. 4: 'Thy fruits are full grown and perfect, they are full of thy salvation.' iv. 9: 'distil thy dews upon us and open thy rich fountains that pour forth to us milk and honey.' ix. 8: 'An everlasting crown for ever is truth. Blessed are they who set it on their heads.' xi. 5, 7: 'And I was established upon the rock of truth . . . and I drank and was inebriated with the living water' (cf. 1 Co 10^4: 'the rock was Christ,' above). xiii. 2: 'Love His holiness and clothe yourself therewith.' xvii. 13: 'And I sowed my fruits in hearts, and transformed them into myself.' xxii. 4, 5: 'He who gave me authority over bonds that I might loose them; He that overthrew by my hands the dragon with seven heads' (Titus or Pompey [?]; cf. Ps 74^{14}, Ezk 29^3). xxv. 8: 'And I was clothed with the covering of thy Spirit, and thou didst remove from me my raiment of skin' (here and in xxi. 2 the reference is to Gn 3^{21}). xxxi. 2: 'error went astray and perished at His hand: and folly found no path to walk in, and was submerged by the truth of the Lord' (here, as elsewhere in Jewish and early Christian literature, qualities are personified).

See J. H. Bernard, *Odes of Solomon* (*TS* viii. 3 [1912]); J. Rendel Harris, *Odes of Solomon*^{2}, 1911, *An Early Christian Psalter* (abridged translation of Odes), 1909.

4. Didache.—i. 1: *ὁδοὶ δύο εἰσί, μία τῆς ζωῆς, καὶ μία τοῦ θανάτου*, 'the way of life and the way of death' (cf. Christianity as 'the way,' Ac 9^2, 2 P 2^2). i. 6: *ἱδρωτάτω ἡ ἐλεημοσύνη σου εἰς τὰς χεῖράς σου*, 'Let thine alms sweat into thine hands.' vi. 2: *εἰ μὲν γὰρ δύνασαι βαστάσαι ὅλον τὸν ζυγὸν τοῦ κυρίου*, 'if thou art able to bear the whole yoke of the Lord.' xii. 5: *χριστέμπορος*, 'making trade of Christ.' xvi. 3: *καὶ στραφήσονται τὰ πρόβατα εἰς λύκους*, 'and the sheep shall be turned into wolves.'

General results of study of metaphors.—The above lists, by no means exhaustive, of metaphors in the NT and early Christian literature, show how rich and various was the stock of ideas from which the writers of Christian antiquity drew to illustrate the gospel message with which their heart was aflame. It is obvious that to understand aright we must know something of the background of the Early Church in the pagan world, that welter of rites and cults in the Græco-Roman and Oriental world which modern research has done so much to make vivid. Yet some are probably mistaken in attaching too much importance, or the wrong sort of importance, to all this: the phraseology in which the gospel message was first clothed had often extraneous origin; the message itself was fresh and unique. External influences may account for the form but not for the fact. It may be that in some cases a metaphor or figure, not only of word but of thought, affected the thought which it clothed, and this is the sole argument for 'mythology' in the NT. This leads, in conclusion, to the psychological aspect of metaphor. Psychology 'proves the fundamental connexion between the religious and the non-religious aspects of Life and Thought' (S. A. Cook, *Foundations of Religion*, 1914, p. 91). All spiritual truths are conceived through imperfect symbols, but the symbol must be examined, and what is essential separated from the outward form, before the truth within can be clear.

LITERATURE.—For Metaphor as a whole: F. E. König, artt. 'Style of Scripture' and 'Symbols and Symbolical Actions' in *HDB* v., *Stilistik, Rhetorik, Poetik, in Bezug auf die biblische Litteratur, komparativisch dargestellt*, 1900; L. E. Browne, *The Parables of the Gospels* (Hulsean Prize Essay), 1913; W. Sanday, *Christologies Ancient and Modern*, 1910, ch. ix.: 'The Guiding Principle of Symbolism.'

For the books of the NT, the best Commentaries; especially Sanday-Headlam, *Romans*^{5} (*ICC*), 1902; Robertson-Plummer, *1 Corinthians* (*ICC*), 1911; H. L. Goudge, *1 Corinthians* (Westminster Com., 1903); J. Armitage Robinson, *Ephesians*, 1903; G. Milligan, *Thessalonians*, 1908; J. B. Lightfoot, *Philippians*^{4}, 1878; J. B. Mayor, *Ep. of St. James*^{3}, 1910; A. E. Brooke, *Johannine Epistles* (*ICC*), 1912; H. B. Swete, *Apocalypse of St. John*^{2}, 1907.

General: C. Clemen, *Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources*, Eng. tr., 1912; H. St. J. Thackeray, *Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*, 1900; G. A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, Eng. tr.^{2}, 1911. Other authorities quoted in the text.

L. D. AGATE.

MICHAEL (Heb. מִיכָאֵל, 'Who is like God?').—In Dn 10^{21} Michael is described as the 'prince,' *i.e.* the patron or guardian angel of Israel, in antithesis to the 'prince' of Persia and the 'prince' of Greece (v.^{20}). In the account of the troublous times of the Last Days in 12^1, Michael, 'the great prince,' is Israel's champion, by whom deliverance is wrought. These are the only references supplied by the OT, but they exercised a powerful influence upon the Jewish tradition that grew up regarding Michael (in which he further appears as one of the seven archangels and the chief of the four great archangels), and through this upon NT conceptions. In the NT he is twice mentioned by name (Jude^9, where he is described as 'the archangel,' and Rev 12^7), and in both cases discharges functions that are in keeping with the position assigned him in Daniel. (1) In Jude^9 (cf. Dt 34^6), which is based on the apocryphal *Assumption of Moses* (see Orig. *de Princip.* III. ii. 1), he stands forward as the representative of Israel to dispute the Devil's claim to possess the body of Moses, a claim made, according to the apocryphal book, on the two grounds that the Devil was the lord of matter and that Moses had been guilty of slaying the Egyptian (see Charles, *Assumption of Moses*, 1897, p. 105 ff.). (2) In Rev 12^7 as in Dn 12 Michael plays a leading part in the conflict that is to issue in the Messianic triumph of the Last Days. In accordance with the Jewish eschatological idea of a celestial battle which is to precede this triumph (*Sib. Orac.* iii. 796 ff.), there is war in heaven, and Michael and his angels go forth to war with the great red dragon (otherwise described as 'the old serpent, he that is called the Devil and Satan,' v.^{9}) and his angels, with the result that the latter are overthrown and cast down to the earth. The significant thing here is the position assigned to Michael. It is by him, not by the 'man child who is to rule all the nations with a rod of iron' (v.^{5}), that the dragon is overcome and cast out from heaven (cf. Bousset, *Der Antichrist*, 1895, p. 151 ff.).

There are two other passages in the NT where Michael, though not mentioned, appears to be referred to. (1) In Ac 7^{38} he is probably to be identified with the angel who spoke to Moses in Mount Sinai. According to Gal 3^{19} the Law was 'ordained by angels,' and in He 2^{2} 'the word' is described as 'spoken by angels' (cf. Jos. *Ant.* XV. v. 3). In *Jub.* i. 27, ii. 1, however, it is the angel of the presence who instructs Moses and delivers to him the tables of the Law, and in what was probably the original *Assumption of Moses* (preserved only in Greek fragments) 'Michael the archangel' is expressly said to have taught Moses at the giving of the Law. (2) In 1 Th 4^{16} 'the voice of the archangel and the trump of God' suggests another reference to the Michael of Jewish tradition. This is the only place in the NT besides Jude ^{9} where the word 'archangel' occurs, and though the archangel in this case is not named, it is natural to suppose that the great archangel is meant. 'The voice of the archangel' and 'the trump of God' are evidently to be taken as parallel expressions (cf. Mt 24^{31}, 'He shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet'), and it is a common feature of the later Jewish tradition of the Day of Judgment that the trumpet is blown by Michael the archangel (see Bousset, *op. cit.* p. 166). J. C. LAMBERT.

MIDIAN (AV **Madian,** Ac 7^{29}).—This was the name of a people broken up into several clans and inhabiting N.W. Arabia. One clan, the Kenites, dwelt near Mount Sinai, and to it Moses fled from Pharaoh (Ex 2^{15}). Its chief was Jethro (or Reuel), whose daughter Moses married (v.^{21}). In the days of the Judges they extended further north and made inroads into central Palestine. But they were severely defeated by Gideon (Jg 6. 7), and are soon after lost to history. The town of Modiana mentioned by Ptolemy (*Geog.* vi. 7) as being on the N.W. coast of Arabia may be a late trace of them. Midian is probably used by later Jewish writers with a spiritual reference, symbolizing the Church's final triumph over its foes (*e.g.* Is 9^{4} 60^{6}, Hab 3^{7}).

LITERATURE. — G. A. Smith, *HGHL*, 1897, p. 525; also art. 'Midian' in *HDB.* J. W. DUNCAN.

MILETUS (Μίλητος).—Miletus was an ancient Greek colony on the coast of Caria, and became the most flourishing of the twelve free cities which formed the Ionian League. Five centuries before Christ it 'had attained the summit of its prosperity, and was accounted the ornament (πρόσχημα) of Ionia' (Herod. v. 28), being unquestionably the greatest of Greek cities at the time. Favourably situated on the S. shore of the Gulf of Latmos, and possessing four harbours, it controlled the trade of the rich Mæander Valley, and was without a rival in the commerce of the Ægean.

'The citizens,' says Strabo (XIV. i. 6, 7), 'have achieved many great deeds, but the most important is the number of colonies which they established. The whole Euxine, for example, and the Propontis, and many other places, are peopled with their settlers. . . . Illustrious persons, natives of Miletus, were Thales, one of the seven wise men, his disciple Anaximander, and Anaximines the disciple of Anaximander.'

After the capture of Miletus by Darius, who massacred the inhabitants (494 B.C.), and by Alexander the Great (334), its days of greatness and glory were ended. The trade of the Mæander Valley was diverted to Ephesus, and, before the coming of the Romans, Miletus, though still called a 'metropolis' of Ionia, had become a second-rate commercial town, which the conquerors did not think it necessary to link up to any important city by one of their great roads. Having no longer any political importance, it became more and more isolated, and nature gradually completed its ruin by filling its harbours and almost the whole gulf with the silt of the Mæander (Pliny, *HN* ii. 91, v. 31). Its site—known as Palatia, from the ruins of its great theatre—is now 5 or 6 miles from the sea, and the island of Lade, which Strabo (XIV. i. 7) mentions as lying 'close in front of Miletus,' is now a small hill in the plain.

St. Paul did not select such a decaying city as a base of missionary operations, and its connexion with the record of his activity is a mere accident. At the end of his third journey, when he was hastening to Jerusalem to attend the Feast of Pentecost, he deliberately chose at Troas a ship which was not to touch at Ephesus, where it was probably still unsafe for him to appear, and where in any case his time would have been very short (Ac 20^{16}). But when the coaster in which he was sailing, and whose movements he naturally could not control, came to Miletus, he unexpectedly found that he would be detained there for some days, and it occurred to him that in the interval he might send a messenger to Ephesus—30 miles distant in a straight line, and somewhat further by boat and road—and summon its elders to meet him.

If his ship sailed from Samos (or Trogyllium, according to D) early in the day, and thus took advantage of the northerly breeze which rises in the Ægean every morning during the summer and dies away in the afternoon, he would reach Miletus, 25 (or 20) miles distant, before noon. His messenger probably did not make the great detour by Heracleia at the head of the gulf, but waited for the gentle south wind (called the *Imbat*), which blows after sunset, to take him across to Pyrrha or Priene.

Strabo makes the ancient topography clear. 'From Heracleia to Pyrrha, a small city, is about 100 stadia by sea, but a little more from Miletus is Heracleia, if we include the windings of the bays. From Miletus to Pyrrha, in a straight line by sea, is 30 stadia; so much longer is the journey by sailing near the land' (XIV. i. 8, 9).

Passing through Priene, crossing Mt. Mycale, and speeding along the coast road, the messenger might reach Ephesus by midnight. The elders would travel south next day to Priene or Pyrrha, and get the northerly wind to take them over the bay to Miletus on the following morning. St. Luke writes as an eye-witness of the meeting, fellowship, and parting of St. Paul and the Ephesians, the record of which has given Miletus an abiding consecration. The Apostle's address to the elders, with its lofty ideal of pastoral duty, reads 'as an unconscious manifesto of the essence of the life and ministry of the most influential exponent of Christianity' (J. V. Bartlet, *Acts* [Century Bible, 1901], p. 327).

Miletus is mentioned again in 2 Ti 4^{20}: 'Trophimus I left at Miletus sick.' This has been regarded as proving that St. Paul, released from his Roman prison, resumed his work in the East, and after all revisited the scene of his pathetic farewell. But many scholars prefer a different construction. Assuming that the passage in question occurs in a brief note (2 Ti 4$^{9.\ 11-18.\ 20.\ 21a}$) sent to Timothy from Macedonia, and afterwards editorially incorporated in a longer letter written to him from Rome, they date the visit to Miletus before the one recorded in Ac 20^{15}. When St. Paul was leaving Ephesus, intending to return by Macedonia to Corinth (1 Co 16^{5}), he may have had reasons for first visiting Miletus, and been obliged to leave Trophimus, who became sick there; or, though he did not personally visit Miletus, he might use a condensed expression, which meant that his friend, having been sent to Miletus and detained there by sickness, was unable to return to Ephesus before the time of sailing, and so was left behind.

Miletus has extensive ruins, of which the most remarkable is the theatre, and the site has been excavated by Wiegland for the Berlin Academy (*SBAW* 1900 ff.). JAMES STRAHAN.

MILLENNIUM.—See ESCHATOLOGY, PAROUSIA.

MILLSTONE (*μύλος*; in Rev 18^{21} TR, following B, has *μύλον*; L WH, following A, have *μύλινον*; C has *μυλικόν*; Lat. *mola*).—The mill of the ancients (as of many Syrians to-day) was a quern—two circular stones, of which the upper and smaller rotated upon the other. The hard and monotonous labour of grinding was imposed on women; in wealthier houses, on female slaves (Ex 11^{5}, Mt 24^{41}). If the upper stone was small, it was turned by one person; if it was of greater size, two, three, or even four slaves required to work together at the task. The heavy toil was often somewhat lightened with a song. The writer of the Revelation alludes to these things in two successive verses. A great millstone flung impetuously (*ὁρμήματι*, 'with a rush,' or 'indignantly'; see LXX Hos 5^{10}) into the sea, to rise no more, is his image of the overthrow of Imperial Rome (Rev 18^{21}). So complete is the desolation he foresees, that the sound of the mill (*φωνὴ μύλου*, the *ᾠδὴ ἐπιμύλιος* of the classics; cf. LXX *φωνὴ τῆς ἀληθούσης* in Ec 12^{4}), the familiar murmur of domestic life, will never be heard again in the ruined city, which will have become a city of death (Rev 18^{22}).

LITERATURE.—J. Yates, art. 'Mola' in Smith's *DGRA*^{3}; G. M. Mackie, *Bible Manners and Customs*^{2}, 1903; W. Carslaw, art. 'Mill, Millstone' in *HDB*; A. R. S. Kennedy, art. 'Mill, Millstones' in *EBi*; C. M. Doughty, *Travels in Arabia Deserta*, 1888, ii. 179. JAMES STRAHAN.

MIND.—1. The noun.—While in the OT 'heart' is used to represent man's whole mental and moral activity (cf. Gn 6^{5} 'every imagination of the thoughts of his heart'), psychological terms begin to be employed in the NT with more discrimination and precision, and 'mind' comes into use to denote the faculty of thinking, and especially the organ of moral consciousness; the fundamental Gr. word being *νοῦς*, with which must be associated its derivatives *νόημα*, *διάνοια*, *ἔννοια*. It is suggestive, however, of the persistence of the OT psychology and terminology in the early Apostolic Church that, outside of the Pauline Epistles, *νοῦς*, the specific word for 'mind,' occurs only in Lk 24^{45}, Rev 13^{18} 17^{9}, though *διάνοια* and *ἔννοια* are occasionally found. In the AV of Ac 14^{2}, Ph 1^{27}, He 12^{3} 'mind' represents *ψυχή*, which in the RV is properly rendered 'soul'; in Philem ^{14}, Rev 17^{13} it stands for *γνώμη*, 'judgment,' 'opinion'; in Ro $8^{7.\,27}$ for *φρόνημα*, which denotes not the mental faculty itself, but its thoughts and purposes.

As illustrating St. Paul's use of *νοῦς* and helping us to appreciate the distinctive meaning he attaches to the word, it is important to notice two contrasts in which he sets it, in the one case with 'flesh' (*σάρξ*) and in the other with 'spirit' (*πνεῦμα*). In Ro $7^{23.\,25}$ he contrasts the mind with the flesh, *i.e.* with the sinful principle in human nature; and the law of his mind, which is also the law of God, with the law in his members or the law of sin. Here the mind is clearly the conscience or organ of moral knowledge, man's highest faculty, by which he recognizes the will of God for his own life. And when in Ro 8^{6} the Apostle speaks of 'the mind of the flesh' (cf. Col 2^{18}, 'fleshly mind'), the suggestion is that man's highest faculty has been debased to the service of what is lowest in his nature, so that the mind has itself become fleshly and sinful. In 1 Co $14^{14.\,15.\,19}$, again, where *νοῦς* (which EV renders here by 'understanding') is contrasted with *πνεῦμα*, the antithesis is between man's natural faculty of conscious knowledge and reflexion and that higher principle of the Christian life which is Divinely bestowed, and which, as in the case of the gift of tongues, may manifest itself in ways that lie beyond the reach of consciousness. The mind, as man's highest natural faculty, thus stands between the flesh, as the lower and sinful principle in his nature, and the spirit, which is the distinctive principle of the Divinely given Christian life. And, as the mind may be dragged down by the flesh until it becomes a 'mind of the flesh,' so it may be upraised and informed by the spirit until it becomes a 'mind of the spirit' (Ro 8^{6}; cf. 12^{2}, Eph 4^{23}). See artt. FLESH, SOUL, SPIRIT.

2. The verb.—The verb 'to mind' is used intransitively, in the sense of to intend or purpose, in Ac 20^{13} (Gr. *μέλλοντες*, RV 'intending'). With the same signification 'to be minded' occurs in Ac 27^{39} (Gr. *βούλεσθαι*), v.^{17} (TR *βουλεύεσθαι*, WH *βούλεσθαι*). More frequently 'to mind' (Gr. *φρονεῖν*) is found in the transitive sense of 'to think about,' 'to direct one's mind to' (Ro 8^{5}, Ph $3^{16.\,19}$). Sometimes *φρονεῖν* is translated 'to be minded,' and in such cases the phrase is equivalent in meaning to the transitive verb (Gal 5^{10}, Ph 3^{15}). The participle 'minded' is met with in the AV in a number of phrases—'likeminded' (Ro 15^{5}, Ph 2^{2}), 'feeble-minded' (1 Th 5^{14}), 'doubleminded' (Ja 1^{8} 4^{8}), 'highminded' (Ro 11^{20}, 1 Ti 6^{17}, 2 Ti 3^{4}), 'sober-minded' (Tit 2^{6}), which are represented in the original by various verbs and adjectives. For 'carnally minded' and 'spiritually minded' in Ro 8^{6} (*τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός . . . τοῦ πνεύματος*) should be substituted as in the RV 'the mind of the flesh,' 'the mind of the spirit.'

LITERATURE.—Grimm-Thayer, *Greek-Eng. Lex. of the NT*^{2}, 1890, *s.v.* *νοῦς*; H. Cremer, *Bib.-Theol. Lex. of NT Greek*^{3}, 1880, p. 435 ff.; J. Laidlaw, *The Bible Doctrine of Man*, 1895, p. 123 ff.; B. Weiss, *Biblical Theology of the NT*, Eng. tr., 1882–83, i. 475 f.; *HDB*, art. 'Mind.' J. C. LAMBERT.

MINISTER, MINISTRY.—In discussing these two terms we have to consider six groups of Greek words which occur in the Bible in connexion with ministering or serving. They run in triplets, each triplet consisting of a concrete noun, an abstract noun, and a verb—'minister,' 'ministry,' and 'to minister.' These six groups are—*διάκονος*, *διακονία*, *διακονεῖν*; *δοῦλος*, *δουλεία*, *δουλεύειν*; *ὑπηρέτης*, [*ὑπηρεσία*], *ὑπηρετεῖν*; [*λάτρις*], *λατρεία*, *λατρεύειν*; *λειτουργός*, *λειτουργία*, *λειτουργεῖν*; *θεράπων*, *θεραπεία*, *θεραπεύειν*. All these are found in the NT excepting *ὑπηρεσία*, which occurs in the LXX in Job and Wisdom, and *λάτρις*, which occurs only in the enlarged text of Job 2^{9}. With regard to nearly all of them it will be found that both the AV and the RV use different English words to translate the same Greek word, while different Greek words are sometimes translated by the same English word. This could hardly be avoided without doing injustice to the meaning of various passages. In all languages words have different shades of meaning, and in some cases the same word has two or more very different meanings; there are very many instances of this in the Greek of the NT.

The fact that we have no less than six sets of words to express the idea of 'minister' and 'ministry' is strong evidence that there was as yet no regular organization of ministers with distinct titles indicating specific duties. This impression is confirmed when we find that English translators are unable to reserve a separate English word for each of the different Greek words. Evidently these different Greek terms do not each represent a class of officials; but individuals who undertake work of a similar character are called by the same name. On the other hand, the name varies, without there being in all cases a corresponding change of meaning. The same person, from somewhat different points of view, might bear four or five of the six names; and even from the same point of view might bear more than one of them. In the earliest congregations of Christians it was soon found that some individuals had certain gifts, and they exercised these gifts for the good of the congregation. Such useful persons were distinguished by words already in use for similar services. At a later time, when the Christian ministry became organized, some of these words acquired a technical meaning and designated Church officers with specific duties. It will be useful to exhibit the diversity of translation somewhat in detail.

διάκονος is found in Mt., Mk., and Jn., in all four groups of the Pauline Epistles, and nowhere else in the NT. In the Gospels it is rendered 'servant,' in the Epistles 'minister,' except Ph 1^{1} and 1 Ti $3^{8.12}$, where it is rendered 'deacon.' διακονία occurs in Ac. and in all groups of the Pauline Epistles, except 1 and 2 Th.; elsewhere thrice. The usual translation is 'ministry'; but we have 'ministration' (2 Co $3^{7.8.9}$ 9^{13}), 'ministering' (2 Co 8^{4} 9^{1}), 'relief' (Ac 11^{29}), 'serving' (Lk 10^{40}), also 'service' and 'administration.' The RV changes 'ministry' to 'service' (1 Ti 1^{12}), 'service' to 'ministry' (Rev 2^{19}), 'ministry' to 'ministering' (Eph 4^{12}, 2 Ti 4^{11}), 'ministry' to 'ministration' (2 Co 6^{3}), and 'administration' to 'ministration' (2 Co 9^{12}). διακονεῖν is always 'to minister' in Mt. and Mk., always 'to serve' in Jn., and nearly always 'to minister' in the Epistles: in Lk. and Ac. both translations are used—'to serve' most frequently. The RV changes 'administer' to 'minister' (2 Co $8^{19.20}$), and 'use the office of a deacon' to 'serve as deacons' (1 Ti $3^{10.13}$). λειτουργός is rendered 'minister' in nearly all places; λειτουργία is 'ministration' in Lk., 'service' in Ph., and 'ministry' in Heb.; λειτουργεῖν is always 'to minister.' The translations of ὑπηρέτης vary between 'attendant,' 'minister,' 'officer,' and 'servant.' The RV changes 'minister' to 'attendant' (Lk 4^{20}, Ac 13^{5}), and 'servant' to 'officer' (Mk 14^{54}). ὑπηρετεῖν is 'to serve' (Ac 13^{36}) and 'to minister' (Ac 20^{34} 24^{23}). These instances of variations in rendering the same word may suffice. The different shades of meaning between the groups of Greek words are of more importance; but the fact that 'minister' and 'servant,' with their cognates, appear in the translations of so many of the groups is evidence that the meanings frequently overlap.

The triplets connected with δοῦλος and θεράπων are somewhat closely allied. The δοῦλος, 'slave' or 'bondservant,' is in a permanent condition of servitude to the person whom he serves, and he cannot free himself from it. The θεράπων renders temporary and voluntary service. Both words may be used of man's relation to God: Moses is called the θεράπων (He 3^{5}, the only place in the NT in which the word occurs) and the δοῦλος (Rev 15^{3}) of God; and in the LXX both words are used to translate the same Hebrew word (*ebed*): *e.g.* Nu 12^{7}, Jg 2^{8}. θεραπεία is used (abstract for concrete) of a body of domestic servants (Lk 12^{42}), and of the special service of healing (Lk 9^{11}, Rev 22^{2}). θεραπεύειν means 'to serve' in any way, and also 'to treat medically' and 'to heal.' The verb is very frequent in the writings of the beloved physician, and, except Ac 17^{25}, always in the medical sense. Except indirectly in the metaphor of the healing leaves (Rev 22^{2}), this triplet is not used of spiritual ministry by man to man; and neither θεραπεία nor θεραπεύειν is found in any Epistle. Nor is the δοῦλος triplet used of man's spiritual ministry to his fellows. Both δοῦλος and δουλεύειν are used of service to God or to Christ, but the nearest approach to spiritual service to man is Ph 2^{22}, where Timothy is said to 'serve' with St. Paul 'in furtherance of the gospel.'

It is probably correct to say much the same of ὑπηρέτης and ὑπηρετεῖν. They indicate a more dignified kind of service than that of the δοῦλος, but they are commonly used of attendance to physical needs or external duties rather than of ministration to souls. The 'attendant' in Lk 4^{20} is one who looks after the fabric and the books, not one who preaches in the synagogue. Ac 13^{5} probably means that John waited on Paul and Barnabas, attending to their bodily wants, so as to leave them free to preach. He had not been set apart for missionary work as they had been (Ac 13^{2}). The exceptions are Lk 1^{2}, Ac 26^{16}, and 1 Co 4^{1}, where the idea of spiritual ministration is prominent. But in none of these three passages is there any allusion to the derivation of the word ('under-rower'), as if it meant a rower in a ship of which Christ was captain.

The three remaining triplets are different, for all of them are frequently connected with the idea of religious service. In the art. DEACON, DEACONESS it has been pointed out that διάκονος, which in classical Greek commonly implies ignoble service, such as waiting at table, in Christian language has high associations. We find the nobler use of the term in the teaching of that *anima naturaliter Christiana*, Epictetus. 'The philosopher should without distraction be employed only on the service of God.' 'I think that what God chooses is better than what *I* choose: I will attach myself as a servant to Him.' 'I obey, assenting to the words of the Commander and praising His acts; for I came into the world when it pleased Him, and I will also depart when it pleases Him.' 'I depart as Thy servant, as one who has known Thy commands and Thy prohibitions' (*Diss.* III. xxii. 69, xxiv. 65, xxvi. 28, IV. vii. 20). In the LXX διάκονος and διακονία are rare (ten times in all), and διακονεῖν does not occur. St. Paul calls heathen magistrates 'servants (διάκονοι) of God' (Ro 13^{4}); and all idea of ignoble service is excluded when apostles are called διάκονοι (1 Co 3^{5}, 2 Co 3^{6}, Eph 3^{7}, Col 1^{23}). The whole triplet has for its root-idea the supplying of serviceable labour, whether to the body or the soul. διακονία is used often of the sending of money to help the poor brethren in Judæa (Ac 11^{29} 12^{25}, 2 Co 8^{4} $9^{1.12.13}$, Ro 15^{31}). Archippus is told to take heed to the ministry (διακονία) which he had received in the Lord (Col 4^{17}) for work in the Church of Colossæ, but we are not told what kind of ministry it was.

There are several passages in which the διάκονος triplet seems to be used of personal service to St. Paul rather than of ministerial service in the Church: διάκονος (of Tychicus, Eph 6^{21}, Col 4^{7}), διακονία (of Mark, 2 Ti 4^{11}), διακονεῖν (of Timothy and Erastus, Ac 19^{22}; of Onesimus, Philem ^{13}; and of Onesiphorus, 2 Ti 1^{18}). διακονεῖν is clearly used of supplying bodily needs in Ac $6^{2.3}$, where the Seven are elected 'to serve tables.' But the Seven are not called διάκονοι, and there is no evidence in the NT which can connect them with the 'deacons' at Philippi or Ephesus. To call the Seven the first deacons is a conjecture which can be neither proved nor disproved.

It may be mere accident that θεραπεία and θεραπεύειν are never used in the NT in the classical sense of Divine worship, although both are used in this sense in the LXX (Jl 1^{14} 2^{15}, Is 54^{17}, Dn 7^{10}, Jth 11^{17}). For Divine worship, the NT writers use either λατρεία and λατρεύειν or λειτουργία and λειτουργεῖν, words which may signify adoration of God in general and sometimes sacrifice in particular. λατρεία or λατρεύειν is used of heathen worship (Ro 1^{25}), of Jewish worship (Ac 7^{7}, Ro 9^{4}, He 8^{5} 9^{1} 13^{10}), of Christian worship (Ro 12^{1}, Ph 3^{3}), and of worship in heaven (Rev 7^{15} 22^{3}). In *Apost. Const.* viii. 15, *ad fin.*, 'mystical λατρεία' is used of the eucharist. But in the LXX, in connexion with religious worship, the group λειτουργός, λειτουργία, λειτουργεῖν is more common. The classical use of these words for the rendering of public services, or contributions to the State, at Athens, prepared the way for the religious use; and it is probable that the employment of these expressions by the writers of the NT in describing Christian worship is not entirely due to the influence of the LXX. Numerous papyri of about 160 B.C. or earlier show that λειτουργία and λειτουργεῖν were frequently used in Egypt in this ceremonial sense (Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, Eng. tr., 1901, p. 140). The different members of the triplet occur in the writings of St. Luke and St. Paul, and all three in Hebrews: *e.g.* Lk 1^{23}, Ac 13^{2}, Ph 2^{17}, He $8^{2.6}$ 10^{11} (see Westcott, *Ep. to Hebrews*, 1889, *ad loc.*). In his full notes on Ph 2^{17} (*Philippians*^{4}, 1878) Lightfoot remarks: 'The Philippians are the priests; their faith (or their good works springing from their faith) is the sacrifice: St. Paul's life-blood the accompanying libation. Commentators have much confused the image, by representing St. Paul himself as the sacrificer.' This passage is one of those which point to 'the fundamental idea of the Christian Church, in which an universal priesthood has supplanted the exclusive ministrations of a select tribe or class.' In the NT all Christians have in Christ that immediate access to God which is the special privilege of priests, and the sacrifices which they offer are spiritual—their wills, praises, and prayers. The priesthood belongs to Christians, not as individuals, but as members of the Church, in the 'royal priesthood' of which each has a share; and the sacrifice which each brings is service and self-consecration, made acceptable by union with the sacrifice offered by Christ. When certain selected individuals exercise priestly functions on behalf of the whole, they act as organs or representatives of the community. But we need to consider the point at which 'sacrifice' and 'priesthood' become metaphors.

LITERATURE.—F. J. A. Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, 1897; T. M. Lindsay, *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries*, 1902; A. W. F. Blunt, *Studies in Apostolic Christianity*, 1909; C. H. Turner, 'The Organisation of the Church' in *The Cambridge Medieval History*, i. [1911] ch. vi., *Studies in Early Church History*, 1912; L. Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church*, ii., Eng. tr., 1912.

A. PLUMMER.

MINISTRATION (Ac 6^{1}).—Neither AV nor RV, except in the margin, indicates that 'ministration' (διακονία) in v.^{1} and 'serve' (διακονεῖν) in v.^{2} are cognate words; or that 'ministration' in v.^{1} is the same word as 'ministry' in v.^{4}. The 'ministration' or 'serving tables' is the distribution of food at the common meals: tables of exchange for money cannot be meant. Hellenist converts complain that Hebrew distributors 'overlooked' Hellenist widows. The Twelve forthwith initiate and regulate the first attempt at self-government made by the Church. They state the number and qualifications of the new officials, leave the election to the whole body of Christians, and ordain the elected. A. PLUMMER.

MINSTREL (αὐλητής, from αὐλός, 'pipe').—The word appears twice in the NT. In Mt 9^{23} αὐλητάς is translated 'minstrels' in the AV, and more correctly in the RV 'flute-players.' In Rev 18^{22} αὐλητῶν is rendered 'pipers' in the AV, while the RV retains 'flute-players'; but the latter version specifies the general term μουσικῶν in the same verse as 'minstrels' (see PIPE, FLUTE).

ARCHIBALD MAIN.

MIRACLES.—In this article we may consider the meaning of the words used in the NT for 'miracles,' and the evidence for the apostolic belief in them; the evidence will then be compared with that for miracles in the succeeding ages, and the evidential value of miracles will be weighed. But the limits assigned preclude a general investigation of the *a priori* credibility of miracles as such. As, however, this has been done very fully by Bernard in *HDB* iii., it is scarcely necessary here to repeat what has there been well said.

1. Meaning of the words used.—(*a*) The principal NT words for what we should now call a 'miracle' are σημεῖον, τέρας, δύναμις, ἔργον. Of these, σημεῖον, 'sign,' denotes that which conveys spiritual and symbolic instruction; τέρας, 'wonder' or 'prodigy,' denotes a work above the ordinary working of nature; δύναμις denotes a work showing 'power'; while ἔργον, 'work,' is in itself a neutral word, the context of which in many passages, especially in Jn. (5^{36} etc.), shows it to denote a 'miracle' (so Mt 11^{2}; but in Jn 17^{4} the word includes the whole of Jesus' deeds). It is noteworthy that the mighty deeds of our Lord and His disciples are never called 'prodigies' (τέρατα) alone; the only apparent exception to this rule is in Ac 2^{19} ('I will show wonders in heaven'), which, however, is a quotation from Jl 2^{30}, and 'wonders in heaven' are coupled with 'signs on earth,' and both are interpreted by St. Peter as 'powers and wonders and signs' in v.^{22}. A Christian miracle is not a mere prodigy exciting astonishment, but is intended for instruction; and here we see at once the great difference between the NT miracles and most of those of the apocryphal Gospels, which are mere exhibitions without any teaching purpose, and are often repulsive to the Christian sense of reverence. It must be added, also, that herein lies the difference between the NT miracles and most of those commonly known as 'ecclesiastical' (see below, 4). The mighty deeds related in the NT did, indeed, excite wonder and fear (Mk 2^{12} 4^{41} 6^{51} 7^{37}, Lk 7^{16}, Ac $3^{10f.}$), but this was not their only or even their chief object. Hence, when τέρας is used it is always combined with σημεῖον (Jn 4^{48}, Ac $2^{19.43}$ 4^{30} 5^{12} 6^{8} 7^{36} 14^{2} 15^{12}, and [of false prophets] Mt 24^{24}, Mk 13^{22}, and [with δύναμις added] Ac 2^{22}, Ro 15^{19}, 2 Co 12^{12}, 2 Th 2^{9}, He 2^{4}); δύναμις and σημεῖον are joined in Ac 8^{13}. It may be noticed that θαῦμα is not used in the NT of miracles, but θαυμάσια ('wonderful things') is used in Mt 21^{15}, παράδοξα ('strange things') in Lk 5^{26}, ἔνδοξα ('glorious things') in Lk 13^{17}.

(*b*) Turning to the English versions, we are struck by the confusion occasioned by the indiscriminate use of the word 'miracle.' In AV it often represents σημεῖον (in the singular in Lk 23^{8}, Jn 4^{54}, Ac $4^{16.22}$, and in the plural in Jn $2^{11.23}$ 3^{2} $6^{2.26}$ 7^{31} 9^{16} 11^{47} 12^{37}, Ac 6^{8} 8^{6} 15^{12}, Rev 13^{14} 16^{14} 19^{20}); in these passages RV rightly substitutes 'sign' except in the text of Lk 23^{8}, Ac $4^{16.22}$, where 'miracle' is with some inconsistency retained. Again, in AV 'miracle' represents δύναμις in Mk 9^{39}, Ac 2^{22} 8^{13} 19^{11}, 1 Co $12^{10.28f.}$, Gal 3^{5}, He 2^{4}, while in these passages there is an unfortunate confusion even in the RV text (though RVm gives 'power'), as we find 'mighty work' in the first two passages, 'miracle' in the next five, and 'powers' in the last; if 'powers' was thought somewhat unintelligible, 'mighty works' or 'mighty deeds' might with a little ingenuity have been used in all these places. The confusion in AV is increased by σημεῖα being translated 'wonders' in Rev 13^{13} and 'miracles' in v.^{14}, and by δυνάμεις being translated 'mighty deeds' in 2 Co 12^{12}; in Mk 6^{52}, AV unnecessarily inserts 'the miracle,' which is not in the Greek. It is a serious misfortune that 'miracle' should be so much used in the AV to represent σημεῖον, for the connotation of the English word is exactly what that of the Greek word is not, and it has given the English reader an erroneous idea of the purpose of the works of our Lord and the disciples; it was not so much to produce wonder as belief.

2. Evidence for miracles in the Apostolic Age.—(*a*) *The Gospels* are all full of the mighty deeds worked by our Lord, nor is it possible to separate the miraculous from the non-miraculous in these histories. The Synoptic Gospels do not profess to be written by eye-witnesses, but the Fourth Gospel does claim to give first-hand testimony (Jn 21^{24}, confirmed by many internal indications), though it was written more than half a century after the events which are recorded. It narrates healings ($4^{16ff.}$ 5^{8} 6^{2}), giving sight to the blind ($9^{6f.}$), raising the dead (11^{44}), and several 'miracles of nature'—water made wine (2^{9}), feeding the five thousand ($6^{11f.}$), walking on the sea (6^{19}), the miraculous draught of fishes (21^{6}); also the Resurrection (20. 21) and 'many other signs' (20^{30}). It is to be noted that in all the Gospels the evidence for 'miracles' of nature is as strong as that for miracles of healing, and that the evidence of Jn. does not differ in kind from that of the Synoptists. For the evidence of the Gospels, reference may be made to Sanday's art. 'Jesus Christ' in *HDB* ii. 625 f. Though the witness of the Synoptists is not in form at first hand, it still rests on very good authority, and there is excellent reason for believing that the evidence of Mk. is in effect that of St. Peter himself (see *DCG* ii. 121 f., and, for the autoptic character of the Second Gospel, *ib.* 124). Also the first-hand evidence of St. Paul that he himself had the power of working miracles (see below) indirectly gives good testimony to the fact that our Lord worked them, for we can hardly imagine that St. Paul could have thought that he himself had the power from Christ unless his Master also had it. For a classification of the Gospel miracles see *DCG* ii. 186 ff. (T. H. Wright).

Further, in the Gospels it is recorded that our Lord bade the disciples heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out devils (Mt 10^{8}); and that they would have power to do so if only they had faith is implied in 17^{20}. So in the appendix to Mk. ($16^{17f.}$) the signs which would follow believers are said to be casting out devils in Christ's name, speaking with new tongues, taking up serpents, drinking poison without hurt, and healing the sick by laying on of hands.

(*b*) We may proceed to consider how these predictions are borne out by the *Acts and Epistles.* It will be convenient to separate the evidence which is at first hand from that which is at second hand.

(i.) Under the former head will come those mighty deeds and outward charismata which are attested by those who claimed to see, or to do, or to possess them. In the 'we' sections of Acts (accounts of events in which the author took part) and in St. Paul's Epistles we read of several mighty works, prophecies, and visions, attested at first hand. In Ac 16^{18} the Python is cast out of the ventriloquist girl; in 16^{26} there is an earthquake, the doors of the prisons are opened, and the prisoners' bonds are loosed; in 20^{12} we read of the raising of Eutychus (*q.v.*), though it is not said that he was dead (the reverse seems to be implied in v.^{10}); in 21^{9} of the prophesying of Philip's daughters; in 21^{11} of the prophecy of Agabus; in 28^{5} of St. Paul's shaking off the viper without hurt (cf. 'Mk' 16^{18} as above); and in $28^{8f.}$ of the healing of Publius' father by St. Paul by the laying on of hands; and of the healing of others, in which St. Luke himself seems to have taken part (see v.^{10}: 'honoured *us*'). Further, the narratives in Ac $9^{3ff.}$ $22^{6ff.}$ $26^{12ff.}$ of the appearances of our Lord to St. Paul at his conversion are brought almost to the level of first-hand evidence by the corroboration of Gal 1^{1-16}. St. Paul claimed that Christ worked miracles through him (Ro $15^{18f.}$, 2 Co 12^{12}), and testifies to the fact that some (not all) of his converts also had the power (Gal 3^{5}, 1 Co $12^{9f.\ 28-30}$ 14^{22}). These works, which are instances of *πνευματικά* or spiritual [gifts], include healings and other 'powers,' speaking with tongues and interpretation of tongues, and prophecy. We have it at first hand that the Jews expected such signs of Christian preachers (1 Co 1^{22}). The visions of St. Paul are attested by himself in 2 Co 12^{2-4}.

(ii.) Of other works and charismata in the NT, we have not, outside the Gospels, first-hand evidence; yet even what we have must be pronounced exceptionally good when we remember the opportunities which St. Luke had of converse with those who actually saw the events. At the outset we note that St. Peter in his speeches attributes to our Lord 'power and wonders and signs' (Ac 2^{22}), and the healing of demoniacs (10^{38}). Then, signs and wonders, healings of the sick and of demoniacs, are attributed to the apostles generally (2^{43} $5^{12.\ 16}$). In 3^{7} 9^{34} St. Peter heals the lame man and Æneas; in $5^{5.\ 10}$ he inflicts sudden death on Ananias and Sapphira; in 9^{40} he raises Dorcas from the dead; and in 5^{15} the sick are brought so that his shadow may fall on some of them, though it is not said that they were thereby cured. In 6^{8} Stephen works wonders and signs; in $8^{6.\ 13}$ Philip works signs and powers at Samaria. In 15^{12} Barnabas and Paul relate to the Apostolic Council how signs and wonders had been worked by them. In 13^{11} St. Paul strikes Elymas blind; in 14^{10} he heals the impotent man at Lystra; in 19^{11} he works 'special' (*οὐ τὰς τυχούσας*) powers at Ephesus, and even his garments taken to the sick and the demoniacs heal them. In He 2^{4} the first preachers of the gospel are said to have worked signs and wonders and powers. Divine interpositions are recorded in Ac 5^{19} 12^{10}, where an angel opens prison doors. We read of speaking with tongues and prophesying at Pentecost (2^{4}) and at Ephesus (19^{6}), and the same thing is probably implied in $8^{17f.}$, because Simon Magus *saw* that the Holy Ghost was given at Samaria. Another prophecy of Agabus (this time at second hand) is quoted in 11^{28}. Numerous visions of our Lord are recorded: in Ac $1^{3ff.}$ (between the Resurrection and the Ascension), $9^{3ff.}$ etc. (to St. Paul at his conversion), 9^{10} (to Ananias), 22^{18} 23^{11} (to St. Paul at Jerusalem); and something of this sort is implied by the direction of the Spirit in $16^{6f.}$. Visions of angels are recorded in 8^{26} (to Philip), 10^{3} (to Peter), 27^{23} (to St. Paul on his voyage to Italy); in 16^{9} St. Paul sees the 'certain man of Macedonia.'

Miraculous deeds are ascribed to non-Christians and also to Satan and his ministers. The Jewish exorcists might expect to cast out demons, though as a matter of fact they were not successful in doing so (Ac $19^{13f.}$). Simon Magus by his 'magic' did wonderful things, so that he was named 'that power of God which is called Great' (8^{10}). The Lawless One in 2 Th 2^{9} is marked by 'power and signs and lying wonders'; in Rev. the second beast ($13^{13f.}$), the spirits of demons (16^{14}), the false prophet (19^{20}), who is apparently to be identified with the second beast (see H. B. Swete, *Apoc.*^{2}, 1907, p. 206), work signs, just as our Lord had said that false Christs and false prophets should show signs and wonders (Mt 24^{24}, Mk 13^{22}).

3. Examination of the evidence.—In considering the facts enumerated above, it is quite possible, and even probable, that we must deduct several of the incidents mentioned as not being in any real sense miraculous, even though they might have seemed so to the bystanders. It is, for instance, probable that Eutychus was not really dead. Agabus' prophecies may have been but shrewd forecasts of events. The viper in Malta may not in reality have been poisonous. It is conceivable that Dorcas was in a state of coma and not really dead. The visions, the gift of tongues and of prophesying may not belong properly to the category of the miraculous. Yet when all possible deductions have been made, there can be no doubt that the NT is saturated with miracles, and that the writers were firmly persuaded that Jesus and His disciples had worked them.

How, then, are we to interpret the 'signs,' 'powers,' and 'wonders' of the NT? There is an increasing disposition at the present time among those who formerly would have denied all miracles to accept as genuine many of the NT narratives, especially those of healings and of expulsions of demons; and this is due to the greater knowledge which we now have of the power of mind over matter. But much depends on what we mean by a 'miracle.' To the man in the street it usually conveys the idea of a contravention of nature. This, however, is not a good definition. Augustine, in an often-quoted passage, remarks that a miracle (*portentum*) is not against nature, but against *known* nature (*de Civ. Dei*, XXI. viii. 2). What may appear to one eye to be a contravention of the laws of nature is often found in a later age to be in reality in accordance with them. As an example, wireless telegraphy would have seemed in the 1st cent. to be a miracle, whereas we now know it to be a natural phenomenon. Many, therefore, of the 'signs' of the NT, not only those which we are now beginning to see are no contravention of nature, such as the healings in nervous cases, but also others, may before long be found to be in accordance with law. When we ourselves shall have risen from the dead, and see 'face to face,' we may find that our Lord's resurrection and our own are the necessary outcome of law. The theory of 'relative miracles' was propounded by Schleiermacher, and has perhaps hardly been done justice to, though it is not possible to assent to all his reasoning. The theory substitutes for a contravention of nature a miracle of knowledge. Certain persons had a greater hold on the secrets of nature than their contemporaries; but this was by a Divine interposition. Even in the case of Jewish and heathen magicians this may to some extent be true; it is not necessary to brand men like Simon and Elymas and Apollonius of Tyana (a Cappadocian of the 1st cent. of our era) as mere impostors. It follows, then, that while the stories of miracles are narrated in the way that was best suited to the comprehension of the Apostolic Age, several of them, had they been written in our day, would have been given in different language (Sanday, *HDB* ii. 625^{a}).

It is answered to what has been suggested here, that this reasoning makes the miracles to be no miracles at all. But this is not a substantial objection, and is based only on the presupposition that miracles are contraventions of nature. A miracle of knowledge implies Divine intervention as much as—nay, more than—a breach of natural law. Sanday remarks: 'The essential point is the Divine act; and that, I think, is proved. We are beginning to learn the lesson that an act is not less Divine because it is fundamentally in accordance with law' (*Life of Christ in Recent Research*, p. 218).

It may be that what has been said does not directly apply to *all* the 'signs' recorded in the NT. Yet these suggestions may at least give us pause if we are inclined to think that the excellent evidence which we possess cannot stand against the *a priori* improbability of a miracle happening.

4. Miracles in the sub-Apostolic and later ages.—It is important to compare NT records with those of subsequent ages in this respect.

(1) Let us first examine two actual miracles which have been thought to have happened in the 2nd century.

(*a*) *Miracles at Polycarp's death* (see Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, pt. ii.: 'Ignatius'^{2}, 1889, i. 614 ff., iii. 392 f.).—The Letter of the Smyrnæans (*Martyrdom of Polycarp*), written *c.* A.D. 156 immediately after the event, relates (§§ 9, 15 f.) that on the saint's entering the stadium, a voice was heard from heaven, saying, 'Be strong, Polycarp, and play the man'; no one saw the speaker, but the bystanders heard the voice. A little later, they saw a marvel—the flame enveloping the martyr like a sail, and a fragrant odour was perceived. When the executioner stabbed Polycarp to death 'there came forth [a dove and] a quantity of blood, so that it extinguished the fire.' Here the only real 'miracle' is the dove; but all mention of it is omitted by Eusebius, who quotes the letter at length (*HE* iv. 15). It is therefore probable that *περιστερὰ καὶ* is either, as Lightfoot thinks, an insertion by a later writer, perhaps by pseudo-Pionius, a 4th cent. biographer of Polycarp, or else a corruption, perhaps of *περὶ στύρακα*, 'about the sword-haft' (Christopher Wordsworth), or of *περὶ στερνά* (Ruchat), or of *ἐπ' ἀριστερᾷ* (Le Moyne). The life of pseudo-Pionius (for the text and translation of which see Lightfoot, 'Ign.'^{2} iii.) describes several miracles, but the MS breaks off in the middle, and does not give Polycarp's death: the Life is followed in the MS immediately by the Letter of the Smyrnæans.

(*b*) *The Thundering Legion* (*c.* A.D. 174).—A letter of Marcus Aurelius details the incident of the Christian soldiers praying for rain, and of its falling in abundance. The letter, however, is 'a manifest forgery' (Lightfoot, 'Ign.'^{2} i. 488). There may be elements of truth in the story, but it can hardly be called a miracle, unless every answer to prayer be deemed such. Thus the two descriptions of actual miracles fail us.

(2) Next, let us examine the testimony of the writers who succeeded the apostles.

(*a*) Papias, a 'hearer of John and companion of Polycarp' (Iren. *Hær.* V. xxxiii. 4), in words quoted by Eusebius (*HE* iii. 39), says that in the time of Philip the Apostle one rose from the dead, and that Justus Barsabbas (Ac 1^{23}) drank deadly poison without hurt. This, however, was in the Apostolic Age.

(*b*) The writer of the *Didache* (10 f.) and Hermas (*Mand.* 11) speak of the existence of true and false prophets in the Christian Church in their time.

(*c*) Justin testifies to the healing of demoniacs in his day (*c.* A.D. 150; *Apol.* ii. 6, *Dial.* 30, 76: in the last passage he apparently speaks of this as the fulfilment of the promise that they should tread on scorpions, etc., Lk 10^{19}); he says that one received the gift of healing, another of foreknowledge, etc. (*Dial.* 39), and that 'prophetical gifts remain with us even to the present time' (82).

(*d*) Irenæus (*c.* A.D. 180; *Hær.* II. xxxii. 4) says that Christians 'in Christ's name perform [works] . . . some cast out devils . . . others have foreknowledge and see visions and prophesy, others heal the sick by laying on of hands. . . . Even the dead have been raised up and remained among us for many years.' Note the change of tense here. The raising of the dead in Irenæus' own time is not alleged, and the reference may be to Dorcas or to such a case as is mentioned by Papias. Irenæus ascribes the miracles of heretics to magic.

(*e*) At the end of the 2nd cent. Tertullian speaks of the healing of demoniacs in his day: *Apol.* 23, 37 ('without reward or hire'), 43 (heathen demoniacs healed).

(*f*) In the 3rd cent. Origen says (*c. Cels.* i. 2) that *traces* of the signs and wonders of the First Age were still possessed by those who regulated their lives by the precepts of the gospel; and (*ib.* iii. 24), speaking of heathen ascriptions of healings to Æsculapius, that by the invocation of Jesus' name some Christians of his time had marvellous power of healing; he would seem to speak chiefly of mental diseases.

These passages show that healings, especially in nervous cases, continued in the 2nd cent. and later; but there are indications that even they were not very frequent, and there is no good evidence of the other miraculous works of which we read in the NT being continued. In the *Church Orders* we read of the benediction of oil for healing and for the exorcism of candidates for baptism, and these features may probably be due to the lost original of several of the Orders, which may be dated about the beginning of the 3rd century. But here we have passed from the stage of miracle to that of ordinary liturgical usage. At the end of the 4th cent. Chrysostom implies that miracles had ceased—and this in the face of the fact that that century saw the rise of miracle-loving hagiography. He says (*de Sacerd.* iv. 6 [416]) that his contemporaries, though they all came together with myriads of prayers and tears, could not do as much as the 'aprons' (*σιμικίνθια*) of St. Paul once did (Ac 19^{12}).

The evidence, then, seems to show that miracles gradually died out, and that after the Apostolic Age they scarcely went beyond 'healing by suggestion.' The case is very different after the 4th cent., when lives of the saints and martyrs are full of miracle, and eventually the power of working miracles became a test of saintship, in direct contrast with the restraint of Holy Scripture, in which it is said that 'John did no sign' (Jn 10^{41}), and no miracle is ascribed to the great majority of the heroes of the OT. Moreover, most of the 'ecclesiastical' miracles are mere prodigies, and can in no sense be called 'signs.' In many cases they are demonstrably the invention of later biographers, and contemporary writers show no knowledge of them. But we cannot *a priori* deny the possibility of miracles happening in any age of the Christian Church, and it is quite probable that some mighty deeds of later times, notably healings, may have a modicum of truth in them, and may be such as would have been termed *σημεῖα* in the NT. (For miracles in the Columban Church see J. Dowden, *Celtic Church in Scotland*, London, 1894, ch. viii.)

5. Evidential value of NT miracles.—The object of the miracles was to arrest attention (Jn 2^{23} 3^{2}); they were not, however, *faith-compelling* (Mt 11^{20}, Jn 12^{37}). Since the apostles believed (see above, **3**) that even evil men and evil spirits could work miracles, they would not have said that a miracle-worker must be a true teacher. Now a miracle, because of its anomalousness, requires more proof than an ordinary event. The latter, if properly vouched, at once becomes probable; not so the former, unless it has a certain degree of *a priori* likelihood. Such we find in the belief in the spiritual world. If we believe in a God who is not aloof from the world, but loves His creatures, it is not improbable that He should, for good cause, intervene. The method of intervention may be unusual, and not in accord with the *ordinary* course of nature as we know it (cf. Augustine, above, **3**); but if an unusual event such as the Incarnation happens, it is not improbable that such interventions should accompany it. It follows, however, that we cannot rest our argument for the existence of God, or for the truth of Christianity, merely on the fact that miracles happened, and it was a mistake in the reasoning of the 18th cent. apologists that they to a large extent did so. If for other reasons we believe in the Godhead of our Lord, we can also believe that He worked miracles, and empowered His disciples to do so—whether for one generation or for longer we need not stop to discuss.

It was never professed that miracles were worked to make those who were without any faith believe. The Risen Christ appeared only to believers, though this does not mean that the disciples believed merely because they wished to believe; here their 'hardness of heart' is of great evidential value. And miracles were only worked when there was a certain amount of faith (Mk 6^{5}, Mt 13^{58}; cf. Lk 16^{31}). Indeed, it is seen that miracles did not make the great impression on the First Age that they would make now. Did they happen now, the impression would be so great that they would be almost faith-compelling, and this is a very good reason for their having ceased. Even the disciples were not so much impressed by the Resurrection that they believed it without any doubt. Some of those who had seen the Risen Lord at first believed, then disbelieved (Mt 28^{17}: 'some doubted'), and only after a time were fully confirmed in the faith. So, again, though the story of the raising of Lazarus made a stir at the time in Jerusalem, it is quite intelligible that the impression did not extend very far or last very long. To say, therefore, that St. Mark could not have known of the raising of Lazarus because he does not mention it in the account of Jesus' ministry in another part of the country is to import 20th cent. ideas into the narrative of the Apostolic Age.

The conclusion would seem to be that miracles have never been intended to be a direct proof of the truth of the gospel, or of the holiness of those who worked them; and their absence does not imply want of authority or of saintliness. But when at great crises of the world's history they were worked, they at once arrested attention, and so led men on to believe in doctrines which for other reasons commended themselves to the sense of humanity.

LITERATURE.—Out of a voluminous literature may be mentioned: W. Sanday, *Life of Christ in Recent Research*, Oxford, 1907, ch. viii., and art. 'Jesus Christ' in *HDB* ii. (section on the 'Miracles of Jesus'); J. H. Bernard, *HDB* iii., art. 'Miracle'; T. H. Wright, *DCG* ii., art. 'Miracles'; J. R. Illingworth, *Divine Immanence*, London, 1898; R. C. Trench, *Notes on the Miracles of our Lord*^{9}, do., 1870, which is never out of date; G. Salmon, *Non-Miraculous Christianity*, London, 1881. For other works see *HDB* and *DCG* as above.

A. J. MACLEAN.

MIRROR (*ἔσοπτρον*, 1 Co 13^{12}, Ja 1^{23}; the classical word was *κάτοπτρον*, whence *κατοπτρίζεσθαι*, in 2 Co 3^{18}; Lat. *speculum*, late Lat. *miratorium*, from *mirari*, whence Fr. *miroir*).—The mirrors of the ancients consisted of a thin disk of metal—usually bronze, more rarely silver—slightly convex and polished on one side. Glass mirrors coated with tin, of which there was a manufactory at Sidon (Pliny, *HN* xxxvi. 66, 193), were little used, and the art of silvering glass was not discovered till the 13th century. Corinthian mirrors were considered the best, and it is interesting that St. Paul's two figurative uses of the word occur in his letters to Corinth.

1. To bring home to the imagination the limitations of human knowledge, he says that in the present life we see only by means of a mirror darkly (*δι' ἐσόπτρου ἐν αἰνίγματι*, 1 Co 13^{12}). In a modern mirror the reflexion is perfect, but the finest burnished metal gave but an indistinct image. To see a friend in a mirror, and to look at his own face, was therefore to receive two different impressions. So this world of time and sense, as apprehended by the human mind, imperfectly mirrors the true and eternal world, leaving many things 'enigmatic.' Mediate knowledge can never be so sure and satisfying as immediate. Plato (*Rep.* vii. 514) in his well-known simile of the cave compares our sense-impressions to shadow-shapes that come and go, giving but hints of the real world beyond; and the figure of the mirror is found in such Platonists as the writer of Wisdom (7^{26}) and Philo (*de Decal.* 21). J. H. Newman directed that his memorial tablet at Edgbaston should bear the words—*Ex umbris et imaginibus in veritatem.* Many writers have supposed that St. Paul refers not to a mirror but to a semi-transparent window-pane: 'velut per corneum specular obsoletior lux' (Tertullian, *de An.* 53). But a window of talc would be διόπτρον (Lat. *speculare*), not ἔσοπτρον. Tertullian has indeed the right interpretation in *adv. Prax.* 16, 'in imagine et speculo et ænigmate.'

2. St. Paul says that we all, with unveiled face mirroring (κατοπτριζόμενοι) the glory of the Lord, are transfigured (cf. Mk 9^{2}) into the same image (2 Co 3^{18}). While Moses, who saw God and for a little while outwardly reflected His glory, gradually lost the supernatural radiance, the disciples of Christ steadily beholding (cf. Jn 1^{14}) and reflecting His moral glory, become daily more like Him: 'the rays of Divine glory penetrate their innermost being and fashion them anew' (Bousset, *Die Schriften des NT*, 1908, ii. 179). The older interpretation—'beholding as in a mirror'—loses the parallel between Moses' direct vision of God and ours (by faith) of Christ, and fails to do justice to the 'unveiled face.'

3. James (1^{23-25}) compares the law of liberty—a splendid paradox—to a mirror in which a man sees himself as he is. The mere hearer of the law is like a person who gives a hasty glance at his face in a mirror and then turns his attention to other things; but he who continues to look into the mirror of the law till the moral ideal fascinates him and the categorical imperatives win his passionate assent, so that his own will is more and more conformed to the will of God—that man shall learn the secret of true happiness. JAMES STRAHAN.

MITYLENE (Μιτυλήνη).—Mitylene, or—according to the usual spelling in classical writings and on coins—Mytilene, was the chief town in the island of Lesbos, lying on the S.E. coast, about 12 miles from the mainland of Asia Minor. Built on a peninsula which had once been an island, it had two excellent harbours, the northern for merchantmen, the southern for triremes.

Horace calls it 'Mitylene pulchra' (*Ep.* I. xi. 17), and Cicero praises it as 'urbs et natura de situ et descriptione ædificiorum et pulchritudine, in primis nobilis' (*Leg. Agr.* ii. 41). Mitylene was the home of Alcæus and of Sappho, 'an extraordinary person (θαυμαστόν τι χρῆμα), for at no period within memory has any woman been known at all to be compared to her in poetry' (Strabo, XIII. ii. 3). For its old renown the Romans left the city free—'libera Mitylene' (Pliny, v. 39).

Mitylene is mentioned only incidentally in Acts (20^{14}). The ship in which St. Paul sailed from Assos to Patara in the month of April lay overnight either in the northern harbour of Mitylene (which Strabo mentions as μέγας καὶ βαθύς [XIII. ii. 2]), or else in the roadstead outside. Mitylene was about 30 miles S. from Assos—an easy day's sail. It was contrary to the general practice to sail at night in the Ægean, where, throughout the summer season, the N. wind commonly blows fresh in the morning and dies away towards evening. In later Christian times the whole island of Lesbos came to be called Mitylene. The Turks, who captured it in A.D. 1462, have corrupted its name into *Midüllü.*

LITERATURE.—Conybeare-Howson, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, new ed., London, 1877, ii. 261; H. F. Tozer, *The Islands of the Ægean*, Oxford, 1890, p. 134 f.; W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, London, 1895, p. 291 ff.

JAMES STRAHAN.

MNASON.—Mnason, an 'early disciple' (ἀρχαίῳ μαθητῇ, *i.e.*, probably, a disciple from the beginning [cf. Ac 11^{15}, ἐν ἀρχῇ]), is mentioned in Ac 21^{16} as the host of St. Paul in Jerusalem. The ambiguity of the text has caused much discussion. Grammatically it may mean either that Mnason accompanied St. Paul and his friends from Cæsarea to Jerusalem and then took in St. Paul, or that St. Paul's friends brought him to Jerusalem to lodge with Mnason. Moreover, Cod. D and Syr. p. marg. (Tisch.) introduce a variant reading which makes Mnason entertain St. Paul in a village on the way. But the difficulty is met by observing that the mind of the author of Acts is picturing the company after v.^{15} as already in Jerusalem, as having Mnason as host, and being welcomed by the disciples. Nothing further is known of Mnason. The name occurs as a personal one some 30 times in the *CIG*, Græc. sept., vol. i., and also in Kaibel, no. 2393 (368). Cod. ℵ and one or two Versions read 'Jason' for 'Mnason'; cf. 'Mambres' for 'Jambres' (see JANNES AND JAMBRES).

W. F. COBB.

MODERATION.—See TEMPERANCE.

MOLOCH.—Moloch (Ac 7^{43}) occurs in a quotation from Am 5^{26}. The Hebrew has 'your king'; thus the LXX may either be an explanatory gloss or represent another text. Moloch is spoken of in the OT as the god of the Ammonites, and is evidently the national deity, just as Chemosh is the god of Moab, and Jahweh the God of Israel, though the worship of other gods is not precluded. The Israelites regarded Moloch as an 'abomination,' and their temporary adoption of the worship of Moloch in the Valley of Hinnom gave rise to the ominous meaning attaching to 'Gehenna.'

F. W. WORSLEY.

MONEY.—See WEALTH.

MONOGAMY.—See MARRIAGE.

MONTH.—See TIME.

MOON.—There is only one reference to the natural light of the moon—there will be no need of the moon to shine in the heavenly Jerusalem (Rev 21^{23}). The change in colour or obscuring of the moon denotes some great judgment, *e.g.* the moon will be turned into blood before the great Day of the Lord (Ac 2^{20}). So again at the opening of the sixth seal 'the moon became as blood' (Rev 6^{12}). At the sounding of the fourth trumpet a third of the moon's disk is obscured (Rev 8^{12}). In Rev 12^{1} the woman who appears as a sign in heaven has the moon under her feet as a footstool (see SUN). In Col 2^{16} St. Paul warns the Colossians to let no man judge them in respect of a holy day or of the new moon—a monthly festival of the Jews. These things had served their purpose under the old dispensation and were but shadows and types of the realities of the new. See HOLY DAY.

MORLEY STEVENSON.

MORALITY.—See ETHICS.

MORNING-STAR.—See DAY-STAR.

MORTIFY.—This word translates (AV and RV) θανατοῦν (Ro 8^{13}) and νεκροῦν (Col 3^{5}). Elsewhere in the NT the former word is applied only to the infliction of physical death (by the Greek medical writers to 'mortification' in the pathological sense), the latter to senile decay of the vital powers (Ro 4^{19}, He 11^{12}). In the passages cited the words are synonymous, and are used, as the contexts plainly show, in an ethical sense. Although St. Paul is far from disparaging the necessity of wholesome self-discipline (1 Co 9^{27}), the idea, readily suggested by the associations of the word 'mortify,' of a *gradual* subjugation of the bodily appetites by the practice of bodily austerities, is here foreign to his thought. His exhortation is to 'put to death the (evil) practices of the body' (Ro 8^{13}), and this is to be done, not by physical means, but by the 'spirit'; and again to put to death 'the members which are upon the earth' (*i.e.* the impure and selfish lusts of which the bodily members are the natural instruments—fornication, uncleanness, etc.), and for this end the rules of an arbitrary asceticism are of no value (Col 2^{16-23}).

The main emphasis of St. Paul's doctrine of sanctification is ever on the *positive* issue of the believer's vital union with Christ—that 'newness of life' which by its native force expels and excludes the lustings of the lower nature (Ro 13^{14}, Gal 5^{16}, Eph 5^{18}, 2 Ti 2^{22}); yet necessarily the negative principle is also involved. By man, in his present state, spiritual life is realizable only through the slaying of sin; union with the Crucified implies crucifixion of the passions and lusts (Gal 5^{24}). While 'raised together with Christ,' we 'seek the things that are above' (Col 3^{1}), the converse fact that in Christ 'we died' (Col 3^{3}) carries with it the converse requirement, as it does also the power, to kill out what is base and sensual and to hold all natural appetites in rigid subordination to the highest ends of life. ROBERT LAW.

MOSES.—Just as, in the Synagogue, the Law (the Torah), was accounted the most important division of the Canon, and as Holy Scripture in its entirety might thus *a parte potiori* be designated the 'Law' (ὁ *νόμος*, the *tôrāh*), so in the primitive Church Moses was regarded as the supreme figure of the OT.

1. Moses as the author of the Pentateuch.—Moses was honoured as the author of the 'Law,' *i.e.* the Pentateuch: Ro 10^{5} ('Moses writeth'); cf. Ac 3^{22} 7^{37}. His name had become so closely identified with the books of the Torah that we even find it said, 'Moses is read' (Ac 15^{21}, 2 Co 3^{15} [cf. v.^{14}]). The Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch was an assumption of Jewish tradition and, as such, seems to have been taken over by Jesus and His apostles without criticism of any sort. It is to be noted, however, that they attached no special importance to the belief that Moses himself wrote the Pentateuch. This is in no sense the point of the above references, as the name 'Moses' is used either metonymically for the Law ('the Old Covenant') as in Ac 15^{21} and 2 Co 3^{15} (cf. v.^{14}), or as a designation of the correlative, *i.e.* the first, portion of Holy Scripture or Divine revelation; cf. *e.g.* Ro 10^{19} (where Moses is referred to only as the mouth-piece of God, exactly like 'Isaiah' in the next verse). Occasionally, however, special emphasis is laid upon the fact that Moses, as a prophet, gave utterance to certain sayings, since, as the recognized representative of Judaism, he forms in some sense a contrast to Jesus; cf. Ac 7^{37} and 3^{22} ('Moses said') with Jn 5^{46} (Ro 10^{5}).

2. Moses as a prophet.—Among the early Christians generally Moses was honoured as pre-eminently a prophet. While the religion of the OT revolved around the two foci, Law and Promise, primitive Christianity—in contrast to later Judaism—laid the chief emphasis upon the Promise; and, if the Jews exploited Moses in their controversies with the Christians, the latter could always appeal to his Messianic prediction; cf. Ac 3^{22} 7^{37} 26^{22} 28^{23}, Lk $24^{27.\,44}$, Jn 5^{45-47} (Dt 18^{15}: 'The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me'). More especially in the speech of Stephen a strong emphasis is laid upon the prophetic character of Moses (Ac 7^{37}); here, moreover, Moses does not merely foretell the coming of Christ, but in his calling, and even in his experiences, he is also, as indicated in the passage cited from Dt., a prototype of Christ, having been first of all disowned by his people (vv.$^{23-29}$), then exalted by God to be their leader and deliverer (v.^{35}), and at length once more rejected by them (vv.$^{39-41}$). St. Paul, too, uses the figure of Moses as a type of Christ: the Israelites in their exodus from Egypt 'were all baptized unto Moses' in the Red Sea (1 Co 10^{2}); and in He 3^{2} Moses is spoken of as typifying Christ's faithfulness in the service of God's house. That Christ is called the Mediator of the New Covenant (He 8^{6} 12^{24}) doubtless presupposes that Moses was the mediator of the Old (cf. Ac 7^{38}, Gal 3^{19}). In the speech of Stephen the life of Moses is sketched at some length, and is furnished with certain particulars which were derived from the oral tradition of the Synagogue (the Haggādā), as *e.g.* in Ac 7^{22} ('instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians')—just as the names of the Egyptian magicians, Jannes and Jambres, are given by St. Paul (2 Ti 3^{8}). Further, among the heroes of the faith enumerated in He 11, Moses wins more than a passing reference as a pattern of faith (vv.$^{24-26}$).

High as Moses stands in the Old Covenant, however, his glory pales before that of Christ, as the transient and the material gives place to the permanent and the spiritual (2 Co 3^{7-18}, He 3^{3-5}). Moses was but the servant of God, while Jesus Christ is God's Son, who not merely superintends, but actually governs God's house, and was in fact its builder (He 3^{3-5}). In the fading away of the dazzling glory on the face of Moses (Ex 34^{33-35}) St. Paul finds a symbol of the transient glory of the Old Covenant mediated by Moses, while the glory of the Lord (*i.e.* Christ), and thus also of the New Covenant, is imperishable (2 Co 3^{12-18}; cf. vv.$^{7-11}$).

3. Moses as the law-giver.—This brings us to the function of Moses as the law-giver. As Judaism became more and more definitely legalistic, an ever higher position was assigned to the great intermediary of the Law. He towered above every other character in the OT, and Judaism became neither more nor less than Mosaism. To impugn the Law in any way was to speak blasphemy, not only against Moses, but even against God (cf. the charge against Stephen, Ac 6^{11}). The primitive Church, on the other hand—as was said above—laid great stress upon the prophetic and prototypic character of Moses, as also upon his subordinate position in relation to Christ. But as long as Moses remained the great canonical standard, the Church could not renounce his legislative authority. Even the Lord Jesus Himself had sanctioned the Law of Moses, and co-ordinated it with the Prophets (Mt 5^{17-20}, Lk 16^{17}; cf. vv.$^{29.\,31}$), and the primitive community in Jerusalem could never have entertained the thought of disparaging the authority of Moses for Christians as well as Jews. Still, the relation of the disciples of Jesus to the Mosaic Law could not permanently remain the same as that of the unbelieving Jews; the differentiating factor of belief in Jesus was felt more and more to be paramount, and at length it was fully realized that salvation could be secured not by the Law but by faith, or grace, and that it came not from Moses, but from Jesus Christ.

Thus too had come the time when the believing Gentiles must be fully recognized as brethren, and received into the Church without circumcision.* Yet this does not in any sense imply that the mother church in Jerusalem and the rest of the Jewish Christians believed themselves to be exempt from the obligation of the Law. On the contrary, we are told in Acts that the many thousands of Jewish Christians continued to be 'zealous for the law' (21^{20}), and in a continuation of the passage we are shown that the rumour of St. Paul's having taught the Jewish Christians in his churches to forsake Moses was without foundation (vv.$^{21-26}$), while we learn from St. Paul's own letters that within certain limits he desired the distinction made by Moses between Jew and Gentile to be maintained in his churches (cf. 1 Co 7^{18}, Gal 5^{3}; see also art. LAW, p. 690^{b}). Furthermore, even as regards a Gentile Christian community, the Apostle could appeal to particular regulations of the Mosaic Law as expressions of the Divine will in contrast to the dictates of human reason (1 Co $9^{8f.}$; cf. 1 Ti 5^{18}, where the same OT passage—Dt 25^{4}—is placed side by side with a saying of Jesus)—just as elsewhere he frequently refers to special provisions of the Law, or to the Law as a whole. Yet this in no way detracts from the validity of the principle that all things are spiritually judged (1 Co $2^{14f.}$), and that nothing is to be enforced according to the letter which killeth (2 Co 3^{6}), the regulative canon being that the external statutes, 'the commandments in ordinances' (Eph 2^{15}), are merely the shadow of things to come, while the body is Christ's (Col 2^{17})—whence it follows that the outward regulations of the Law are to be applied in a typological (or allegorical) way. A further result was a certain relaxation of the Mosaic ordinances relating to practical life, enabling the Jewish Christians to live in brotherly intercourse with the believing Gentiles.

---

* A detailed explanation of this development is given in the art. LAW.

In this connexion, however, certain difficulties arose which seemed actually to necessitate some limitation of Gentile Christian liberty, and it was this state of things that led the primitive Church to promulgate the 'Apostolic Decree.' According to Ac 15^{19-21}, St. James, the brother of the Lord, justified his proposal regarding the Decree by the circumstance that 'Moses from generations of old hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every sabbath.' The point of this statement is much debated. Does St. James mean thereby that the apostles do not need to trouble regarding the dissemination of the Mosaic legislation, and that they should therefore lay upon the Gentile Christians nothing beyond the four prohibitions specified by him, since Moses had from of old been sufficiently represented throughout the Diaspora (so *e.g.* Zahn)? If this be the true interpretation, the statement of St. James fails to explain why these particular prohibitions were fixed upon. We must thus rather look for an interpretation according to which v.^{21} provides a reason why precisely these four injunctions were laid upon the Gentile churches. Such a reading of the passage would be as follows: Since, not only in the Holy Land, but also in heathen lands, the doctrines of Moses are every Sabbath inculcated upon those who attend the Synagogue, it is necessary that the believing Gentiles—like the so-called 'God-fearing' (*οἱ σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν*)—should give some consideration to the Mosaic Law, and should at least abstain from taking part in those heathen practices which were most revolting to the Jewish mind. The prohibitions of the Apostolic Decree, which resemble those imposed upon Jewish proselytes, were probably framed in conformity with Lv 17. 18, which contain, *inter alia*, laws to be observed by aliens resident in the land of Israel. They seem at first sight to be a strange mingling of moral and purely ritual laws, the prohibition of sexual immorality being conjoined with three interdicts about food (cf. Ac 15^{29}). But while this collocation has certainly an appearance of arbitrariness, a glance at Rev 2^{20-24} (where we undoubtedly hear an echo of the Apostolic Decree), as also a comparison with 1 Co $10^{7f.}$, shows us that abstinence from idolatrous sacrifices and abstinence from sexual immorality are closely related, and that *πορνεία* here refers not merely to the forbidden degrees of marriage but also to ceremonial prostitution; the Gentile Christians must abstain both from taking part in the sacrificial meals of the heathen world and from the immoralities connected therewith, *i.e.* from practices regarded among the heathen as *adiaphora* (cf. 1 Co 6^{12}). As regards the other two restrictions, it is clear that they converge upon a single point—the supreme necessity of maintaining the sacredness of blood in every form, as already recognized in the so-called Noachian dispensation: the believing Gentiles must no longer partake of blood either in the flesh or by itself (*e.g.* mixed with wine, as drunk by the heathen in their sacrificial feasts); in other words, only the flesh of ritually slaughtered animals may be eaten.

The essential equivalence of these two prohibitions might also explain the uncertainty attaching to the reading *πνικτοῦ* in the textual tradition. Here, however, another consideration arises. In the Western text, which omits *καὶ πνικτοῦ* (*πνικτῶν*), we find an addition which points to an entirely different conception of the Apostolic Decree, viz. *καὶ ὅσα μὴ θέλουσιν ἑαυτοῖς γίνεσθαι ἑτέροις μὴ ποιεῖν* (15^{20}; so D, Iren., Tert., Cypr., some Minuscules, and the Sahidic). The 'golden rule' being thus added to the prohibitions of idolatrous sacrifices, fornication, and blood, the Decree is transformed into a short moral catechism, in which are forbidden the three cardinal vices—idolatry, fornication, and murder (*αἷμα*='shedding of blood'). But although the genuineness of this form of the text is defended by able scholars, such as Blass and Harnack, it should in all probability be rejected as of secondary origin. For not only is the golden rule introduced most inaptly in a formal respect, but the purely ethical character of the decree as thus transformed presupposes the conditions of a later time—a time when the Church was no longer concerned with the specific problem that had called for the attention of the Apostolic Council; in the West, where the 'ethical' form of the Decree took its rise, Jewish Christianity was a relatively insignificant force, and what was wanted there was a brief compendium of the anti-heathen morality of Christianity. At the same time, however, the altered form of the Decree shows that the Church never regarded it as an inviolable law, but thought of it simply as a provisional arrangement which might be varied to suit local and temporary circumstances.

In Rev 2 the prohibitions of idolatrous sacrifices and (ritual) immorality are once more brought to view, while in 1 Co 6^{8-10} St. Paul urges the same restrictions, though without appealing to the Apostolic Decree. Nor, strangely enough, does he mention the Decree in Gal 2^{1-10}; this, however, would be sufficiently explained on the ground that the Apostle had emphasized its provisions (which, be it remembered, were not new, but had already found a regular place in the Jewish propaganda) in his missionary labours in the Galatian region (Ac 16^{6}). In that case it was not necessary that he should complicate the deliverance of the Council as to the recognition of his gospel and his apostolic status by mentioning the Decree, and all the less so because the account in Ac 15 does not imply that St. Paul himself was charged with the duty of enforcing its provisions in his missionary sphere.

We may sum up the whole by saying that while primitive Christianity originally set Moses and Jesus side by side, it came at length, in the process of development, to contrast them with each other, and St. John, in the Prologue to his Gospel, gives expression to this result in his great saying: 'The law was given by Moses; grace and truth came by Jesus Christ' (1^{17}).

LITERATURE.—H. H. Wendt, *Apostelgeschichte*^{8}, in Meyer's *Kommentar*, 1899; G. Hoennicke, *Apostelgeschichte*, Leipzig, 1913; text-books of *NT Theology*, by B. Weiss (Eng. tr., 1882–83), H. J. Holtzmann (^{2}1911), P. Feine (1910), G. B. Stevens (1899); E. B. Reuss, *Hist. of Christian Theology in the Apostolic Age*, Eng. tr., 1872–74, i. 139, 205, etc.; J R. Cohu, *St. Paul*, 1911, p. 40 ff.; A. E. Garvie, *Studies of Paul and his Gospel*, 1911, p. 192 ff.

OLAF MOE.

MOTHER.—See FAMILY.

MOUNT, MOUNTAIN (*ὄρος*).—'Mountain' is a somewhat elastic term expressing not only an isolated peak, but an extended range, or even a whole district of high elevation. Palestine being an exceptionally mountainous country, it was natural that Biblical writers should often allude to its physical features; but it is noteworthy that they spend little time in describing the mere scenery. To the ancients mountains played a conspicuous part in religion; they were not infrequently the scenes of theophanies, and when great men, such as Aaron and Moses, died, they were buried on the tops of mountains. Mountains are also the natural image for eternal continuance and stability. But even these monuments of firmness and stability are pictured as moved out of their place in the final cataclysm (Rev 6^{14} 16^{20}).

In apostolic history four conspicuous mountains are especially referred to: the Mount of Olives, Sinai, Zion, and 'the Mount' (of Transfiguration).

1. The Mount of Olives (*τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν*, Ac 1^{12}).—In this passage it is related that after the Ascension the disciples returned 'unto Jerusalem from the mount called Olivet.' Apostolic history thus begins, geographically, where Gospel history leaves off (cf. Lk 24^{50-53}, Mk $6^{19.\,20}$). The Mount of Olives, called by the Muslims *Jebel et-Tur* ('Mountain of Light'), and *Jebel ez-Zeitun* ('Mount of Olives'), is the name of the somewhat elevated range (*c.* 2,650 ft.) lying due east of the Holy City and separated from it by the deep Kidron ravine. Its northern portion is called *Scopus* by Josephus (*BJ* v. ii. 3); its southern is known to the Arabs as *Batn el-Hawa*, and by many is identified as the 'Mount of Offence.' The distance from Jerusalem to its summit is 2,000 cubits, or about 6 furlongs. This was fixed by the Rabbis as the maximum distance to be travelled on the Sabbath day. The view from Olivet is one of the most extensive in all Palestine, including the Holy City, the hill country of Judæa, much of the Jordan Valley, a portion of the Dead Sea, and the broad sweep of the mountains of Gilead and Moab.

2. Mount Sinai (Σινᾶ, Ac $7^{30.\,38}$, Gal $4^{24.\,25}$, He 8^{5} $12^{18.\,20}$).—In the first of these passages (Ac $7^{30.\,38}$) the martyr Stephen recalls to his murderers' minds Moses' vision of the Burning Bush (Ex $3^{1\text{ff.}}$), and thus defends himself against the charge of speaking against Moses and the Law. In the second (Gal $4^{24.\,25}$) St. Paul makes Hagar, Abraham's bondwoman, representative of the earthly Jerusalem and the bondage of the Law, whereas Sarah was free and represents the heavenly Jerusalem and the freedom of the gospel. Hagar's son Ishmael was a child according to the course of nature, whereas the birth of Isaac was according to the promise, and therefore a Divine event. The whole OT story is here allegorized, and is intended to show the incompatibility of a spirit of bondage with a spirit of sonship. Mount Sinai is usually identified with *Jebel Musa* (*c.* 7,000 ft. in altitude), though some prefer to identify it with *Jebel Serbal* (*c.* 6,500 ft.), a few miles to the N.W. of the former, both being located in the southern portion of the Sinai Peninsula. Of the two passages in Hebrews, the first (8^{5}) affirms that the tabernacle constructed in the wilderness was a mere copy and shadow of the heavenly things, made by Moses according to the pattern that was showed him in the Mount (cf. Ex 25^{40}). Even the furniture of the earthly tabernacle had its heavenly archetypes; so also the priesthood of Aaron and his descendants is but a copy of the priesthood of Jesus. In the other passage from Hebrews (12^{18-24}) the terrors of the Old Covenant, given at Sinai, are contrasted with the glories of the New. The words 'a mount' are not in the original of v.^{18}, but they are implied by the words 'mount Zion' in v.^{22} (cf. v.^{20}). The Apostle paints the theophany of Sinai (Ex 19) vividly, in order to appal his readers with the awful sanctity of the mountain where God proclaimed His Law. So great was the sacredness of the mountain, indeed, that even unconscious trespass was visited by death.

3. Mount Zion (Σιών, He 12^{22}).—Over against Sinai, which quaked at the giving of the Law, the Apostle places Zion, using it, however, in a spiritual sense: 'But ye are come unto mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem,' etc. The contrast between the two Dispensations is thus emphasized: Sinai, sensible, provisional, and accompanied by the physical phenomena of the world; Zion, ideal, super-sensible, abiding, final, and pertaining to the world above. To the Apostle, Zion is here not the earthly Jerusalem, but the heavenly world of realities, 'Jerusalem the golden.' As there was a Zion below after the order of the world, there is also a Zion above true to the ideal; the one here is only the symbolic abode of God, that above is His real abode; yea, the abode also of the Lamb (Rev 14^{1}).

4. 'The Holy Mount.'—The expression occurs in St. Peter's description of the transfigured glory of Christ, 'when we were with him in the holy mount' (*ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῷ ἁγίῳ*, 2 P 1^{18}). Doubtless the Mount of Transfiguration is meant (cf. Mt 17^{1-13}). This was very probably one of the spurs of Mount Hermon, *Jebel esh-Sheikh*, 'the mount of the chief.' It is the highest peak in all Palestine and Syria, rising 9,050 ft. above sea-level, and covered with snow during a great part of the year. The name 'Hermon' signifies that it was considered sacred.

5. The other references in apostolic history to 'mountains' are for the most part mere figures of speech. For example, St. Paul says in his matchless pæan on love (1 Co 13^{2}), 'And if I have all faith, so as to remove mountains.' Mountains were the image of eternal stability, yet, though one had faith to remove the unmovable, without love one would be nothing. In He 11^{38} there is an allusion to the sacrifices which the heroes of faith endured in OT times, wandering 'in deserts and mountains'—mountains being symbols of the difficulties and dangers of life. On the other hand, the apostle John, attempting to describe the terrors of the Final Judgment, pictures kings as hiding themselves 'in the caves and in the rocks of the mountains,' and as saying 'to the mountains and to the rocks, Fall on us and hide us, etc.' (Rev $6^{15.\,16}$), the swift agony of being crushed to death being considered preferable, as the implication is, to being left face to face with an angry God. The same Seer, when the second angel sounded, beheld a great burning mountain cast into the sea (Rev 8^{8}). Perhaps he had seen such phenomena in his lonely life of exile amid the islands of the Ægean! The allusion in Rev 17^{9} is likewise figurative, 'The seven heads are seven mountains.' Finally, the Apostle is 'carried in the spirit to a mountain great and high' (Rev 21^{10}), from which as a vantage-ground of elevation he saw 'the holy city Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God.' This was St. John's mode of describing heaven. There is a peculiar ecstasy associated with mountain tops, even to the most prosaic.

GEORGE L. ROBINSON.

MOURNING.—Mourning is primarily the expression of sorrow for the dead; but the term is also applied to the grief over sin and to the distress over calamity.

1. A list of mourning customs among the Hebrews will be found in the art. 'Mourning' in *HDB*. Among them are weeping and wailing of an intentionally demonstrative and unrestrained kind, the rending of garments, the wearing of sackcloth, the sprinkling of dust and ashes on the head, the striking of breast and head, fasting, ejaculations of woe, the recital of elegies for the

departed. Reference is made to several of these customs in the description given in Rev 18 of the mourning over the destruction of Babylon. The worldly kings, the merchants and mariners, act as mourners: they weep and wail, cast dust upon their heads, utter exclamations of woe, and in turn dirgefully declare the past glories of the fallen (v.$^{10f.}$). The term *κοπετόν* (used in Ac 8^{2} to indicate the lamentation of the devout men over Stephen; cf. *κόψονται* [Rev 1^{7} 18^{9}]; derivation, *κόπτειν*, 'to strike') indicates the association of the beating of head and breast with mourning. In Ac 9$^{36f.}$ the widows gather round the body of Dorcas, weep and recount her good deeds. In Ja 5^{1} the rich are bidden to weep and howl, *i.e.* as wailing mourners.

2. The Pauline version of the eucharist introduces the words, 'Do this in remembrance of me' (*εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*), and the rite is regarded as a proclamation of the Lord's death till He come (1 Co 11$^{24-26}$). This language suggests a comparison with the customs of commemorative mourning for the dead (cf. the annual lamentation for Jephthah's daughter [Jg 11^{40}]; see art. 'Jahrzeit' in *JE*). If the Pauline version of the eucharist has been influenced by the mysteries, the mourning customs for Attis and Adonis ('weeping for Tammuz,' see J. G. Frazer's *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*^{3}, 1914) may not be without significance for the study of this feature of the Lord's Supper.

3. The gravity with which sin was regarded is suggested by the application of terms of mourning to the grief over transgression. Sinners are bidden, as a sign of humble penitence, to be afflicted, mourn, and weep. Laughter is to be turned to mourning (Ja 4^{9}; cf. 1 K 1^{27}). Among the welcome indications of a repentant Corinthian church is its mourning (*ὀδυρμός* [2 Co 7^{7}]). The idea in the writer's mind in Rev 1^{7} ('Behold, he cometh with the clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they that pierced him, and all the tribes of the earth shall mourn over him') was probably the mourning of guilt, regret, and shame—there was no need to mourn a living Christ returning in glory. Possibly, however, the words indicate that now all nations recognized that the ignominiously crucified One was worthy of a world's mourning.

4. National calamity is presented under the figure of a bereavement (cf. the mourning for Israel [Jl 1$^{8.13}$]). Babylon in her strength boasts, 'No widow am I, and shall in no wise see mourning' (Rev 18^{7}). In a day she knows the widowhood of retributive disaster (v.^{8}). The representation changes—widowed Babylon is herself mourned for by others (vv.$^{8-19}$); see 1.

5. The emphasis placed by the early Church on the overthrow of death as an elemental power by the resurrection of Jesus, on the certainty of a future life, the conception of a fuller, richer existence beyond the grave—a 'clothing upon' rather than a stripping of personality—all tended to rob death of its sting and the grave of its victory. The believer had no need to sorrow as did the rest that had no hope. On the other hand, it is significant that the parting of St. Paul from his children in the faith at Miletus, who expected to see him no more, was with loud lamentation (Ac 20^{36}), and the Apostle felt that the severance from the brethren at Cæsarea was breaking his heart (21^{13}). Faith lights up the tomb, but does not make the human heart unnatural. Human grief 'will have way' until, as in the Apocalyptist's vision, God shall wipe away all tears from men's eyes, and death and mourning shall be no more (Rev 21^{4}).

H. Bulcock.

MOUTH, LIPS.—As in the OT, the mouth (*στόμα*) and lips (*χεῖλη*) are sometimes named simply as a result of the particularization to which graphic description tends, especially in the Oriental world (*e.g.* Ac 8^{35} 11^{8}, He 11^{33}, Rev 3^{16}). We may usually, however, trace the influence of Hebrew psychology, which ascribed psychical or ethical quality even to peripheral organs, regarding them as constituent parts of the unity of personality (cf. H. W. Robinson, in *Mansfield College Essays*, 1909, p. 275). Isaiah's lips were purged of their uncleanness by the coal from the altar (Is 6$^{6.7}$); with this we may compare the command of the high priest to smite St. Paul on the mouth (Ac 23^{2})—a command prompted by the apparent blasphemy of which that organ had been guilty. The same idea underlies the demand that the mouths of evil speakers be stopped (Tit 1^{11}, *ἐπιστομίζειν*; cf. Ro 3^{19} and the contrasted statement of 2 Co 6^{11}). Even in such purely imaginative descriptions as those of Christ seen in vision, with the sword proceeding from His mouth (Rev 1^{16}, etc.; cf. 2 Th 2^{8}), or of the frog-vomiting mouths of the three evil powers in the Apocalypse (16^{13}), the latent psychology helps to explain the harshness of the metaphor. 'The mouth as the organ of speech, the chief source of human influence, is frequently in the Apocalypse the instrument of good or evil' (H. B. Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*^{3}, 1907, p. 207).[*] The detached ethical quality of the organ of speech gives added force to such apostolic words as 'mortify your members . . . put away . . . shameful speaking out of your mouth' (Col 3$^{5-8}$); 'in their mouth was found no lie' (Rev 14^{5}); 'out of the same mouth cometh forth blessing and cursing' (Ja 3^{10}); 'the poison of asps is under their lips' (Ro 3^{13}= Ps 140^{3}).

In apostolic writings, the mouth has a three-fold function in regard to the proclamation of truth—viz. revelation, evangelization, and confession. It was the instrument of the original revelation of the OT, given, *e.g.*, through the 'mouth' of David (Ac 1^{16} 4^{25}) or of the prophets (3$^{18.21}$). It is the instrument of gospel-preaching (Ac 15^{7}, Eph 6^{19}; cf. *Odes of Solomon*, xlii. 6), and the *Epistle of Barnabas* claims that 'every word, which shall come forth from you through your mouth in faith and love, shall be for the conversion and hope of many' (xi. 8). It is the instrument of that confession which is necessary in order to unite the whole personality, body and soul, with its Redeemer: 'the word is nigh thee, in thy mouth . . . with the mouth confession is made unto salvation' (Ro 10$^{8-10}$). This confession elsewhere appears as 'a sacrifice of praise,' 'the fruit of lips which make confession to his name' (He 13^{15}; cf. Is 57^{19} and the LXX of Hos 14^{2}). The unity of outer word and inner experience in the case of the true Christian is frequently emphasized in the *Odes of Solomon*, *e.g.* xxi. 7: 'my heart ran over and was found in my mouth: and it arose upon my lips.' On the other hand, the painful contrast possible between the spoken testimony and the real character of the life was not absent even from these early Christian communities; *e.g.* Hermas speaks of those 'that have the Lord on their lips, while their heart is hardened' (*Mand.* XII. iv. 4; cf. *Sim.* IX. xxi. 1, 1 Clem. xv. 2, 2 Clem. iii. 4).

See also artt. Man and Tongue.

H. Wheeler Robinson.

MURDER.—The prevalence of murder was one of the dark facts in the social and political background of the early Apostolic Church. Fanaticism of a fierce and ruthless type was in the air, and human life was frequently as little regarded as is normal under such conditions. The resentment of the Zealots against the authority of Rome was a persistent fact in the situation from the third decade to the final catastrophe in A.D. 70, and when cruelty and oppression were carried to excess by Felix it was inevitable that there should arise in opposition a body of extremists to whom murder was merely a detail in a policy.

---

[*] In Rev 10$^{9.10}$ the mouth is the organ of taste; according to the curious statement of *Ep. Barn.* x. 8, the weasel conceives through her mouth.

Thus during the time of Felix and Festus there arose the *Sicarii* (see ASSASSINS), whose Jewish patriotism took a murderous shape. Their weapons were daggers (*sicæ*; cf. Latin *sicarius*, 'a murderer.' The law passed under Sulla against murderers was *Lex Cornelia de Sicariis*). Armed with these, they moved with stealth through the crowds at festival seasons, seeking to remove their opponents by assassination. Then, in order to turn aside any possible suspicion, they gave way to loud expressions of grief. We find a reference to this group in Ac 21^{38}, where the chief captain (ὁ χιλίαρχος), finding that St. Paul speaks Greek, asks: 'Art thou not then that Egyptian, which before these days stirred up to sedition and led out into the wilderness the four thousand men of the Assassins (τετρακισχιλίους ἄνδρας τῶν σικαρίων)?' The Sicarii must have been the easy instrument at hand to every clever impostor, and the incident referred to here was the most notable example. An Egyptian Jew gave himself out as a prophet and held out to a crowd in the wildnerness the alluring promise that the walls of Jerusalem would fall down at his word and so make the city theirs once more. Felix, however, put down the movement and took many prisoners. Josephus gives two accounts of this false prophet, in one of which (*BJ* II. xiii. 5) he says that the majority of the 30,000 followers were captured or slain, and in the other (*Ant.* XX. viii. 6) that four hundred were killed and two hundred taken prisoners.

That murder was not unknown even among those identified with the Church may be inferred from 1 P 4^{15}, where the writer addresses a warning to Christians. They are not to resent the fiery trial, but to rejoice as those sharing the sufferings of Christ—only 'Let none of you suffer as a murderer (ὡς φονεύς).' In later days it was a commonplace of anti-Christian abuse to charge Christians with the horrors of child-slaying and cannibalism, but there seems to be no sufficient reason for reading into the passage quoted any reference to these charges. As C. Bigg has said, 'A Christian might quite well be guilty of murder. The times were wild, and conversions must often have been imperfect' (*ICC*, 'Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude,' Edinburgh, 1901, p. 177).

R. STRONG.

MURMURING.—The non-classical 'vernacular terms' (H. A. A. Kennedy, *Sources of NT Greek*, 1895, p. 38 ff.) γογγυσμός and γογγύζειν are used seven times in the LXX in reference to Israel in the wilderness. The verb is used in the same connexion in 1 Co 10^{10}—'Neither murmur ye, as some of them murmured, and perished by the destroyer,' the allusion being apparently to the rebellion of Korah against the authority of Moses and Aaron, which was followed by the punishment of violent death (Nu 16). The OT reference and the evil of partisanship which had become conspicuous at Corinth (1 Co 1^{12} 3^{6} $4^{6.\ 18f.}$) suggest that the 'murmuring' the Apostle had in mind was that of schismatic discontent in the Church, rather than that of complaint against Providence because of the limitations of the human lot—the sense which the term most naturally suggests to us.

The second Pauline passage where the term occurs ('Do all things without murmurings and disputations' [Ph 2^{14}]), follows an appeal for Church harmony (vv.$^{1-4}$; cf. 4^{2}) and is obviously a warning similar to that of 1 Co 10^{10}. The quotation from the Song of Moses (Dt 32^{5} LXX) in the following verses hints that the history in the wilderness is again in the author's mind.

The 'murmurers' of Jude's letter (v.^{16}) are the false teachers who have crept into the Church and are fostering discontent for their own advantage, challenging (Church) authority and railing at 'dignities' (v.^{8}). Again there is a reference to the incident of Korah (v.^{11}).

The murmuring of the Grecian Jews against the Hebrews (Ac 6^{1})—a complaint against Church administration—is the only instance where murmuring has not a conspicuous reproof. Even here the language of the Apostles (vv.$^{2.\ 4}$) may hint censure.

In 1 P 4^{9} ('using hospitality one to another without murmuring') the reference appears to be to the grumbling against the obligation, *imposed by Church tradition*, of mutual hospitality among Christians (cf. the communistic spirit of Ac 2^{44}). The AV translation 'without grudging' (so also Weymouth) misses the above significance.

The term thus appears to have been used by the NT writers in a specific sense (suggested by the classical instance of Korah) of disloyalty in one way or another to the Church, its traditions, its harmony and unity. 1 Co 10^{10} and Jude ^{16} suggest that, as in the case of Korah, such murmurings are really against God Himself. H. BULCOCK.

MUSIC.—See PRAISE, and artt. on various Musical Instruments.

MYRA (Μύρα, a neut. plur.; often written Μύρρα, as in B).—Myra was 'a city of Lycia' (Ac 27^{5}), situated on a hill 2½ miles from the sea (Strabo, XIV. iii. 7), and the name often included the seaport of Andriaca. In the time of the Ptolemys, Myra shared with other Lycian towns the benefits of a great maritime traffic which was developed between Egypt and Asia Minor; and when Rome became mistress of the world, the conditions of navigation in the Mediterranean made Myra a place of growing importance. The corn-ships of Alexandria, which brought food to the population of Rome, were in the habit of sailing due north to Lycia, making Myra a place of call, and then proceeding westward. This long route was the shortest in the end. Instead of sailing straight for Italy, and, in doing so, contending with the westerly winds which prevail in the Eastern Mediterranean during the summer months, it was better seamanship to make for the S.W. of Asia Minor, and then get under the protection of the south coast of Crete. When, therefore, the centurion who brought St. Paul from Cæsarea found an Alexandrian corn-ship in the harbour of Myra, about to continue her course to Italy, this was no surprising occurrence. It was not an unlucky event which made a disastrous change in his plans, as T. Lewin suggests (*The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*^{3}, 1875, ii. 187). It was exactly what he had expected. Before he began his voyage he no doubt calculated on being able to trans-ship into one of the vessels of that great fleet of corn-ships which linked the names of Alexandria and Myra in the common talk of all men of the sea.

St. Nicholas, one of the bishops of Myra, became the patron saint of Levantine sailors. Myra was still an important city in the Middle Ages, being known as the *portus Adriatici maris* when 'the Adriatic' included the whole Levant.

Both Myra, which is now called *Dembre*, and Andriaca have some interesting ruins.

LITERATURE.—W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, London, 1895, p. 298 f.; E. Petersen and F. v. Luschan, *Reisen in Lykien, Milyas und Kibyratis*, Vienna, 1889. JAMES STRAHAN.

MYSIA (Μυσία).—Mysia was an ill-defined country in the N.W. of Asia Minor, having the

Ægean, the Hellespont, and the Propontis on the W. and N., Bithynia on the N.E., and the equally ill-defined regions of Phrygia and Mysia on the S.E. and S. The absence of landmarks between the land of the Mysians and that of the Phrygians gave rise to the saying, *χωρὶς τὰ Μυσῶν καὶ Φρυγῶν ὁρίσματα.* ‘The reason is this: strangers who came into the country were soldiers and barbarians; they had no fixed settlement in the country of which they obtained possession, but were, for the most part, wanderers, expelling others from their territory and being expelled themselves’ (Strabo, XII. iv. 4). For the most part a mountainous country, Mysia was not so productive as Lydia and Caria. It was sometimes regarded as including the Troad in the W., sometimes as separated therefrom by the river Æsepus. The river Caicus and Mount Temnos were usually taken as the southern limits, and the district of Phrygia Epictetus, which extends a considerable distance eastward—as far as Dorylæum and Nakoleia—was at one time in the hands of the Mysians. The Romans, who showed little regard for ethnical distinctions, absorbed Mysia in the great province of Asia.

Mysia is referred to in an important but difficult passage of Acts (16$^{7.8}$). St. Paul and Silas, having in the second missionary tour ‘come over against Mysia’ (*ἐλθόντες κατὰ τὴν Μυσίαν*), were restrained by the Spirit of Jesus from going into Bithynia; whereupon they turned westward, and ‘passing by Mysia (*παρελθόντες τὴν Μυσίαν*) they came down to Troas’ (Ac 16$^{7.8}$). For a discussion of the vexed question as to the apostles’ movements before they came to the borders of Bithynia and over against Mysia see PHRYGIA and GALATIA. Assuming that St. Paul and Silas were travelling from Pisidian Antioch northward through Phrygian Asia, Ramsay observes that they would be ‘over against Mysia’ when they reached such a point that a line drawn across the country at right angles to the general line of their route would touch Mysia (*The Church in the Roman Empire*, 1893, p. 75 n.). This point would be the city of Dorylæum. From there they turned due westward, and, ‘passing by,’ or neglecting, Mysia—this does not mean passing along its borders, but going straight through it without pausing to do any evangelistic work in it—they came down to the Ægean. The other reading, *διελθόντες*, preferred by Blass despite its weak authority (D and Vulgate), seems in Acts and the Pauline Epistles invariably to designate a missionary tour, which is in this case out of the question, as the apostles have just been forbidden to preach in Asia (Ac 16^{6}). The distance from Dorylæum to Troas is about 240 miles. The route would lead through the valley of the Rhyndacus and the town of Apameia, where there is a local tradition of a Pauline visit (*ExpT* x. [1898–99] 495).

JAMES STRAHAN.

MYSTERY, MYSTERIES.—1. Meaning and usage.—The word ‘mystery’ (*μυστήριον*) is derived from the Greek *μυεῖν*, ‘to initiate’; but it is also connected with *μύειν*, ‘to shut the eyes *or* the mouth.’ Consequently it stands for rites and truths which must be closely guarded by those who possess them. J. E. Harrison (*Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, Cambridge, 1903, p. 154) ventures to suggest as its source *μύσος*, ‘pollution.’ And, since in her judgment the aim of the mysteries is primarily purification, the *μύσος*, or pollution, from which the liberation is desired, gives the ceremonies of purification their name. But this derivation restricts the compass of the word, and leaves its use in the Scriptures unintelligible. Whence did it come into Christian use? Was it taken over from pagan sources, or did it reach the writers of the NT and of the early Christian literature through Jewish channels? There is sufficient ground to decide for the latter view. The word occurs several times in the LXX (*e.g.* in Dn 2$^{18.19.27.28.29.30.47}$ 4^{6}); it meets us again in some of the apocryphal books (Sir 3^{22} 22^{22} 27^{16}, Wis 2^{22} 6^{22}, To 12$^{7.11}$, Jth 2^{2}, 2 Mac 13^{21}). In these passages the word is applied to dreams and their interpretation, or else to the political and military plans of the king which have not been divulged. These plans are the king’s secrets, which no one should know until he has revealed them or put them in operation (G. Anrich, *Das antike Mysterienwesen*, p. 144; Hans von Soden, *ZNTW* xii. [1911] 197). Von Soden says that without doubt the passages in the book of Daniel suggest the origin of the NT use of *μυστήριον*, ‘mystery.’ The idea of the king’s secrets becomes that of God’s secrets, the plans of God, which remain hidden until He reveals them. This is already apparent in the *Book of Enoch* (ciii. 2, civ. 10, cvi. 19). In the Gospels the word occurs in this sense. But singularly it is found in only one Synoptic passage (Mk 4^{11}, Mt 13^{11}, Lk 8^{10}), which, according to Carl Clemen, contains no word of the Lord (*Der Einfluss der Mysterienreligionen*, p. 24), whereas in the Fourth Gospel, which some critics view as the most Hellenistic of all the Gospels, it is not found at all. From this solitary occurrence we may infer that the word had no attraction for the writers as a means for expressing their thought. But evidently it had a charm for St. Paul. He uses it 21 times in his Epistles, of which 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, and Colossians give us by far the largest number of examples. In every case the word retains its LXX meaning, which leads Von Soden to affirm that St. Paul did not borrow the word from the Greek, but from Jewish sources. It may have already become characteristic of Jewish eschatology, but Von Soden intimates that it was now a term of Jewish Christian theology which St. Paul both used and developed still further (see A. Schweitzer, *Geschichte der paulinischen Forschung*, Tübingen, 1911, p. 141 ff.). It is possible that St. Paul made this term conspicuous in his Epistles in order to oppose it to the same term as used in the mystery-religions. But it has yet to be demonstrated that he was familiar with their thought, terms, and rites. W. M. Ramsay’s fine discussion of the matter in his *Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day*, London, 1913, pp. 283–305, needs more proofs than those given by him to carry conviction. The only one of the mysteries prevalent in St. Paul’s sphere of work was the Attis-cult, but he gives no hint of a knowledge of it save in the obscure passage in Col 2 discussed by Ramsay.

The word occurs in the early Church Fathers with noticeable infrequency. It is absent in the writings of Clement, Barnabas, and Hermas. It appears three times in the Epistles of Ignatius (*ad Eph.* xix. 1, *ad Magn.* ix. 1–3, *ad Trall.* ii. 3) and twice this number in the anonymous *Epistle to Diognetus* (iv. 6, vii. 1–2, viii. 10, x. 7, xi. 2, 5). In the *Didache*, or *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, it occurs only once (xi. 11). In these passages *μυστήριον* is no central conception and no sacrament, although T. Zahn explains the term ‘mysteries’ in Ignatius, *ad Trall.* ii. 3, as baptism and the Lord’s Supper (*Ignatius von Antiochien*, Gotha, 1873, p. 323)—an explanation rejected by both Lightfoot and Srawley. The mysteries are in the main the Incarnation and the Atonement of Christ.

The Apologists using the word took another step. In the writings of Aristides, Athenagoras, and Tatian the word is wanting; but in Justin it occurs many times, and usually signifies not any particular rite, but 'the whole complex of religion' in which the Passion of Christ pre-eminently appears (*Apol.* i. 13; *Dial.* 74, 91, 106, 121). It is placed by him on the same plane with symbol or parable or type, a usage which continues until the time of Augustine. The serpent is a mystery or symbol (*Apol.* i. 27); a prophecy is a mystery: 'that which God said to David symbolically [ἐν μυστηρίῳ] was interpreted by Isaiah as to how it would actually come to pass' (*Dial.* 68, quoted by E. Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*, Oxford, 1889, p. 60). Justin, however, does not go much beyond his predecessors except to emphasize cosmological and ethical aspects. But he is the first to compare the Christian μυστήριον in its individual features with the pagan mysteries (*Apol.* i. 66; cf. i. 25, 27). This was ominous, for it tended to weaken the idea that the Christian mystery is peculiar and distinct, although Justin shows in his condemnation of the pagan rite that he had no thought of bringing about this result.

Irenæus uses the term in a Gnostic sense. It stands for what he calls 'these portentous and profound mysteries,' against which he writes his famous work, *c. Hæreses.* Therefore little light is thrown by him on the word 'mystery' as it was used in the early Church. However, from him is drawn much of the information which enables us to determine to some extent the Gnostic conception of 'mystery.' Apparently he represents it as magical in character (see, *e.g.*, *Hær.* I. xiii. 2). The Gnostic conception is important, for it is regarded by some as introducing the change of the idea of mystery in the Christian Church. Carl Schmidt, Harnack, and others view the sacramentalism of Gnosticism as an anticipation of Christian sacramentalism. But to this Catholicism replies that the relationship was just the reverse, and, therefore, that Gnostic sacramentalism found its source in the sacramental ideas of the Church (Schmidt, *TU* viii. [1892] 525; A. Struckmann, *Die Gegenwart Christi*, Vienna, 1905, p. 97; *CQR* xlii. [1896] 412). Neither position has thus far been sufficiently substantiated to carry conviction.

Two great writers at the end of the 2nd cent. did exercise a marked influence on the Christian conception of 'mystery.' One was Clement of Alexandria, who brought the Christian sacramental idea still nearer to that of the pagan cults. Von Soden affirms that 'with him an essential extension and a hellenizing change of the use of μυστήριον begins' (*ZNTW* xii. 205), and E. Bratke in his article 'Die Stellung des Clem. Alex. zum antiken Mysterienwesen,' in *SK* lx. [1887] i. 647) is an ardent advocate of the same belief. Anrich takes a similar view but is more cautious in his support of it (*Das antike Mysterienwesen*, p. 140). From the time of Clement the Christian sacraments began to be called the Christian mysteries; and, while it is possible that they already bore this name, the influence of Clement's writings must have done much to establish it. He speaks of Christ as initiating us into the mysteries, and quotes from Euripides, *Bacchæ*, 470–473: 'Seeing those who see he bestows his mysteries. Of what fashion are these mysteries? Secret except to the initiate' (*Strom.* iv. 25). Christianity is the true Divine mystery, a mystical miracle; consequently the Church is an institution of mysteries (*Protrept.* 11). We, as perfected Christians, are permitted by Jesus to communicate 'those divine mysteries' and 'that holy light' to persons capable of receiving them (*Strom.* i. 1). In the same chapter Clement says that 'there are some mysteries before other mysteries.' He also draws a direct parallel between Christianity on one side and the Eleusinian and Dionysiac cults on the other (*Protrept.* 12). Clement had no intention, as Bratke seems to imply (*SK* lx. 662; cf. Anrich, *Das antike Mysterienwesen*, p. 140), of breaking down all demarcations between Christianity and heathenism, nor was he bent on an accommodation of one to the other. But his use of mystery terminology, which he probably drew from the philosophy of his day rather than directly from the cults, must have affected the Christian conception of mystery and given it the idea of a secrecy that could be uncovered only to the initiated. His doctrine of the sacraments is still a matter of dispute; especially is his view of the Lord's Supper difficult to determine. Almost all the Protestant historians of dogma deny that he believes in a real presence of the body and blood of Christ within and under the consecrated elements. Catholic theologians confidently attribute to him this belief (C. Bigg, *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, Oxford, 1913, p. 105; A. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, ii. [London, 1896] 145; Struckmann, *Die Gegenwart Christi*, p. 117; P. Batiffol, *L'Eucharistie*[6], Paris, 1913, pp. 248–261).

The other great writer who exercised a marked influence on the Christian conception of 'mystery' was Tertullian. He accepted the term *sacramentum* as the Latin rendering of μυστήριον. The earliest use of the Latin word in connexion with Christian life occurs in one of Pliny's letters (*Ep.* x. 96 [97]) wherein he speaks of the Christians as binding themselves by an oath ('seque sacramento . . . obstringere'). But Pliny's use of the term throws no light on its ecclesiastical meaning, for ecclesiastical Latin had not yet come into existence (E. C. S. Gibson, *The Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England*, London, 1896–97, vol. ii. p. 594). The adherents of the mystery-religions were familiar with the word as designating their rites of initiation, particularly the oath of allegiance taken at some point in them. It would be hazardous to state dogmatically how early the word took its place among their religious terms. But 'the votaries of Mithra likened the practice of their religion to military service. When the neophyte joined he was compelled to take an oath (*sacramentum*) similar to the one required of recruits in the army' (F. Cumont, *Oriental Religions*, p. xix). Livy records in his history of Rome the recognition, on the part of the Romans, of the use of the *sacramentum* in the mysteries. In a speech of one of the consuls condemning the Bacchanalian rites, the consul asks, 'Can you think that youths, initiated under such oaths as theirs, are fit to be made soldiers?' ('hoc sacramento initiatos juvenes milites faciendos censetis?', xxxix. 15; cf. x. 38). As an element in mystery terminology *sacramentum* would naturally assume a religious significance, and we understand why its use in the cults awoke hostile suspicions of them among the Romans of the Republic and the early Empire. Even Tertullian occasionally applies the word to the rites of the mystery-religions (*adv. Marc.* i. 13, *adv. Valent.* 30, *Scorp.* 10). Thus its association with the mysteries and its resulting religious character might easily suggest it as a rendering of μυστήριον itself. Points of contact between the two terms would become apparent (F. Kattenbusch, art. 'Sakrament' in *PRE*[3] xvii. 250). And this must have happened speedily, for *sacramentum* represents μυστήριον in the old Latin texts, with some of which Tertullian was evidently familiar. But he himself employed the term in a varied application. On the one hand, he applied it to types and prophecies in the OT (*adv. Marc.* iii. 18, iv. 40; *adv. Jud.* 9, 10, 11, and many other passages in these two works). In this use it is purely a translation of the biblical μυστήριον. On the other hand, he employed it very frequently in the sense of an oath of allegiance or an obligation (*de Cor. Mil.* 11; *adv. Valent.* 30). Between these two applications all other uses of the word fall—namely, as designating baptism, the Eucharist, the rule of faith, salvation, and religion itself. Nothing could show more clearly that the word is not always a strict rendering of 'mystery,' and Tertullian at times seems to have realized this himself.

But how did *sacramentum* come to have the significance of obligation and pledge? Two conceptions are implied in the term: (1) that of a deposit of money, given by persons about to engage in a law-suit, relinquished to the deity by the loser, and thereby becoming actually a sacred or devoted thing; (2) that of the military oath of allegiance taken on the standard. The idea of sacred obligation is thus common to both conceptions. The two were brought closer together by the payment of award for military service (Tacitus, *Hist.* I. lv. 2). Thus *sacramentum* as a military oath assumed the meaning of a sacred bond between the pledge-giver and the pledge-receiver. This characteristic was carried into the significance of sacrament in the terminology of the Church and gave her sacramental rites the nature of pledges. But the idea embodied in *μυστήριον* was still retained, so that *sacramentum* became as well the outward sign of an inward meaning or a spiritual grace. From this it is apparent that *sacramentum* has a wider and more varied meaning than the Greek term, which it, rather than *arcanum*, was chosen to represent.

The full conception held by Tertullian of the sacraments is still a debated question. G. Thomasius (*Die christliche Dogmengeschichte*^{2}, Erlangen, 1886–89, i. 425), Harnack (*History of Dogma*, ii. 145, n. 2), and Roman Catholic theologians (Struckmann, *Die Gegenwart Christi*, p. 229 ff.) attribute to him realistic views, while the great majority of Protestant theologians believe that he held symbolical conceptions. But Harnack is quite sure that 'Leimbach's investigations of Tertullian's use of words have placed this [that Tertullian did not accept a symbolical doctrine] beyond doubt.'

2. The kinds of mystery-religions. — The mystery-religions differed from each other in various ways. Some were State religions, such as the mysteries of Eleusis, near Athens, and the mysteries of Samothrace, an island in the Thracian Sea. Others, enjoying no State recognition, were celebrated in secret associations by private individuals. To the latter class the Orphic mysteries and the mysteries of certain Oriental gods belong. Again, some centred about a male, others about a female divinity. The mysteries of Mithras constitute an example of the former, the mysteries of Cybele and Attis, and the mysteries of Isis, examples of the latter. Miss Harrison remarks (*Prolegomena*, p. 150 f.) that 'in general mysteries seem to occur more usually in relation to the cult of women divinities, of heroines and earth-goddesses,' which is a well-supported statement. In the majority of the cults the female deity plays the chief part; the male deity, Attis, or Adonis, or Osiris, occupies an inferior position. This may be explained by the assumption that the ceremonies of these cults had their remote source in pre-historic rites which were intended to renew the strength of the harvest field and enable it to produce abundant returns. Consequently Mother Earth, with her vegetation unfolding in the spring and disappearing in the autumn, was prominent in the primitive days, and retained her pre-eminence in the persons of the Egyptian Isis, the Phœnician Astarte, the Phrygian Cybele, and the Greek Demeter, although J. G. Frazer (*GB*^{3}, pt. v., *Spirits of the Corn and of the Wild*, London, 1912, i. 40) distinguishes Demeter from Mother Earth. We reach here a striking contrast between the cults on the one side and Christianity on the other. While the pagan deity had his female associate, the Christ of the Christian in the earlier centuries was wholly unaccompanied. It was not until 400 years had elapsed that Mary the Virgin assumed a position in which her relation to Christ could feebly suggest the old association of female and male deities in the mysteries.

In many other respects the mysteries differed from one another. Dissimilarities marked off those of Eleusis from those of Isis; and the mysteries of Mithras possessed a genius or spirit of their own. And yet they were united in one purpose and aim. They were essentially similar; so that they mutually recognized each other and excluded no one on the ground that he belonged to another cult or compelled him on his initiation into the new to relinquish his membership in the old cult. Together they were supposed to confer on the initiate protection against danger, to bring healing to his infirmities, and to assure him of a happy pilgrimage through this world and a blessed immortality in the next. The question of the moral inspiration of the mysteries has been for some time a centre of earnest discussion. Eminent scholars are in disagreement here. So great an authority as E. Rohde (*Psyche*, Freiburg i. B., 1894, i. 298–300) believes that the pagan cults were not uplifting in their effect on the initiate. Others, as H. Lietzmann (*An die Römer* [=*Handbuch zum NT*, ii.], Tübingen, 1906, on Ro 6^{1-4}) and K. H. E. de Jong (*Das antike Mysterienwesen*, p. 69), are equally positive in the belief that the moral effect of the mysteries was elevating and helpful. The fact that the mysteries were pre-eminently ritualistic and formal would support the former view. Their rites of initiation appear to have been regarded as fully capable of accomplishing all that was necessary to bring their subject into union with the deity. Amid such conceptions it is likely that little emphasis would be laid on the need of an upright moral life as an aid. On the other hand, the impressive and, in some respects, beautiful ceremonies would have their influence on the mind and heart of the candidates. It is possible that revolting features characterized the ceremonies of some of the cults. But, if such features, relics of the old Nature religions, accompanied the ceremonial, they were offset by others fitted to exercise an uplifting power. Isis herself was viewed and extolled as the guardian of chastity; and consequently her initiations could have been no stimulation to a careless life. The testimony of the early Christian writers, however, and even of Flavius Josephus (*Ant.* XVIII. iii. 4), concerning the moral tone of the mysteries should not be contemptuously dismissed. Granted that they were inclined to exaggerate the dark side of the ceremonial of the pagan cults, they can hardly be charged with complete falsification of their true character. On the whole, it is highly probable that Rohde was nearer the truth in his unfavourable estimation of the soundness of the moral tendencies of the mysteries.

(*a*) *The mysteries of Eleusis.*—Of the State cults the most famous were the mysteries of Eleusis and of Samothrace. The Eleusinian mysteries existed for at least 1,000 years, and were brought to an end in A.D. 395 by Alaric. The oldest documentary evidence of their existence is contained in the *Hymn to Demeter* (v. 274, 473–482), which may have been composed as early as the 7th cent. B.C. This poem narrates the story of the search of Demeter for her lost daughter Persephone, who while gathering flowers in a lonely field had been seized by Pluto and enthroned as his wife in his subterranean realm. Demeter, indignant at the outrage, checked the sprouting of sown grain and deprived the farmer of his harvest until her daughter should be restored to her. The rich fields lay desolate until Zeus, fearing lest the people should perish with hunger, commanded Pluto to surrender his bride to her mother. The unscrupulous ruler obeyed, but craftily induced Persephone to swallow the seed of the pomegranate, whose magic properties would compel her annually to come back to him and remain in the under world for a part of the year. Consequently Persephone returned to the world from which she had been stolen, and Demeter in her joy released the powers of the seed, and taught the happy Eleusinians her sacred rites and mysteries. The myth clearly had its origin in a time when men were used to deify the energies of the vegetable world, and to see in its springing life the embodiment of the deity herself. The gender of the deity was determined by causes which are still the sport of speculation; but in the Eleusinian mysteries the corn deity was a goddess, Demeter, who, originally solitary in her glory, was subsequently associated with a second goddess, Kore or Persephone. Demeter may have been the original Mother Earth, but Frazer (*GB*³, pt. v., *Spirits of the Corn and of the Wild*, i. 41), on the alleged authority of the *Hymn to Demeter*, regards her as separate from Mother Earth and as exclusively the personification of the ripened and harvested grain; while Kore represents the grain in its sown and sprouting state. As the corn goddess, reappearing from the soil, Kore naturally was related to Demeter as offspring and daughter, and appropriately received her celebration and worship in the early spring. But the perplexities which attend the myths will be dissipated only when the mythology of the old Ægean or Minoan civilization, which is just coming into view, is better known, for the myth of Demeter and the myth of Kore probably have their roots in it.

At the time of the composition of the hymn, Eleusis was a petty independent State, and celebrated its mysteries without the co-operation of the neighbouring Athens. Its government then was in the hands of a ruler who combined in himself the powers of both priest and king, and who always belonged to the family of the Eumolpidæ descended from Eumolpus, a supposed Thracian soldier and immigrant described in the hymn as founding the mysteries under the instructions of Demeter herself. As a result of the conquest of Eleusis by Athens the mysteries became the ruling cult of the whole of Attica, and subsequently, through the supremacy of Athens, the chief cult of the Greek world. But the conservatism of religion kept it centred at Eleusis and under the supervision of the Eumolpidæ. The hierophant, or revealer and interpreter of the sacred objects, was always chosen from this family, and was the object of such profound reverence that the mention of his name during his lifetime was a legal offence. The qualifications required for his election were advanced age, personal charm, and a beautiful voice, which was needed particularly for the recitation of the sacred formulæ. As second in rank, another priestly family, that of the Kerykes or 'Heralds,' shared the authority of the Eumolpidæ. They were also the 'torch-bearers,' symbolizing under this term the search of Demeter for her lost daughter in the under world. These two families, the latter belonging to Athens, worked together for several centuries directing the mysteries, and apparently continuing in their co-operation the ancient council of Eleusis. With them were associated priestesses, few in number, belonging to the family of the Phillidæ and enjoying a dignity almost equal to that of the priests themselves, and performing functions of an important character. But the enumeration of these individuals does not exhaust the official life of the cult. For there were several officers, four in all, who were not of the priestly circle; they were chosen by the people of Attica, and had under their care the financial affairs of the cult. Yet this arrangement did not exclude the priestly families, for one of their number must always be a member of the financial committee. The polity of the mysteries is noticeable, for it had no influence on the polity of the Christian Church. Bratke, who believes that the mysteries, through the writings of Clement of Alexandria, strongly influenced the sacramental life of the Church, excludes their influence in relation to the official ordering of the Church (*SK* lx. 695 ff.). It is singular that, if their influence was so potent in her sacramental sphere, it should have failed to extend its activity to her polity also. But no sign of this activity is perceptible in the ecclesiastical official life. The Christian deaconess might be designated as corresponding to the Eleusinian priestess. But women performed important religious functions everywhere in the Western religious world, both in the State cults and in the mystery-religions, except the cult of Mithras; and it is quite in keeping with their general recognition that they should assume some prominence in Christian worship. They held in the primitive Church, however, a position far less official than that allotted to the pagan priestess, and it was only after the lapse of several centuries that the deaconess acquired her limited sacerdotal character.

As a primary stage of initiation into the mysteries at Eleusis, mysteries were celebrated in the month of February at Agra, a suburb of Athens. Our information concerning their rise, their ceremonial, and their mystic significance is very defective. It is probable that they were once exclusively Athenian, and on the incorporation of Eleusis became subordinated to the Eleusinian rites. Clement of Alexandria calls them the 'minor mysteries which have some foundation of instruction and of preliminary preparation for what is to come after,' namely, the great mysteries at Eleusis (*Strom.* v. 11). The goddess who presided over them appears to have been exclusively Kore or Persephone, the daughter of Demeter. We learn from Hippolytus, a writer of the 3rd cent., that 'the inferior mysteries are those of Proserpine [Persephone] below' (*Philos.* v. 3). The scholiast on the *Plutus* of Aristophanes (845) also tells us that 'in the course of the year two sets of mysteries are performed to Demeter and Kore—the greater were of Demeter, the lesser of Persephone, her daughter,' although the genuineness of this passage is subject to doubt. Dionysus, also, was a sharer in the mysteries, and was known by the name of Iacchos. On the Ninion Pinax, a monument dedicated by a woman named Ninion to the 'Two Goddesses,' he is represented as a full-grown man and as the bearer of the torch. Apparently he has no essential connexion with the mysteries, especially at Eleusis, and might be regarded as a visitor. The exact date of his entrance into the mysteries has not been determined. About these three deities the interest of the mysteries turns. On Demeter, Kore, and Iacchos the devotion of the worshippers is centred.

In the month of Boëdromion, early in the autumn (September), the initiation into the greater mysteries occurred. On the 13th of the month the ἔφηβοι, soldiers still in their young manhood, went out, armed with spear and shield, to Eleusis to bring back the 'holy things' to the Eleusinion, which lay at the foot of the Acropolis of Athens. The 'holy things' were really in charge of the priestess, and, on their arrival in Athens on the following day, they were met by the Athenian priests and magistrates. On the 15th of the month the real festival began. The candidates were assembled for initiation, and the order was proclaimed by the hierophant in the Stoa Poikile that no one of unclean hands or of unintelligible speech should share in the mysteries. Thus two classes of persons were rigorously excluded. The first was composed of those who had been guilty of murder or homicide. These were invariably denied admission to all cults. The second class was composed of barbarians, or else of persons with defective speech, which would prevent their pronouncing clearly and distinctly the sacred words. All others, including children, whatever their position in life might be, were eligible for the reception of the secret rites of Demeter. It has been doubted whether slaves were numbered among them, but the doubt is not well supported. No dogmatic questions were asked, as in the Samothracian mysteries, all being admitted without assent to confessions of any sort. The only requirement to which all alike were subjected was ceremonial purity. Consequently on the 16th of the month the candidates again assembled and began their march of six miles to the sea, shouting as they went, *ἅλαδε μύσται*, 'to the sea, ye mystics.' The salt waters of the mysterious ocean were supposed to possess great purifying powers, and a relic of the belief may be seen in the sacramental use of salt in Christian sacramental practice. Euripides (*Iph. Taur.* 1193) alludes to the belief in his words *θάλασσα κλύζει πάντα τἀνθρώπων κακά* ('the sea washes away all evils of men'). Each candidate had provided himself with a young sacrificial pig which he drove before him, and on his arrival at the shore took it with him into the sea. Thus both were purified and the pig rendered fit for the sacrifice. The blood of the pig sprinkled on the candidate completed the purification, and the candidate himself, with head veiled, seated on a ram's skin and grasping a winnow, was ready for the initiation. But at this point the festival of Asclepius, the Epidauria, which had been recognized in Athens as early as 421 B.C. and which had no vital connexion with the initiation, intervened, and lasted throughout the 17th and 18th of the month. During its celebration the candidates for the Eleusinian mysteries remained quietly at home, while the interval gave an opportunity to late comers to begin their initiation, or to complete the initial ceremonies, if they had already realized a part of them. On the 19th day of the month, perhaps one of the most solemn in the celebration, the procession of purified candidates set out from the Eleusinion on its tedious march over the sacred way leading to Eleusis. It followed the sacred image of Iacchos, which was borne aloft before it, and it carried back to Eleusis the 'holy things' which the *ἔφηβοι* had brought to Athens. The number of those who composed it was comparatively great, sometimes 10,000 persons being in line; of course these could not all have been candidates, for the hall of initiation at Eleusis could not have contained so many. They were in part the initiated who accompanied the candidates and sang hymns in praise of Iacchos on the way, or at certain places indulged in coarse ribaldry and witticisms in order to hold aloof the evil spirits. On the evening of the 20th the mystics reached the 'holy city,' which they entered with flaming torches, and passed the following day in rest or in offering the sacrifice. Probably on the 22nd the initiation took place in the Telesterion, a large square building surrounded by thick walls to shield its secrets from prying eyes. It was set almost in the centre of an extensive enclosure, which contained the large and small propylæa or massive gateways, through which the candidates were conducted past the small temple of Pluto along the sacred way leading to the doors of the Telesterion. Seats of stone, partly hewn from the native rock and partly constructed, rose tier on tier around the hall with a capacity for accommodating about 3,000 persons. The original building of course did not have this magnitude, for the Telesterion was repeatedly rebuilt, each time on a larger scale. What part the outer buildings played in the initiation is not known. Possibly the descent of Kore into the under world and Demeter's search for her may have been represented in the temple of Pluto; but this is doubtful, for the ruins of the temple reveal no subterranean construction. It is more probable that the final initiation was begun, continued, and completed in the Telesterion. What the nature of the mystic ceremony was is not easy to determine. Clement of Alexandria tells us that 'Deo [mystic name for Demeter] and Persephone may have become the heroines of a mystic drama; and their wanderings, seizure, and grief Eleusis celebrates by torchlight processions' (*Protrept.* 2). Perhaps it would be precarious to take the word 'drama' literally. It may have had the character of a passion play, as L. R. Farnell suggests (*EBr*^{11} xix. 120); or it may have expressed the rehearsal of the story of Demeter in the pantomimic dance accompanied by songs, sacramental words, and other ceremonies, as De Jong suggests (*Das antike Mysterienwesen*, p. 19 f.). But beyond such conjectures we know nothing of the manner in which the experiences, of which Demeter and Kore were the subject, were presented. In some way they were rendered so vivid, solemn, and impressive amid the dim light as to lift the observer up into a consciousness of union, even of identity, with the immortal goddess. Nor do we know what the 'holy things' were which the hierophant revealed at the most solemn moment of the initiation. Farnell (*EBr*^{11} xix. 120) suggests that they 'included certain primitive idols of the goddesses' and perhaps '"a cut corn-stalk."' A. Dieterich (*Eine Mithrasliturgie*, Leipzig, 1903, p. 125) would find among them symbols significant of phallic worship. The presentation of the corn token rests on the authority of Hippolytus, who says that 'the Athenians, while initiating people into the Eleusinian rites, likewise display to those who are being admitted to the highest grade of these mysteries, the mighty, and marvellous, and most perfect secret suitable for one initiated into the highest mystic truths: [I allude to] an ear of corn in silence reaped' (*Philos.* v. 3). Hippolytus may not be trustworthy in his statement. But the majority of our authorities, such as Frazer, Farnell, and De Jong, are inclined to think that such a token was really shown. De Jong believes that the rendering of the words referring to it should be 'display . . . in silence a reaped ear of corn' (*Das antike Mysterienwesen*, p. 23, n. 1). Dieterich's suggestion of the presence of the phallic symbol rests on the retention of the old reading *ἐργασάμενος*, which C. A. Lobeck (*Aglaophamus*, p. 26) found unintelligible and changed to *ἐγγευσάμενος*. His contention is that we have no right to alter a text, especially the text of a mystic formula, simply because we cannot understand it in its actual sense (*Eine Mithrasliturgie*, p. 125). If Dieterich's interpretation of the difficult term is correct, we can hardly regard this element in the Eleusinian mysteries as morally elevating, even taking into view its religious significance. It may be that at this point in the ceremonies a 'holy marriage' was celebrated in imitation of the marriage of Demeter and Zeus, or of Kore and Pluto. Its possibility rests mainly on the assertion of Asterius, who lived at the close of the 4th cent. and who briefly alludes to the act (*Encomium in SS. Martyres* [*PG* xl. 325]). De Jong seems to place great reliance on his witness (*Das antike Mysterienwesen*, p. 22), while Farnell regards the passage embodying it as doubtful. With this sacred marriage the words of Hippolytus may be connected: 'by night in Eleusis . . . [the hierophant] enacting the great and secret mysteries, vociferates and cries aloud, saying, "August Brimo has brought forth a consecrated son, Brimus," that is, a potent [mother has been delivered of] a potent child' (*Philos.* v. 3). Brimo is commonly believed to have been another name for Demeter; but Miss Harrison explains it as another name for the Thessalian Kore and designating in the Eleusinian mysteries simply a maiden (*Prolegomena*, p. 553). Brimus, the child, is understood by J. N. Svoronos ('Erklärung der Denkmäler des eleus. mystischen Kreisen,' in *Journal international d'archéologie numismatique*, iv. [1901]) to be Pluto, by Dieterich to be Iacchos (*Eine Mithrasliturgie*, p. 138). Frazer attributes reality to this feature of the ceremonies, and explains it as magical, 'intended to make the fields wave with yellow corn' (*GB*^{3}, pt. i., *The Magic Art*, London, 1911, ii. 138). If the 'holy marriage' really occurred in the mysteries, it must have been a relic of the old Nature-religions preserved in the cult and having the meaning which Frazer gives it. One more interesting feature of the mysteries of Demeter is the κυκεών, or sacred drink. Clement of Alexandria refers to it in the only confession he ascribes to the initiate: 'I have fasted, I have drunk the cup (κυκεών); I have received from the box; having done (having tasted) I put it into the basket, and out of the basket into the chest' (*Protrept.* 2). The κυκεών was a mixture of grain, water, and other ingredients, which was the first food that Demeter had taken after her long wanderings and fastings. Among these ingredients the sacramental wine must have been absent, for, while it was offered to other deities, it was not used in the cult of the underground gods (K. Kircher, *Die sakrale Bedeutung des Weines im Altertum*, Giessen, 1910, p. 21; P. Stengel, *Opferbräuche der Griechen*, Leipzig, 1910, p. 129). Stengel explains its absence on the ground that the chthonic cult reaches back to a remote time when the Greeks had not yet begun to cultivate the vine, and by reason of the conservatism of religion were disinclined, on the introduction of wine into use, to make any change in the practices of the religious cult. Moreover, the ancients were loath in their reverence for the chthonic deity to use anything which did not spring directly from the soil. However, the κυκεών was 'a sort of soup' (Miss Harrison, *Prolegomena*, p. 156) or 'a kind of thick gruel,' as Frazer describes it (*GB*^{3}, pt. v., *Spirits of the Corn and of the Wild*, p. 161, n. 4). The part which it played in the progress of the ceremonies cannot be determined. But apparently it was not an important part, and therefore, in this respect, the κυκεών cannot be likened to the Lord's Supper. It was a feature of the experience of Demeter in her search for her daughter, and, as every feature of that experience was closely followed in the pantomime, the manner in which she broke her protracted fast would be imitated. It is quite possible that sharing in the sacred drink meant also a formal induction into the community life of the mysteries and a reinforcing of the bonds which were binding its new members to the old. More than this—*e.g.* that the reception of it implied a belief of the presence of the deity with, in, and under its elements—can hardly be claimed for it. On the 23rd day, the last day of the festival, the final ceremony was performed. The worshippers assembled and, casting water from two vessels, now toward the east, and again toward the west, looked up to the heavens with the brief cry 'Rain!' and then looking down to the earth cried 'Be fruitful!' or 'Conceive!' The prayer, pregnant with significance, throws back a bright light on the real meaning of the mysteries celebrated at Eleusis.

We have no means of determining the extent of the influence of these mysteries. Numerous sanctuaries, dependent on the main sanctuary at Eleusis, arose in other parts of Greece. We hear of a sanctuary or chapel even in Italy. Of these daughter institutions we know but little that we can call trustworthy. The 'truce of God,' which suspended all hostilities during the Eleusinian celebration, was proclaimed in lands as distant as Syria and Egypt. Emperors, such as Hadrian and Marcus Aurelius, gladly became initiated adherents of the cult, and when Valentinian I., in the year 364, forbade religious celebrations at night, he was obliged to make an exception of the ceremonies at Eleusis. An influence so extensive makes it possible that St. Paul knew of the mysteries. But if he did, it is singular that he did not allude to them in his speech at Athens on Mars' Hill. The slightest apparent allusion to them would have been eagerly seized by those who affirm his familiarity with mystery-religions. But his silence would seem to show that he knew little or nothing of the Eleusinian mysteries, or else viewed them with a disfavour which the courtesy of the moment compelled him to refrain from revealing. Their influence on the Church can only be assumed, not proved. Svoronos, as quoted by De Jong (*Das antike Mysterienwesen*, p. 29), affirms that the Greek Church is the successor of the Eleusinian cult, that she borrowed much from Eleusis. If this be true, the act of borrowing could have taken place only at a comparatively late period. Examples of this act are found in her celebration of important ceremonies at night, in her processions with their icons, in the revealing of holy objects, in the confession of sins before the Eucharist, and in the adoration of the Virgin Mary. With these are supposed to correspond the initiation at night in Eleusis, the procession bearing the image of Iacchos, the disclosure of 'holy things' in the Telesterion, the exclusion of the unworthy, and the practice of confession at Samothrace, the mourning of Demeter, having for her Christian parallel the 'mater dolorosa,' and the worship of Demeter, whose cult ceased just before the worship (*hyperdulia*) of the Virgin assumed unusual importance, and, therefore, seems to have replaced that of Demeter. One could speak more confidently of the exactness of these similarities if one knew accurately what the ceremonies in the Telesterion really were. Moreover, the origin of the ceremonial customs and rites of the Greek can be traced and has been traced to other sources than to the cult at Eleusis; and when more than one source can be ascribed to a practice, its assumed origin in a particular quarter is rendered doubtful. At all events, this comparison does not come within the limits of the primitive Church, for such rites as make the comparison possible had not yet been developed.

(*b*) *The mysteries of Samothrace.*—The Samothracian mysteries are far less known to us than the Eleusinian. They get their name from the fact that their chief seat was in the island of Samothrace, which was an object of superstitious regard from pre-historic times to a comparatively late period. The cult itself is very ancient, and seems to be a relic of the religious life of the old Pelasgian or Ægean civilization which flourished even as far as Sicily before the Greek civilization arose. The ruins of its ancient sanctuaries in Samothrace reveal remnants of the same massive, Cyclopean walls, which are found elsewhere in the islands and on the coasts of the Mediterranean. Its mysteries were important in ancient times, and from the 4th cent. rivalled the Eleusinian. They attained their greatest distinction under Philip and his queen Olympia, who were initiated into them, and under the Ptolemys, who patronized them and cared for their sacred buildings. Later the cult extended its influence among the citizens of the Roman Republic. Among its adherents were such Roman soldiers and leaders as M. Claudius Marcellus. We know little about its ceremonies and formulæ, which is a misfortune, for such knowledge might have thrown light on the growth of the religious terminology which St. Paul found and used. They centred in the Kabeiroi, concerning whom we have only the most meagre information. They seem to have belonged to the class of spirits known as demons, goblins, and satyrs. Originally they were chthonian deities or gods of the under world, as the excavations on the island reveal. Their name is probably of Phœnician origin, for it appears to be connected with the Semitic Kabeirim, the 'mighty ones.' They were really gods native to the islands of the Ægean sea; but inasmuch as they were gods of navigation, the Phœnician sailors naturally were interested in them and gave them the name by which they came to be generally known. On Samothrace they were called presumably Axieros, Axiokersos, Axiokersa, and Casmilos. Like all deities of indeterminate character, they were identified at various times with deities of another name. The possible affinity of their mysteries with those of Eleusis led to the subsequent retirement of these barbaric names, and the substitution in the place of the first three of the names of Demeter, Kore, and Pluto or Hades. Cybele and Dionysus rival Demeter and Pluto as usurpers of the native Samothracian names. A worship of the Kabeiroi existed near Thebes also at an early period. Excavations of the sanctuary belonging to the cult have brought to light pottery dating from the end of the 5th and beginning of the 4th centuries B.C., which bears on its surface a figure apparently of Dionysus with the word 'Kabiros' written just above it. The god is evidently chthonic in character. Probably the Kabeiroi were remotely deities of vegetation; but their office in historic times was to safeguard the mariner. He who had been initiated into their mysteries and had the purple thread bound about his person was secure from the perils of the sea. We know nothing more of their mystic festival than that it was ecstatic, and that it contained a sacramental communion, if we accept H. Hepding's interpretation of a Samothracian inscription (*Attis, seine Mythen und sein Kult*, Giessen, 1903, p. 185). Nor is there any way of determining their influence on the development of the religious life which finally found its complete satisfaction in the Christian faith.

(*c*) *The mysteries of Andania.*—The Andanian mysteries were celebrated at Andania in Messenia, the south-western part of Greece (Peloponnesus). Originally they were consecrated to Demeter and to Kore, who was called Hagne, 'the Holy One.' But at a later period Hermes, the Kabeiroi, and Apollo were added to these deities. The Andanian inscription of 91 B.C. gives us some information concerning their external rites. The manner in which the priests take the oath, the various crowns or head-dresses which the priests and the mystics should wear, the dress of linen in which they should be clothed, are described. Women are directed to be present with hair unbound and feet unshod, and the animals to be offered to the different deities are designated. Married women figure as priestesses, and grades of initiation appear here as in the Eleusinian mysteries. While evidences of required baptisms and anointings are apparent, there is no indication of a sacramental meal; but as such meals were customary in the secret cults, it is possible that it had a place in the Andanian mysteries. Of the purpose of these mysteries we know nothing, but we can conjecture that they were related to the harvest, and that they gave to the initiate a happy lot in the future world.

(*d*) *The Egyptian mysteries.*—As early as the XIXth dynasty the Egyptian cults had already begun to spread into other lands. They were founded on the legend of Osiris, who, like Demeter, was originally a deity of vegetation. The myth that centres about him is gathered from various sources, among which Plutarch's account may be regarded as the chief. He is usually represented as the son of the earth-god Keb and the sky-goddess Nut, which is the reverse of the customary relationship of the parental deities. On reaching manhood he ruled his country for twenty-eight years, and proved to be a beneficent monarch. He taught his subjects how to cultivate their fields, to train their vines, and to work with tools. He even left his country and carried everywhere his knowledge of the arts of a helpful life. On his return his evil-minded brother, Set, persuaded him to test the capacity of a chest to receive his body, and, as soon as he had stretched himself in it, Set shut the lid, fastened it down, and threw the chest into the Nile. Isis, the sister-wife of Osiris, in an agony of grief went everywhere seeking him, and, finally recovering the body, returned with it to Egypt and hid it among the reeds by the river. But Set, while hunting at night, discovered it under the moonlight, and, dismembering it, scattered the several parts throughout the country. Isis renewed her search, and on finding the fragments gave them a fitting burial. Another version of the story tells us that Anubis, sent by Ra, came to her aid, and with the help of Thot and of Horus (in Greek times Harpocrates) fitted the parts together, enveloped them in a linen winding-sheet, and then by his magical power restored him to life. From this moment Osiris presided over the under world as its king and judge. All disembodied souls had to appear before him, make their confession to him, and receive at his hands the award of their deeds. In this capacity Osiris was viewed as the representative and giver of immortal life. In order to receive it, one must have become even identified with him and be called by his name. His great festival began on 28th October and ended on 1st November.

It was not until the time of Ptolemy I. (306–285 B.C.) that the Egyptian mysteries made rapid progress. He seems to have given the first impulse to the syncretism, or amalgamation of cults and divinities, which for six or seven centuries was to direct the religious life and practice of men, and which is supposed by some scholars to have deeply influenced even the beginnings of Christianity. The first step in this syncretistic movement was the adoption of the name Serapis for that of Osiris. The origin of the name is still doubtful. Some find its source in the Chaldæan Sar-apsi. But more probably it is simply the reduced form of Osiris-apis (Oser-hapi). The union of the god with the sacred bull, Apis, which was regarded as his incarnation, would suit Egyptian prejudices, and the name Serapis itself would appeal to the Greek mind. Thus Serapis, Isis, and Horus or Harpocrates were the leading deities in the Egyptian cults, Anubis, Jupiter Hammon, and the Sphinx ranking after them. They were invoked sometimes together, and sometimes separately. Usually the name Serapis leads the rest, and when alone is identified with Zeus and Helios, giving rise to the formula, inscribed on amulets, 'Zeus, Helios, and Serapis are one.' More frequently two names, Serapis and Isis, are united in one invocation, but Isis also often stands alone, as in Spain and Gaul, and receives the exclusive worship.

Under the Ptolemys the cults spread through the Ægean islands and found numerous adherents along the shores of Asia Minor. In the same period they had reached Greece, and they arrived in Sicily about the year 298 B.C. The later progress of Christianity was hardly more rapid. The ability of the cult of Serapis by itself to arouse the emotions and fancies, its capacity to answer the ascetic longings, its power to amalgamate itself with other cults, and to meet the monotheistic tendency, combined to give it a victorious career. However, it was Isis, the queen deity, that became the more celebrated of the two. The charm of her personality attracted the affections of many peoples. Her gracious attitude toward women, especially young women, enlisted in her following one of the most potential aids to the dissemination of a religious cult. Her dark temples, solemn and mysterious, drew, rather than repelled, the religiously inclined. About 150 B.C. her cult reached Italy, but did not enter Rome until the middle of the 1st cent. B.C. There it encountered a determined opposition, its altars and images being destroyed four times in the course of one decade. But the cult was tenacious. The emperor Tiberius dealt it another blow in A.D. 19. Soon after this resistance gave way, for the cult of Isis did what the State-religions were not doing—gave to the worshipper the consciousness of direct and personal communion with the deity. In A.D. 38 Caligula built the great temple of Isis on the Campus Martius, which figures in the story of Apuleius. In A.D. 215 Caracalla placed the cult on a level with the State-cults and built for the worship of Isis one of her finest temples. The goddess of countless names, Isis Myrionyma, had conquered. She is rightly called Domina, Victrix, Invicta, Mater, Panthea; and, had her worship finally prevailed, the Creator of all things visible and invisible would have been conceived as the feminine rather than as the masculine principle of the universe. But her reign ceased, although years after every other mystery-religion had vanished. Her cult lingered on in southern Egypt, where probably, in pre-historic times, the goddess began her career, and in A.D. 560 Justinian closed her only remaining temple on the little island of Philæ.

Our chief source of information concerning the mysteries of Isis is *Metamorphoses, or Golden Ass*, written by Lucius Apuleius (born A.D. 125). At the close of the work the author describes the experiences of one undergoing initiation into the Egyptian cult. We may accept the information with confidence, for the account is marked by too much sincerity to pass, like the story which precedes it, as a product of the imagination. Unfortunately, the information bears on the rites of preparation, not on the transactions in the sanctuary itself. We learn from it that the candidate for initiation had to await the summons of Isis, even after he had been assured by her that he was destined for her ministry. During this period of waiting he must carefully perform his religious duties and preserve a dignified silence. At the proper time Isis makes her will known to him in a vision, and the priest, to whom she has addressed herself at the same moment, in the 'darksome night' and by no 'obscure mandate,' informs him that Isis is ready to communicate to him her secrets. After certain ceremonies, whose significance is not disclosed, the priest 'washed and sprinkled him with the purest water,' and, after giving him further secret instructions, enjoined upon him abstinence for ten days from all but the simplest food. At the close of the fast he was led, clothed in new linen garments, to the inner recesses of the sanctuary, where the mysteries of the cult were revealed to him. Of course the revelations were inviolably secret, but no doubt they centred about the cruel treatment of Serapis, the search of Isis for his dead body, and the resurrection of the god. We should be glad to know what was said and done in the sanctuary.

> 'I would tell you,' answers Apuleius, 'were it lawful for me to tell you; you should know it, if it were lawful for you to hear. But both the ears that heard these things, and the tongue that told them, would reap the evil results of their rashness' (xi. 23).

The final initiation was consummated at night, as it was in all the mystery-religions; for it is in the midnight hours that mind and heart are the most deeply impressed.

> In those hours, Apuleius goes on, 'I approached the confines of death, and having trod on the threshold of Proserpine, I returned therefrom, being borne through the elements. At midnight I saw the sun shining with its brilliant light, and I approached the presence of the gods beneath, and the gods of heaven, and stood near and worshipped them' (xi. 23).

In the morning he appeared crowned with palm leaves and dressed in a many-coloured robe, and was received by the people with joy and adoration. Apparently they regarded him as identified with the deity and worthy of divine honours. Christianity escaped this partial idolatry prevalent in all mystery-religions, for at no time in its history was the worshipper of Christ identified in like manner with the Christ Himself. No sacramental meal is mentioned as a part of the ceremony by Apuleius. He speaks of a 'religious breakfast' as a feature of the ceremonies of the third day; but this formed no element in the initiation itself. Since the Egyptian cults had become syncretistic they may have adopted the sacramental meal, for, as in the Semitic, so in the Egyptian religion, it was not emphasized in earlier times. The fact that it occurs in the Eleusinian mysteries is no proof of its presence in the mysteries of Isis; for, while the resemblances between the two cults are sufficiently striking, the differences are equally impressive. De Jong sums them up briefly: the respective tasks of Isis and Demeter are wholly unlike: the one sought her brother and husband, who is dismembered; the other sought her daughter, who remains physically sound. The initiation into the mysteries of Isis involved unreserved consecration to her service; initiation into the mysteries of Demeter did not make this extreme demand. In the one case the individual was initiated by himself; in the other the initiation embraced many individuals at once. The cult of Isis received the candidate at any moment, as her will decided, the cult of Demeter at a stated moment. The one was open to astrological ideas, the other was proof against them. These differences reveal a mutually independent development, although somewhere in pre-historic times they perhaps sprang from a common source.

The extent of the influence of the Egyptian cults can be more satisfactorily determined than the extent of the Eleusinian influence. Cumont regards it as very great. 'At the beginning of our era,' he says, 'there set in that great movement of conversion that soon established the worship of Isis and Serapis from the outskirts of the Sahara to the vallum of Britain, and from the mountains of Asturias to the mouths of the Danube' (*Oriental Religions*, p. 83). Again, he informs us that the priests of the Egyptian religion 'made proselytes in every province' of the Roman world (*ib.* p. 86). But Toutain disputes this conclusion and restricts the influence of the Egyptian mysteries. They did not take root in the provincial soil, did not modify sensibly the ideas and practices of the immense majority of the people, and remained always exotic cults in the Western world (*Les Cultes païens*, ii. 34). This conclusion is based largely on the absence of monuments and inscriptions in certain parts of the Roman Empire, and is, therefore, an inference from silence. But, as we determine the extent of the influence of a mystery-religion by the indications of its presence, the absence of such indications forms a reasonable basis for judgment. The Egyptian cults, however, were sufficiently extensive to make their influence felt in wide areas. Yet that influence cannot be said to have reached with any degree of potency the writings of the NT. Schweitzer seems to admit that St. Paul may have known of the cult of Serapis and Isis (*Geschichte der paulinischen Forschung*, p. 150, tr. W. Montgomery, *Paul and his Interpreters*, London, 1912, pp. 191–192). But, if he did, his knowledge must have been extremely limited, for it exercised no perceptible moulding power over his thought. The effects of the cult on the ceremonial of the Church are more apparent; but even here the resemblances take the form of analogy rather than of genealogy. The division of the followers of Isis into believer and initiate corresponds with the Christian division into catechumen and faithful. But the Christian parallel would be more striking had the Christian division been into layman and priest, as in the Egyptian cult. The Egyptian fasts, processions, morning and evening worship, have their answering Christian ceremonies, but are not causally related to them to the exclusion of all other sources. The tonsure, it is possible, came directly from the Egyptian cults into the Christian Church. From the earliest times it was practised by the priest of Isis and Serapis for the purpose of cleanliness at the sacrifice. It was peculiar to him, for the Attis priest wore his hair long, like the modern dervish. From the Egyptian cult it passed into the Christian communities of Egyptian ascetics, and thence, by the end of the 5th cent., to the Christian clergy. Again, the derivation of the adoration of Mary, the mother of Christ, from the worship of Isis is not wholly convincing, for the Christological controversies of the 4th and 5th centuries may have been the sole factor in bringing about this fateful result. All this took place at a comparatively late period. At any rate, as Clemen intimates (*Der Einfluss der Mysterienreligionen*, p. 9), the influence of the Egyptian mysteries in the 1st cent. must not be assumed to be extensive in the sphere of the Christian Church.

(*e*) *The mysteries of Asia Minor.*—The mysteries of Attis and Cybele were the most famous and influential in the early religious life of Asia Minor. Nowhere and at no time does Attis appear to be worshipped apart from Cybele. He is related to her now as her lover, now as her child. The story of this double relation, like other mythological tales of leading deities, is various. One, the Lydian story, represents Attis as killed, like Adonis, by a wild boar. The other, the Phrygian story, represents him as driven to frenzy by the jealousy of Cybele, and as dying from the effects of self-mutilation under a pine or fir tree, which thereby became sacred to him. Cybele herself was the greatest of the deities of Asia Minor. She bore many names, and the seat of her worship was in the Galatian city of Pessinus. Here in very early times the stone of meteoric character, 'a black aerolite' (Cumont, *Oriental Religions*, p. 47), which was to play an important part in the religious life of Rome, was to be found. And here was the grave of Attis, over whose death the Phrygians mourned in their annual festival.

The primitive history of the cult is unknown. The supremacy of Cybele seems to point back to a matriarchal order of social life. And the name of Attis, for which no explanation has been reached, appears to have belonged to some remote and forgotten speech. A few scholars suggest the Hittite tongue. But possibly it may yet prove to be a relic of the old Ægean civilization which had its seat in Crete and whose ruler bore the title of 'Minos,' as the ruler of the Egyptians bore that of 'Pharaoh.' Farnell thinks that 'in following back to its fountain-head the origins of this cult, we are led inevitably to Minoan Crete' (*Greece and Babylon*, Edinburgh, 1911, p. 92). It was Attis, not Cybele, who was the prominent figure in the mysteries. What Osiris was among the Egyptians, or Adonis among the Phœnicians, Attis was among the Phrygians. He bore the character of a chthonic deity, a god of vegetation, for he had his death and his resurrection, like the grain. His priests were called Galli, or Galloi, and the chief priest claimed the name of Attis himself. In honour of the god, and in a moment of extreme ecstasy, they unmanned themselves—an act which distinguishes the cult of Attis from all others, and whose source and explanation still baffle the investigator. In the year 204 B.C. the sacred stone of Cybele was taken from Pessinus and carried to Rome. This was done in obedience to a Sibylline oracle, which declared that the conquests of Hannibal in Italy would not cease until a sanctuary was established for the worship of Cybele in Rome. The stone was received with much ceremony and was placed in the temple of the goddess of victory on the Palatine. This inauguration of the worship of Attis and Cybele in Rome is regarded as the first step toward the conquest of the West by the Oriental cults. But at the outset the Phrygian cult gained no perceptible control over the Roman mind. Romans were forbidden by legislative acts to take part in its ceremonies. It was placed exclusively in the hands of Phrygian priests, who alone were permitted to perform its rites and to receive alms from the citizens for its support. This rigorous exclusion of Romans from the cult continued until the reign of Claudius (A.D. 41–54), who placed the Phrygian festival among the publicly recognized festivals of the city. The cause of this act is attributed by Cumont to the desire of Claudius to establish a rival of Isis, whose worship had already been favoured by Caligula, and whose processions were attaining a constantly increasing popularity. This early date is disputed, but both Hepding (*Attis, seine Mythen und sein Kult*, p. 145) and Cumont (*Oriental Religions*, p. 55) agree on its correctness.

The festival of Attis was brilliantly celebrated in Rome at the spring equinox in the second half of the month of March. It evidently possessed the main characteristics of the wild and ecstatic worship as practised in the native home of the cult. It was introduced by a preparatory ceremony on 15th March, when the *cannophori*, or reed-bearers, had their procession, commemorating some forgotten event or rite in the remote ceremonial life of Asia Minor. The reed played an important part in the commemoration of Cybele, but only speculation can explain its connexion with her worship. A week later, on 22nd March, a pine or fir tree was cut down in the sacred grove of the goddess and was borne by the *dendrophori*, or tree-bearers, in procession to the temple of the Idæan mother on the Palatine. Its branches were garlanded with violets and its trunk swathed with woollen bands. It represented the dead body of Attis, and the garlands were woven of violets, because violets sprang from the blood-drops which fell from his person when he unmanned himself at the foot of the pine. Julius Firmicus Maternus, who wrote about A.D. 347, is responsible for the statement that the effigy of a youth, apparently of Attis, was bound to the tree (*de Err. Prof. Relig.* xxvii. 1). The succeeding day was passed in mourning the death of Attis. It is possible that on this day the mourners joined in the Tubilustrium, or the Feast of Trumpets, when the trumpets, used at the sacrifice, were purified. But our sources do not assure us of this. The 24th was the *dies sanguinis*, the day of blood, when the mourning reached its highest intensity. Under the shrill sounds of various instruments, the hoarse cries of the Galli, and the spectacle of their whirling dances, the crowd of worshippers were lifted to unrestrained ecstasy, in which they slashed themselves with knives that the blood might sprinkle the statue of the goddess, and when the neophyte, insensible to pain, emasculated himself in her honour with a sharp stone. His use of the sharp stone to complete his self-consecration to the deity is but another indication of the conservatism of religion, which preferred to retain in the sacred rite the ancient means rather than adopt the more modern means of metal. Our sources, however, give us but slight information concerning this stage of the ceremonies. The real initiation was probably consummated under the light of torches and in the sanctuary of Cybele during the hours of the succeeding night. This can be gathered only from hints of early writers and from a few existing monuments relating to the cult. The 25th was called the Hilaria, the joyous festival, when the announcement of the resurrection of Attis was made and the expressions of mourning were turned into extravagant expressions of joy. It was characterized by a sort of carnival, when a certain amount of freedom was permitted in the public streets. Later, in the 3rd cent., this masked and hilarious procession had become one of the most important among Roman festivals. The next day was given up to quiet and rest. But on the 27th, called the Lavatio, the ceremonies were resumed. The silver image of the goddess was borne on a wagon drawn by cows from the sanctuary on the Palatine through the Porta Capena to the Almo, which entered the Tiber not far from Rome. There the Archigallus bathed the image in the stream, and thoroughly washed the wagon and the rest of the *sacra*. On the return of the procession to the sanctuary the wagon was filled with flowers cast into it by the people who lined the way, and the Galli made good use of their opportunity to receive alms from the charitable. So the great celebration of the rites of Attis and Cybele was closed.

We infer from formulæ recorded by Firmicus and Clement of Alexandria that a sacramental meal was administered to the candidate during the initiation. Firmicus, quoting the Greek equivalent of his Latin formula, gives it as, 'I have eaten from the tambourine, I have drunk from the cymbal, I have become a mystic of Attis' (*de Err. Prof. Relig.* xviii. 1). Clement gives the same formula more fully (*Protrept.* ii. 15). It is probable that the rite was celebrated at the beginning of the initiation as a preparation for other rites, such as the 'holy marriage,' though we have but the slightest evidence that the 'holy marriage' figured in the cult. The elements of the communion were, according to M. Brückner (*Der sterbende und auferstehende Gottheiland*, Tübingen, 1911, p. 24) and Hepding (*Attis*, p. 186), bread, wine, and the fish. The belief that the fish was one of the elements is based by Hepding on the much-discussed inscription found on the tomb of Abercius, who he thinks was a follower of Attis, and not, as others affirm, a Christian bishop (*Attis*, p. 188). It is true that certain species of fish were sacred to Atargatis, the Phœnician goddess, and were eaten sacramentally by her priests. Phœnicia lay not far away from Phrygia. But the proof that the features of her communion meal characterized that of Phrygia resolves itself under close examination into mere supposition. Hepding himself confesses that his opinion rests only on assumption. How the Attis communicant regarded his sacramental meal is also open to conjecture. Dieterich, reasoning from words of Firmicus which follow his quotation of the Attis formula, concludes that the communicant recognized in this sacrament a real presence of the deity (*Eine Mithrasliturgie*, p. 103; see also O. Pfleiderer, *The Early Christian Conception of Christ*, London, 1905, p. 127). O. Seeck says dogmatically that 'what he consumed was regarded as the flesh and blood of Attis, which he absorbed in order to deify his mortal body' (*Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, iii. [Berlin, 1909] 128). Hepding falls back on the theory of Robertson Smith that the solemn act of eating and drinking together is the ceremonial introduction to personal relationship to the deity and to the common life of the community (*RS^2*, London, 1894, p. 265). Yet Hepding adds that, while in the mysteries the idea of admission to a brotherhood is not ignored, 'the personal relation of the individual to the deity was emphasized' (*Attis*, p. 188). Cumont takes a similar view of the sacrament (*Oriental Religions*, p. 69). But the evidence cited for the belief of the Attis worshipper in a real presence of the deity in, with, and under the elements is not wholly assuring. We do not know from any trustworthy source what conception he had of the elements, as consecrated, though the chances are that it was decidedly realistic. The position of the sacrament in the initiation is also unknown. It probably followed the fast, and, as Brückner suggests, was the first step in the ceremonies. The final ceremony was the resurrection of Attis. When the rites had reached their most impressive stage, amid the gloom and the singing of mournful hymns, a bright light suddenly irradiated the atmosphere; the tomb was opened, and the god arose. The priest whispered to the initiates, 'Be of good cheer, oh mystics, the god is saved; for there shall be salvation to you from your trials' (Firmicus, *de Err. Prof. Relig.* xxii. 1). The words are significant, for they reveal the aim of the mysteries of Attis—escape from perdition and the assurance of a bright immortality. Thenceforth, not through the sacrament, but through the resurrection of Attis and his share in it, the initiate was a mystic of Attis.

The *taurobolium* (less frequently *criobolium*, the offering of the ram) became a part of the rites of the cult after the middle of the 1st century. The mystic, swathed in linen as if prepared for burial, descended, while the spectators sang dirges, into a pit which was covered with lattice-work. The blood of the slaughtered animal streamed through the openings in the platform on the mystic below, who eagerly caught it, bathing himself with it and drinking it. When he ascended, red and dripping, from the pit, he was regarded as born again to eternal life, and was received by his associates with divine honours (Prudentius, *Peristephanon*, x. 1048). The idea of his re-birth was further emphasized by the nourishment of milk which was given him, as though he were a new-born babe. The *taurobolium* was not always regarded as lasting in its effects, but might be repeated by the individual after the lapse of twenty years in order to re-invigorate his spiritual life. In this respect it differed wholly from the Christian baptism by water, which was permanent and repeated only conditionally. The influence of the *taurobolium* on the formation of the sacramental doctrine of the Church could have been only very slight. It is more likely that the Christian idea of cleansing and purification 'in the blood of the Lamb' (Rev 7^{14}) influenced the *taurobolium.* The source of the rite and even of its name is conjectural. It is not strictly Phrygian; it may be traced to the peoples of Syria, and even further to the deserts of Arabia. Cumont has changed his mind more than once concerning its origin, and his various conclusions are subjected by Toutain to sceptical criticism (Cumont, *Oriental Religions*, p. 66 ff.; Toutain, *Les Cultes païens*, ii. 86 ff.).

It was not until the second half of the 2nd cent. that the cult of Attis and Cybele began to command an extensive attention and interest in the Western world. In the time of Irenæus it was already present in Lyons, which became the centre of its extension in this part of the Roman Empire (Toutain, *Les Cultes païens*, ii. 112–114). It had been brought thither by a few of its devotees, whose missionary zeal may have been inspired by the success of the Church in her missionary enterprise. Two factors greatly aided the spread of the cult. One was the *taurobolium* already mentioned. Its assurance of spiritual purification and immortality gave it an inestimable value in the eyes of the converts. To have experienced the *taurobolium* was to be free of sin either temporarily or permanently, and to possess, with this cleansing, the grant of a happy life hereafter. The other factor was the agrarian character of the cult. What promises to men an abundance of food is also dear to them. Consequently, the processions around the sown fields with the image of Cybele borne aloft, the accompanying songs and dances in her honour, the resulting assurance of a rich harvest, increased the capacity of the cult to win the affections of the common people. Thus a joyful life here and the anticipation of a joyful life hereafter made it a centre of attraction wherever it went. By the middle of the 3rd cent. its *taurobolia*, at first private, had become public, and were offered even for the welfare of the imperial family. By this time the cult had established itself in Gaul, Spain, and Africa. Where its sanctuary stood in Rome, the original centre of its propagandism, rises now the dome of the cathedral of St. Peter.

(*f*) *The mysteries of Persia.*—Mithras was the centre of devotion and worship in the Persian cult. In early Persian times he was associated with the highest god, Ahura, and afterwards was a modification of him. Specifically he was the god of light—that is, the light of day. Daily from the eastern to the western horizon he rode in his chariot drawn by four white horses. In him the dawn, the brightness of the noon, and the sunset glow were embodied. He was also the god of vegetation, not because he possessed a chthonic character, but because his warming light quickened the seed and brought forth the abundant harvest. It is possible that Mithras also was remotely a chthonic deity, like Demeter and Attis. His association with the cave, his worship in the underground chamber, and the representations of vegetable life on his monuments, might imply it. But as he is portrayed in Persian mythology he was a celestial deity and is devoid of all chthonic features (J. Grill, *Die persische Mysterienreligion im römischen Reich und das Christentum*, Tübingen, 1903, p. 28). The life-giving power of Mithras was naturally extended by human reflexion to the moral sphere. He was regarded as the inspirer of truthfulness, honesty, and bravery in his subjects. Before him the oath was taken, and he was the avenger of the violation of treaties. Under the Persian kings he became, as their protector, the god of war. Thus he was a soldier's deity, which, in part, explains his charm for Roman legionaries. As the deity to whom appeal was made in battle, he became also a mediator between gods and men, and ruled the realm intermediate between the abode of Ahura and that of Ahriman.

The Mithras of the Roman Empire was not the same as the Mithras of the Persian kingdom. In the progress of his worship from Persia westward his cult experienced numerous additions and modifications. It is difficult to mark the moment when it became a mystery-religion, but the cult was already well advanced, theologically and sacramentally, in the 2nd cent. B.C. During its sojourn in Babylonia it fell under the influence of the Chaldæan astrology and absorbed much of it. Consequently, the instructions given the candidate, probably in the later stages of his initiation, assumed a partially scientific character. When the cult reached the Greek-speaking peoples, it suffered fresh modifications, but these did not vitally affect it. While pliant under the Chaldæan, it was unyielding under the Greek influence. This conservatism distinguishes it from other cults which were less sturdy in their capacity for resistance. The Romans, among whom it was to assume its greatest importance, first came into contact with it in their invasion of Asia Minor, especially when Pompey waged his war with Mithradates (66 B.C.), although a company of Mithraic worshippers had already appeared in Rome. The Roman soldiers, chiefly the officers, were at once drawn to this martial god, and, giving him their allegiance, became his most effective missionaries in the West. They carried his cult, as they moved from camp to camp, west of the Black Sea, up the Danube, to Central Europe, and then southward. However, only from the time of the Flavian emperors (A.D. 70–96) can it be said to have gained a foothold in the Roman Empire. In the meanwhile it failed to entrench itself on the shores of Asia Minor and in Greece. This failure had a serious effect on its destiny, for, when it came into conflict with the Christian faith, which had succeeded in capturing the culture of Greece, it found itself labouring under a great disadvantage. The religion which can interest the intellect to the greatest degree, as well as arouse the emotions, gains the day (A. Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums*, Leipzig, 1902, p. 271; but see Grill, *Die persische Mysterienreligion*, p. 55 ff., for additional reasons). From the end of the 2nd cent. its foothold in Rome was assured. There it allied itself with the Attis cult and flourished under the protection of the privileges granted this cult by the State. The reign of Commodus (180–192) marks an epoch in the progress of Mithras. The emperor offered himself for initiation into the mysteries, and raised the god to the position of patron deity of the imperial power; and in the reign of Severus, his successor, we find the name of a chaplain of the imperial court in the service of Mithras. The influence of the cult steadily grew in the West during the century, though it secured but slight control in Egypt and Spain. In A.D. 307 Diocletian and his associates dedicated a sanctuary to Mithras at Carnuntum on the Danube, and in that dedication recognized him as the 'protector of the Empire.' Fifty years later Julian became sole emperor of Rome (361–363); and, although educated a Christian, immediately announced himself to be a follower of Mithras. The cult was introduced into Constantinople; but its ascendancy lasted only a brief time. It quickly lost it, and, on the ascent of Theodosius to undisputed power (A.D. 394), it led a precarious existence until it vanished in its last place of refuge in Cappadocia and its neighbourhood.

The cult always conducted its worship in a cave, or, if a natural cave were not available, in a subterranean chamber. The underground temple was rectangular in form, and provided with rows of seats for the accommodation of the worshippers. It bore the name of Mithræum, and could not have held more than 100 persons. Consequently, each congregation was small, but the limited number of 'brethren' was an advantage, for it brought the individual members into the closest acquaintance and sympathy with each other. Each congregation was well organized. It had its *summus pontifex*, or high priest, who had charge of the initiates, and, according to Tertullian, could marry but once. He superintended either in person or by delegated authority the numerous sacrifices, and kept the fire on the altar always burning. He directed the worship of the planets and the sun, to each of which a special day was devoted. Parallel with the duties of the priesthood there was also a system of duties assigned to elected officers of the corporation, which had the legalized right to hold property. A college of *decurii* governed it; besides these there were curators, who had charge of the financial affairs of the cult; advocates (*defensores*), who defended its interests in courts of law; patrons, whose private means helped to defray exceptional expenses. Thus its official ordering was somewhat similar to that of the cult of Isis (*ERE* vii. 436). Unlike the cult of Demeter, its polity seems to have been congregational, each community of worshippers being independent of every other.

The candidates for initiation passed through seven stages or grades, each possessing its own mask and robe, which the candidate wore on the completion of its rites. These seven stages answered to the spheres of the seven planets, which the soul of the devotee was supposed to traverse after it was liberated from the body. It was thus fitted to enter and leave in safety each sphere, for it was no longer a stranger to it, and knew how to answer the challenge of the guardian of it. At each grade the candidate received a special name, appropriate to the character of the grade—raven, occult or veiled, soldier, lion, Persian, sun's messenger, and father. This is now the accepted list, though the names are variously recorded by different early writers (Porphyry, *de Abstinentia*, iv. 16; Jerome, *Ep.* 107). But the bearer of the last of them, 'father,' held a pre-eminent place in the mysteries; in fact, all the priests of the cult were called 'fathers,' as in the Attis cult. The high priest himself received the name of 'father of fathers.' The holders of the first three grades were regarded as servants. But when they had passed through the grade of 'lion,' which is the most frequently mentioned in inscriptions, they entered the rank of companions or 'participants.' During the initiation a system of tests was brought to bear on the candidate in order to prove his capacity for endurance. Vows of strict silence concerning the things revealed to him were required. Baptisms for cleansing appear in the various rites; and there are indications of the practice of a sacrament of Confirmation. We learn from Tertullian that the brow of the 'soldier' was marked with a sign: 'Mithras set his mark on the forehead of his soldiers' (*de Præscr.* 40). A communion which Cumont describes (*Textes et Monuments*, Brussels, 1896–99, i. 320, tr. T. J. McCormack, Chicago, 1903, p. 158) figured among the rites. It belonged to an advanced stage of the initiation, and its elements were bread and water, though some (Cumont and Grill) believe that the water was mixed with wine, of which there is no convincing proof. Doubtless the communion was an imitation of the triumphant banquet, which Mithras, just before his glorious ascension, enjoyed with the sun-god. It was probably regarded by the communicant as magically imparting to himself the vigour of health, increased prosperity, illumination of mind, power to cope successfully with evil spirits, and finally a blessed immortality. De Jong appears to regard the communion as the culmination of the initiation. Others view the *taurobolium*, which was a rite in the Persian cult also, as the culmination, when the candidate emerged from his repulsive bath and received the homage of the people as one who had become identified with the god. Of the two opinions the latter may be viewed as the more correct.

The relation of the Persian to the Egyptian cult was close. There were Mithras-fathers who at the same time were priests of Serapis and Isis. It is significant that the priest who conducted Apuleius through the mysteries of Isis bore the name of Mithras. The idea of the service of the god as a life-long warfare was common to both; and the moral requirements received in them stronger emphasis than in the other mystery-religions. Further, the followers of Mithras, inasmuch as women with few exceptions were excluded from their cult, sought and received the admission of their wives and daughters into the Isis cult, where they were sometimes advanced to high official position. The relations of the Mithraic cult to the Attis mysteries were hardly less cordial. The Mithræum in Rome adjoined the temple of the Phrygian mother, and the possession of the *taurobolium* by both formed a bond of sympathy. The attitude of Mithraism to the growing Christian Church also was kindly until the rivalry between them became intense, when goodwill gave way to animosity, and the Mithraic priesthood early in the 4th cent. inaugurated through the emperor a determined persecution of the Christians.

It has been affirmed that this rivalry was deepened by the similarity between the tenets and practices of the two religions. The similarity is striking. The Fathers of the Church—Justin and Tertullian, for example—were impressed by the likeness, and attributed it to the effort of Satan to imitate the Christian teachings and rites. Each religion had a revelation, a mediator, who was both creator and redeemer; the story of his birth into the world, of his adoration by shepherds; an atoning sacrifice for the salvation of men, a last supper, and an ascent into heaven; a baptism, a communion, a confirmation, a belief in the immortality of the soul, in a final judgment, in the resurrection of the dead, in the end of the world by fire, in a heaven for saints and in a hell for the reprobate. This parallelism of teachings and practices has suggested to some students a borrowing on the part of Christianity from Mithraism, or the absorption of Mithraism into it. But with the similarities there are equally impressive differences. Mithraism presents a pantheon, a personification of abstractions and forces; Christianity, the one living God who is Spirit and Holy Love; the one an eternal dualism of good and evil, the other a creation subject to the will of an unrivalled Creator; the one the controlling and inexorable power of fate, the other the government of a wise and beneficent Providence; the one a mythological saviour, the other a historic person, who lived a real yet sinless life and died a heroic death to rescue the world from sin. Mithraism saved exclusively by sacramentalism, Christianity by faith with sacramentalism subordinate to it. These distinctions colour the two religions through and through, imparting their distinctiveness to the minor features which help to characterize them. Further than this, Mithraism was established in the Western world only after the Christian doctrines had been wrought out in the Church. Christianity becomes more wonderful in our eyes if it could have absorbed a religion so disparate from itself and so powerful without becoming itself radically affected by the act. De Jong is quite right in rejecting utterly the plea that Christianity borrowed any of its tenets from the Mithraic cult (*Das antike Mysterienwesen*, p. 60).

It was only at the end of the 2nd cent. that this mystery-religion began to assume importance in the life of the Empire, but it always remained local in its influence. It was a soldier's religion, and naturally followed the Roman army from encampment to encampment. One can trace the movements of the army on the soil of Europe by the surviving Mithraic monuments. Outside of the army posts it got a footing along the great routes of travel, frequented by the Oriental, who would naturally carry his religion with him. As a military religion it was confined socially to a limited social life—from the officers of legions, governors of provinces, to their captives and slaves. Under such conditions extensive territories would lie beyond its influence (Toutain, *Les Cultes païens*, ii. 150–159). And from these territories, which were not dominated by Mithraism, the religion of Christ drew in great measure its converts. Throughout its career, therefore, the Persian cult could have had but slight direct influence on the Christian faith.

(*g*) *The Orphic mysteries.*—Orphism is the speculative element in the Thracian worship of Dionysus. The oldest witness to Orphism is Herodotus (ii. 81), who emphasizes the agreement of some Bacchic and Orphic customs with the Egyptian (Rohde, *Psyche*, ii. 103). Orpheus was its founder, and from him it received its name. There are two main conceptions of him, the one laying the stress on his humanity, the other on his divinity. The first presents him as a historic figure, an immigrant from the South, perhaps Crete, into Thrace and Thessaly (Miss Harrison, *Prolegomena*, p. 456 ff.). The second presents him as a god, either chthonic or celestial. His assumed chthonic character is based on the derivation of his name from ὄρφνη, the darkness of the nether world. If he was a god, he was originally identified with Dionysus. Seeck believes that the two were nearly related forms of the sun-god, whose cult was strongly influenced by that of Sabazius, who was Thracian as well as Phrygian, an unmistakable chthonic deity, his symbol being the serpent. But the problem of the original inter-relationship of Orpheus and Dionysus remains still unsolved. Miss Harrison confesses that 'mythology has left us no tangle more intricate and assuredly no problem half so interesting as the relation between the ritual and mythology of Orpheus and Dionysos' (*Prolegomena*, p. 455). Orpheus, however, failed to keep the position which his supposed identification with Dionysus gave him; for later he appears merely as a priest of Dionysus and a promoter of the Dionysiac mysteries. In spite of his close relationship to him there are distinctions which separate them and give to Orpheus an individuality of his own. Two distinguishing features characterize the cult, which often bears his name rather than that of Dionysus. The first was its capacity to embody the finer aspirations of the soul in fitting melody. This capacity was presumably due to Orpheus, whose soft and gentle music, varied in its expression, could easily be contrasted with the uniformly wild and strident strains, more customary among his actual or adopted countrymen. The second feature was its possession of an abundant sacred literature, such as was wanting in the other mystery-religions, with the exception, perhaps, of that of Isis. In its form it was poetical, and continued to increase in volume from the 6th cent. B.C. to the 4th cent. A.D. (Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, pp. 341–347). In character it was dogmatic, presenting authoritatively its peculiar view of the world and of man. Time was the original generative power. Thence came Æther or the heavenly world, and Chaos, the mighty void (πελώριον χάσμα). Time produced a silver egg which Æther fructified and over which Chaos brooded. From the egg Phanes, the mystic principle of the world, was born. The new deity was two-fold in gender, male and female at once, and from its co-ordinated activities a universe emerged, which it reduced to harmonious arrangement. Then follows a succession of deities, among which are the Titans, and the sole ruler, Kronos, who swallows his own children and is finally conquered and supplanted by Zeus. Each succession of rulers introduces a new ordering of the world—a new epoch. At the end of the succession Dionysus appears, with the added name of Zagreus, possibly a chthonic deity. While he was still a child his father, Zeus, entrusted to him the government of the world. The evil Titans, the enemies of Zeus, approached him in disguise at the instigation of the jealous Hera, and gained his goodwill by gifts. While he was intent on one of the gifts they fell upon him, but Zagreus escaped from them by repeated transformations of himself. At last they caught him when he was in the form of a bull and tore him into pieces, all of which except the heart they swallowed. Zeus, hearing of his death, avenged it by smiting the Titans with a thunder-bolt, and out of their ashes the race of man arose, possessing according to its origin good qualities (dionysiac) and evil qualities (titanic). The legend which recounts the restoration of Dionysus to his former life and glory is varied. But he, as restored, introduced a new era in which mankind is now living. The story, thus briefly recounted, is very old. Onomacritus of Athens (530–485 B.C.) evidently had it under his hands. The Orphic theology begins with it and continues in it. For man by nature is dominated by an evil principle, from which he must seek to free himself. It is his original sin, which holds him down morally, and his hope of victory lies in Dionysus Zagreus, to whom the government of the world has again fallen. But in the effort to attain victory certain ritualistic practices are enjoined, such as abstinence from certain foods, meat, eggs, and beans, and wearing of white garments, and the offering of unbloody sacrifices.

The Orphic theology dealt with the soul not merely as it exists in this world, but with its fate in the future world. On the one hand, the Orphic doctrine of the state of the blessed dead was the reverse of the dreary conception which, applied to all but a few persons, was prevalent in the time of Homer. On the other hand, its doctrine of final retribution was almost as sombre as that of Chinese Buddhism. The idea of transmigration formed the central point of its view of the future. This idea, with others, seems to point to a close connexion at some early period between the cult and the Egyptian mysteries, and to sustain the theory that Orphism was derived mainly from Egypt. But the connexion of Orphism with Thracian beliefs and trends is too deep-seated and unmistakable to give room to this theory. The doctrine of transmigration, which we find alike in India and Egypt, must have been an extensive belief in remote times. No one knows whence it came, and it is likely to have been as native to Thrace and Thessaly or to lower Italy, where the cult early made its home, as to India or to Egypt. At a primitive period it made its way, as a religious conviction, into Orphic teaching, and so came, not from the philosophers to the priests, but rather from the priests to the philosophers (R. Falke, 'Die Seelenwanderung,' in *Biblische Zeit- und Streitfragen*, Berlin, 1913, p. 5).

About the year 600 B.C. the Orphic influence began its march southward through Greece, inaugurating one of the greatest conversions the world has experienced. It embodied itself in the form of the Dionysiac religion, and reinforced the waning worship of Dionysus which had established itself in Greece as early as the days of Homer. But its advent was not graciously received (Plato, *Rep.* 364 E). Nevertheless, its missionary spirit was ardent and persistent. It not only continued to found its own sanctuaries, but is supposed to have exercised a profound moulding power over other cults. Thus far the precise degree of its influence on them has not been determined. Much discussion has been centred on its influence upon the Eleusinian mysteries in particular. But the verdicts of individual judges differ widely. Miss Harrison (*Prolegomena*, p. 540 f.), Seeck (*Gesch.* iii. 19), and B. I. Wheeler (*Dionysos and Immortality*, Boston, 1899, p. 35) give it great weight; while Rohde (*Psyche*, i. 285), one of our most distinguished authorities, gives it no weight at all. De Jong (*Das antike Mysterienwesen*, p. 28) justly feels that the utter denial of it would be rash. But its influence in other directions is undoubted. If it failed to touch the Eleusinian cult, it certainly helped to mould the thought of Pindar and Plato; it evidently contributed to the Pythagorean philosophy (Rohde, *Psyche*, ii. 109); and its teachings were prized by the Stoics, the neo-Platonists, and the Gnostic sects. Its influence on the Scriptures of the NT is quite problematical. The witness for the origin in Orphism of the custom, mentioned in 1 Co 15^{29}, is too late to be important; and the story of the descent of Orpheus into Hades bears no close resemblance to that of Christ's descent into hell. And it is more than doubtful whether the passages Mt 11^{14} 17^{11} 16^{14}, Jn $9^{2.3}$ imply the Orphic view of the hereafter. Its degree of influence on the Christianity of later times is too elusive to be estimated. The painters of the Catacombs seem to have used Orpheus, 'charming the wild beasts,' as a symbol of Christ. But when one recalls the pantheistic trend of the Orphic conception of God, and the superficial character of its idea of redemption, one becomes sensible of the radical distinctions separating the Orphic and the Christian theologies.

On the whole, the mystery-religions exercised but a slight influence on the oldest Christianity (Clemen, *Der Einfluss der Mysterienreligionen*, p. 81). And when, after the beginning of the 3rd cent., they were in a position to exert it with any degree of potency, the Church had already substantially formed her doctrines. Similarities of terms used by both can be explained on the ground that both drew their expressions from a common stock of language, which the religious aspirations of the past had formed. St. Paul would naturally use the ordinary religious speech of his day, but the ideas expressed in it by him were not the ideas of the mystery-religions. They bore another character and breathed a different spirit. In its early ceremonies and customs Christianity gave no indication that it was a mystery-religion. Its Scriptures, its doctrines, even its sacraments, were open to the gaze of all. It was not until the 4th cent. that the secrecy which reminds us of that of the mystery-religions made itself conspicuous and began to be strictly enjoined on the communicant. But even then the substantial doctrines of Christianity, formed centuries before this, kept it steady under pagan accumulations, and enabled it in the course of years to throw off more or less of this accretion. For example, the secrecy, the *arcani disciplina*, attached to its rites in the time of Augustine fell away and disappeared not long after his death. Christianity can hardly be called a mystery-religion even of a higher order, and they who thus designate it have deceived themselves concerning the actual potency of the mystery-religions over it, or have forgotten the steady dominance and persistence of an inherited nature.

LITERATURE.—L. R. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States*, 5 vols., Oxford, 1896–1909, iii. and v.; F. Cumont, *The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism*, Chicago, 1911; P. Gardner, *The Religious Experience of St. Paul*, London, 1911; H. A. A. Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions*, do., 1913; C. Clemen, *Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources*, Eng. tr., Edinburgh, 1912; J. G. Simpson, *The Sacraments of the Gospel*, London, 1914; W. M. Groton, *The Christian Eucharist and the Pagan Cults*, do., 1914; J. Toutain, *Les Cultes païens dans l'empire romain*, 2 vols., Paris, 1907–11; C. A. Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, Königsberg, 1829; C. Clemen, *Der Einfluss der Mysterienreligionen*, Giessen, 1913; R. Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, Leipzig, 1910; K. H. E. de Jong, *Das antike Mysterienwesen*, Leiden, 1909; G. Anrich, *Das antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christentum*, Göttingen, 1893; L. R. Farnell, art. 'Mystery,' in *EBr*^{11} xix. 117 ff.; L. C. Purser, artt. 'Mysteria' and 'Orphica,' in Smith's *DGRA*^{3}, London, 1890–91, ii. 202, 297; W. Kroll, art. 'Mysterien' in *RGG* iv. [1912] 586.

W. M. GROTON.

MYSTICISM.—There are definitions of mysticism which place the subject outside the limits of this work. Harnack says: 'Mysticism is Catholic piety in general, so far as this piety is not merely ecclesiastical obedience, that is, *fides implicita*. . . . If Protestantism is not at some time yet, so far as it means anything at all, to become entirely Mystical, it will never be possible to make Mysticism Protestant without flying in the face of history and Catholicism' (*History of Dogma*, Eng. tr., London, 1894–99, vi. 98 ff.). E. Lehmann asserts that 'the aim of mysticism . . . is and always has been quiescence and emptiness of soul, darkened consciousness, and the suspension of natural understanding. All this eventually ends in conventual practices and the technics of the confessional' (*Mysticism in Heathendom and Christendom*, London, 1910, p. 235). But Christian mysticism cannot be identified with either its scholastic or its ecclesiastical forms; even Lehmann, in his sympathetic account of Santa Teresa, 'the greatest saint of mysticism,' significantly describes her thoughts as 'almost Protestant. . . . Union with God did not mean union in a pantheistic sense, but rather a transformation of the soul through love, leading up to a condition of perfect acquiescence to the will of God' (*op. cit.* p. 234). Harnack also acknowledges that 'that Mysticism cannot certainly be banished which at one time is called Quietism, at another time "Spurious Mysticism"; for the Church continually gives impulses towards the origination of this kind of Christianity, and can itself in no way avoid training it, up to a certain point' (*op. cit.* vii. 100). That mysticism degenerated into fanaticism which has no warrant in apostolic teaching is indisputable; it is, for this reason, essential that the false mysticism should be distinguished from the true. 'It was always the Ultra's, who, by making an appeal to them, brought discredit upon the "Church" Mystics' (Harnack, *op. cit.* vi. 105 n.).

Mysticism and historical religion are sometimes regarded as mutually exclusive alternatives. S. W. Fresenius, having expounded Luther's teaching in his *de Libertate Christiana*, says: 'that is historical religion as the Reformers understood it, but it is not Mysticism' (*Mystik und geschichtliche Religion*, Göttingen, 1912, p. 94). There may, however, be a mystical element in Christianity, although it does not rest upon a mystical basis. Christianity is a historical religion founded on facts, apart from which the experience of Christian believers is inexplicable; that experience is mystical in proportion as the soul has direct personal intercourse with God through Christ. But this is not to affirm that every Christian realizes the mystical implications of his own experience. From

Apostolic Christianity it is impossible to exclude the mysticism which has been defined as 'the type of religion which puts the emphasis on immediate awareness of relation with God, on direct and intimate consciousness of the Divine Presence. It is religion in its most acute, intense, and living stage' (Rufus Jones, *Studies in Mystical Religion*, London, 1909, p. xv).

The result of the contact of Christianity with non-Christian philosophies was the intrusion of non-Christian elements into Christian mysticism. But its corruptions ought not to be identified with its essence. The mysticism which Harnack condemns had its origin in the philosophy of Dionysius the Areopagite (4th cent.): 'The mystical and pietistic devotion of to-day, even in the Protestant Church, draws its nourishment from writings whose connection with those of the pseudo-Areopagitic can still be traced through its various intermediate stages' (*op. cit.* i. 361). But Christian mysticism differs essentially from the 'Platonic mysteriosophy' of Dionysius with its pantheistic tendency and its exclusive insistence on the *via negativa* (W. R. Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, London, 1899, p. 105). The mystical element in the Christian religion is found in the earliest stages of its history. Divine revelation could not possibly 'leave untouched the mystical yearnings of mankind. . . . Not only in John, but also in Paul, there are plentiful traces of Mysticism' (S. M. Deutsch, 'Theologie, mystische,' in *PRE*^{3} xix. [1907] 635; cf. *ExpT* xix. [1907–08] 304). To some of these traces attention must now be directed; it will then be necessary to inquire how far the apostles had the mind of Christ.

1. Pauline mysticism.—Inge has shown that the mystical element in St. Paul's theology has been under-estimated; that 'all the essentials of mysticism are to be found in his Epistles,' and that his authority has been wrongly claimed for two false and mischievous developments of mysticism, namely, 'contempt for the historical framework of Christianity,' and 'extreme disparagement of external religion—of forms and ceremonies and holy days and the like' (*op. cit.* p. 69 ff.). Von Hügel finds 'in St. Paul not only a deeply mystical element, but mysticism of the noblest, indeed the most daringly speculative, world-embracing type' (*The Mystical Element of Religion*, London, 1908, i. 35). Referring to St. Paul as an ecstatic mystic, this able Roman Catholic interpreter of mysticism supplies a salutary test for such experiences: 'Visions and voices are to be accepted by the mind only in proportion as they convey some spiritual truth of importance to it or to others, and as they actually help it to become more humble, true, and loving' (*op. cit.* ii. 47). Inge says: 'These recorded experiences are of great psychological interest; but . . . they do not seem to me to belong to the essence of Mysticism' (*op. cit.* p. 63 f.).

The most important elements of St. Paul's mysticism are derived from his experience of fellowship with the living Christ. W. K. Fleming gives a useful summary of 'the special points with regard to which Mysticism gains its inspiration and direction from St. Paul' (*Mysticism in Christianity*, London, 1913, p. 30 ff.). The subject is more extensively and most luminously treated by Miss Underhill (*The Mystic Way*, London, 1913, ch. iii.), though the technical phraseology of the great mystics is, at times, too rigidly applied to the Apostle's spiritual experiences. Rufus Jones holds that the term 'mystic' more properly belongs to St. Paul than to St. John, because 'Paul's Christianity takes its rise in an inward experience, and from beginning to end the stress is upon Christ inwardly experienced and re-lived' (*op. cit.* p. 16). St. Paul's explanation of his initiation into the spiritual life is: 'It was the good pleasure of God to reveal his Son in me' (Gal $1^{15f.}$). In his doctrine of mystical union with Christ he gives pregnant expression to his own consciousness of oneness with Christ: 'when he came to analyze his own feelings, and to dissect this idea of *oneness*, it was natural to him to see in it certain stages, corresponding to those great acts of Christ, to see in it something corresponding to death, something corresponding to burial . . ., and something corresponding to resurrection' (Sanday-Headlam, *ICC*, 'Romans'^{5}, 1902, p. 162, note on Ro 6^{1-14}). Appealing from Kant and Ritschl and Herrmann to Luther and his doctrine of the *unio mystica*, Söderblom argues that 'the mystical union . . . is a genuine constituent of evangelical Christianity, inasmuch as its mysticism is inseparably bound up with the essentials of every Christian life, that is to say, with the forgiveness of sins and with justification' (*Religion und Geisteskultur*, vi. [1912] 298 ff.; cf. *ExpT* xxiv. [1912–13] 117). Another truth which St. Paul put in the forefront of his teaching finds its highest expression in his great hymn in praise of Love (1 Co 13), for therein he 'declares the conditions, and sets the standard, to which the whole of Christian mysticism has since striven to conform' (Underhill, *op. cit.* p. 205). Finally, as Moberly has impressively said, 'the real truth of Christian Mysticism is, in fact, the doctrine, or rather the experience, of the Holy Ghost.' Mysticism is 'the realization of the Spirit of Holiness, the Spirit of the Creator of Heaven and Earth, in, and as, the climax of human personality' (*Atonement and Personality*, London, 1901, p. 312). In this doctrine the key to St. Paul's mysticism is found, for if Christ is to dwell in our hearts through faith we need to pray that we may be 'strengthened with power through his Spirit in the inward man' (Eph 3^{16}).

2. Johannine mysticism.—'The greatest monument of most genuine appreciation of St. Paul's mysticism . . . is the Gospel and the Epistles of St. John' (Deissmann, *St. Paul*, Eng. tr., London, 1912, p. 133). The two apostles agree in giving prominence to the mystic idea of the believer's oneness with Christ, to the pre-eminence of Love, and to the Holy Spirit as the Source of knowledge of the things of God, the Giver and Sustainer of spiritual life, and the witness to the Divine sonship of believers. St. John's chief contributions to the mystical element in religion are (1) that by his insistence on a historical revelation in time 'he counterpoises the strong mystical tendency in succeeding ages to regard the Gospel story as a kind of drama,' as though the birth, death, and resurrection of Christ took place within the soul; 'Yet he views what he holds as historical under so mystical an aspect, that it would be right to say that for him all life is sacramental; above all, the Life of lives' (Fleming, *op. cit.* p. 38); (2) that, by his use of symbols in the expression of mystical thought, he so treats the words and works of Christ as to ensure that 'all things in the world may remind us of Him who made them, and who is their sustaining life' (Inge, *op. cit.* p. 59).

3. Mysticism of other NT writers.—The mystical element in the remaining NT Epistles is of minor importance. In the Epistle to the Hebrews visible things are regarded as symbols of invisible realities of the spiritual world; the mystic conception of life as an exile and a pilgrimage also has a place (He $11^{13ff.}$ 13^{14}; cf. 1 P 1^{17} 2^{11}). 'St. Peter, who shares the Johannine conception as to the "incorruptible seed," echoes the thought of both St. John and St. Paul as to the timelessness of the redemptive process' (Fleming, *op. cit.* p. 44).

As regards the mystical element in the writings of apostolic men before the close of the 1st cent. it is sufficient to say that the judgment of Rufus Jones as to the Church Fathers in general applies especially to this early period: 'The Fathers were not "mystics" in the ordinary sense of the word. Their type of religion was mainly objective and historical, rather than subjective and inward' (*op. cit.* p. 80).

4. Christ 'the true mystic.'—When Moberly asserts that 'it is Christ who is the true mystic,' he is referring to the disproportionate emphasis which mystics of various schools (ascetic, contemplative, symbolic, etc.) have laid upon their own aspect of truth, and he claims that 'one and all the exaggerations find their full correction in the Person of the Incarnate, our Lord Jesus Christ; for all the exaggerations are partial lights from the full splendour of the presence of His Spirit, which is the ideal meaning of Christian personality.' To those who hesitate to speak of Christ as the true mystic, Moberly says: 'If the mode of expression be preferred, it is He who alone has realized all that mysticism and mystics have aimed at. . . . In Him this perfect realization evidently means a harmony, a sanity, a fitly proportioned completeness. . . . In being the ideal of mysticism, it is also the ideal of general, and of practical, and of *all*, Christian experience' (*op. cit.* p. 314). When the Synoptic narratives are read in this light, the main elements of mysticism are found therein. Miss Underhill is more ambitious, and strives to show that the characteristic experiences of great mystics, as, *e.g.*, Suso and Teresa, 'are found in a heightened form in the life of their Master' (*op. cit.* p. 77). This involves some straining of the records and the anachronistic application to our Lord's experiences of mediæval phraseology. But it remains true that although 'the first three Gospels are not written in the religious dialect of Mysticism,' yet in the earliest accounts of the teaching of Christ 'the vision of God is promised . . . only to those who are pure in heart,' the inwardness of the blessings of His Kingdom is emphasized, and He identifies Himself with the least of His brethren. In the Synoptists is also found 'the law of gain through loss, of life through death,—which is the corner-stone of mystical (and, many have said, of Christian) ethics' (Inge, *op. cit.* p. 44).

Of mysticism which is impatient of the historical facts which are the foundation of the Christian religion and has no need of Christ as Mediator, the apostolic writers know nothing. P. T. Forsyth, who has no sympathy with mysticism of this type (cf. *ExpT* v. [1893–94] 401 ff.), has, nevertheless, said: 'We need more mystic souls and mystic hours. But the true mysticism is not raptly dwelling in the mystery of God, it is really living on His miracle. . . . And the only mysticism with a lease of life is that which surrounds the moral miracle which makes Christianity in the end evangelical or nothing. It is the mysticism of the cross' (*The Principle of Authority*, London, 1912, p. 465). Christian mysticism, as understood by the apostles, is also the mysticism of the Spirit. 'The Christianity which is content to remain "non-mystical" is impoverished at the very centre of its being. All Christians profess belief in the Holy Ghost. Had only all Christians understood, and lived up to, their belief, they would all have been mystics' (Moberly, *op. cit.* p. 316).

LITERATURE.—In addition to the works mentioned in the art., see H. Hering, *Die Mystik Luthers im Zusammenhange seiner Theologie*, Leipzig, 1879; M. Reischle, *Ein Wort zur Controverse über die Mystik*, Freiburg i. B., 1886; G. Klepl, *Zur Umbildung des religiösen Denkens*, Leipzig, 1908; P. Mehlhorn, 'Christliche Mystik,' in *RGG* iv. [Tübingen, 1912–13] 600 ff.; G. Lasch, 'Mystik und Protestantismus,' in *Religion und Geisteskultur*, v. [Göttingen, 1911] 34 ff.; N. Söderblom, *Religionsproblemet inom Katolicism och Protestantism*, Stockholm, 1910; W. Herrmann, *The Communion of the Christian with God*, Eng. tr.[2], London, 1906; W. Major Scott, *Aspects of Christian Mysticism*, do., 1907; J. M. Campbell, *Paul the Mystic*, do., 1907; E. C. Gregory, *An Introduction to Christian Mysticism*[2], do., 1908; H. B. Workman, *Christian Thought to the Reformation*, do., 1911; W. T. Davison, *The Indwelling Spirit*, do., 1911; F. von Hügel, *Eternal Life*, Edinburgh, 1912; A. Seth Pringle-Pattison, 'Mysticism,' in *EBr*[11] xix. 123 ff.; O. C. Quick, 'The Value of Mysticism in Religious Faith and Practice,' in *JThSt* xiii. [1911–12] 161 ff., and 'Mysticism: its Meaning and Danger,' in *ib.* xiv. [1912–13] 1 ff.; H. Kelly, *The Meaning of Mysticism*, in *ib.* xiii. 481.

J. G. TASKER.

N

NAME (ὄνομα).—'Naming,' says De Quincy,* 'is not a pre-historic, but a pre-mythical, not only a pre-mythical, but even a pre-fabulous and a pre-traditional thesis.' Indeed man must, at a very early period of his history, have been forced to give names to the things and beings around him, and even to those which existed only in his imagination. We may suppose, either that sensations and actions first received appellations, and then the objects which caused these were named after them; or, what is far more likely, that first of all objects and actions essential to life gradually acquired names. Such designations would not be given unthinkingly, but rather, as onomatopoetic terms indicate, on account of some peculiarity in that to which the name was given.

The derivations given as those of certain names in the OT, even if incorrect, indicate that names, like nicknames, were given for some reason.†

1. Names of persons.*—Ethnologists picture the earliest men as living together in little herds, 'co-operative groups,' as Bagehot calls them.† Such a group would acquire a name from some object or animal with which it was closely associated. This would, most probably, be bestowed on it by a neighbouring group and then be used by the group to indicate itself to others. The animal or other thing by which it was thus designated became its totem. Worshippers of a totem marked themselves with it, and by the mark 'men of the same stock recognised one another';‡ hence the totem mark, which was connected with the habit of tatuing, became the tribal mark. The name of an individual seems originally to have been his stock-name. שֵׁם is primarily a stock-name rather than that of an individual.§ Hence arose such totemistic names as those of animals, etc.* In course of time these and all other names tended to lose their primitive significance and became mere hereditary designations. Such are Ἀκύλας (Aquila),† the Græcized form of the Latin *aquila*, 'eagle'; Ἄγαβος (Agabus),‡ very probably a Gr. form of חָגָב, 'locust'; Δάμαρις (Damaris),§ probably a corruption of Δάμαλις, 'heifer,' 'Damalis,' indeed, being the reading of one Latin MS. The Heb. צְבִי has in Aram. the form טַבְיָא (Tabitha). In the LXX this is translated Δορκάς,‖ 'gazelle'; while Ῥόδη (Rhoda)¶ is simply the word for a rose.

---

* A. H. Japp, *Life of Thomas De Quincy*, 1890, p. 363.

† A. Lang, 'The Origin of Totem Names and Beliefs,' in *FL* xiii. [1902] 382 ff.

* Names of countries, places, nations, natural objects, and animals, civic names, and those of persons mentioned in the OT and in the Gospels, do not fall within the scope of this article.

† W. Bagehot, *Physics and Politics*, new ed., n.d., p. 213.

‡ W. R. Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*, 1903, p. 251.

§ *Ib.* p. 248.

As the totemistic tribes amalgamated, the wider life demanded more exact, more personal, designations. Hence some peculiarity, bodily, intellectual, or moral, which was, or which it was hoped would be, exhibited by the individual, was assigned to him as a name. Thus from ἀλέκω, 'defend,' and ἀνήρ we have Ἀλέξανδρος (Alexander),** 'a defender of men'; from the Latin *amplius*, 'great *or* noble,' we have the Gr. name Ἀμπλιᾶς (Amplias),†† or in a longer form Ἀμπλιᾶτυς (Ampliatus). Something striking in the appearance is indicated by the name Ἐπαφρόδιτος (Epaphroditus),‡‡ the Gr. word for 'handsome'; from ἀνδρεῖος, 'manly,' comes Ἀνδρέας (Andrew),§§ as Ῥοῦφυς is just the Greek form of Rufus,‖‖ 'red.' Some peculiar circumstance attending a child's birth may suggest a name, as Ἀγρίππα (Agrippa),¶¶ 'one born feet first.' What names could be more appropriate for a trusted slave than Ὀνήσιμος (Onesimus),*** the Greek adjective for 'helpful,' or Ὀνησίφορος (Onesiphorus),††† 'the profit-bringer?' A Hebrew king bore the name מְנַחֵם, 'comforter,' which in the LXX is Μαναήν (Manaen).‡‡‡

In the development of religion man, having come to believe in spirits and raised some of these, partly by giving them names, into divinities, began to incorporate in a personal name that of a deity; and thus we have theomorphous names. Such a practice was almost inevitable when men began to give names to the lower divinities as angels, whose names Μιχαήλ (Michael),§§§ and Γαβριήλ (Gabriel),‖‖‖ like Raphael and Uriel, are both compounds of אֵל. As it was believed that a divinity was of necessity closely connected with a person if the name of the former was introduced into that of the latter, the custom was extended to human beings.

The names of exalted personages, like kings, were often compounded of divine names. Most of the names of the Egyptian kings have incorporated in them the names of Ra, Amon, etc.¶¶¶ The great majority of Mesopotamian names contain the name of a god, the greater number containing two, some three, such elements, as *Sin-kalama-idi*, meaning 'Sin knows everything.'**** Among the South Arabians, as among the Minæans and Sabæans, a great many of the personal names are compounds of *ilu*, the generic name for 'God.'†††† A Minæan inscription of the Ptolemaic period gives us the name זידאל (Zaid-El); in 1 Mac 11^{17} we have the name Ζαβδιήλ as that of an Arabian chief, while Nabatæan inscriptions of the age of Jesus have many such names.‡‡‡‡ 'In pre-Islamitic inscriptions of Arabia,' we have such names as 'Ili-kariba, "My God hath blessed"'; which 'served as spells for the protection of the child' who bore them.§§§§ A great number of personal names in the OT are compounded of Jahweh, El, or Baal. This custom, a survival from animism, was not intended to serve as a protection to the Divine name, which might not be uttered; the entwining of the name of the deity in the human name meant the enlisting of the power of the god on behalf of the man.* In such theomorphous names, the predicate is sometimes a verb and sometimes a noun; the subject may be at the beginning as אֶלְנָתָן, or at the end as Ναθαναήλ.† This custom is closely akin to the Hebrew one of 'calling the name over,' solemnly invoking the name of a person, Divine or human, over a person or place, and thus linking them in the closest possible connexion.‡

The records of the Apostolic Church furnish us with several such names, as Ἀνανίας (Ananias),§ the Gr. form of the Heb. חֲנַנְיָה ('Jahweh hath been gracious'); Ματθαῖος (Matthias),‖ an abbreviation of Ματταθίας, the Gr. form of מַתִּתְיָה ('gift of Jahweh'); Γαμαλιήλ (Gamaliel),¶ the Heb. form of which, גַּמְלִיאֵל, means 'reward of God.' Βαρνάβας (Barnabas),** formerly taken as the Greek form of בַּרְנְבוּאָה, is in reality a form of a recently discovered Semitic name, Βαρνεβοῦς, and is בר־נבו ('son of Nebo'). Demetrius is another instance of the same thing.†† It was not uncommon to brand or tatu the name of the deity on the person by whose name he was called. It is possible that St. Paul was alluding to some such mark on himself when he speaks of bearing 'branded on my body the marks of Jesus,'‡‡ and the custom is clearly alluded to in the Apocalypse in the marking of the adherents of the Beast with his name or the number of his name,§§ and the marking of his opponents with the seal of the living God.‖‖ In Greece we have clear traces, in such names as Apollodorus, Zeno, and Diogenes, of the incorporation of a divine name in a human one.

As the members of communities increased and nations grew larger, necessity demanded that individuals bearing the same name should be differentiated one from another. This was done as a rule by making an addition to the original name. This addition might be the name of the father, the name of some place with which the individual was specially connected, or another name in some cases in a different language. All these cases are dealt with in the art. SURNAME.

Names, like other words, were, in course of general use, subject to slight alterations, the most important of which may be classed under—

(*a*) *Abbreviations and diminutives.*—A number of these occur in the apostolic writings; thus Apollonius is shortened into Apollos (Ac 18^{24}); Ampliatus into Amplias (Ro 16^{8}); Demetrius into Demas (Ac 19^{24}, 3 Jn ^{12}, 2 Ti 4^{10}, etc.); Epaphroditus into Epaphras (Ph 2^{25}, etc., Col 4^{12}, etc.); Hermogenes (like Hermagoras and Hermodorus) into Hermas (Ro 16^{14}, 2 Ti 1^{15}, and the author of the *Pastor*); Lucanus into Lucas (Philem ^{24}, etc.); Lucius into Lucullus (Ac 13^{1}, Ro 16^{21}); Silvanus into Silas (Ac 15^{22}, etc., 2 Co 1^{19}, etc.); Olympiodorus into Olympas (Ro 16^{15}); Prisca into Priscilla (Ac 18^{2}, Ro 16^{3}, etc.); Parmenides into Parmenas (Ac 6^{5}); Tertius into Tertullus (Ac 24^{2}, Ro 16^{22}); Theodorus into Theudas (Ac 5^{36}); and, if Nymphas be the correct reading of Col 4^{15}, it is probably a contraction of Nymphodorus.

Nicknames.—Just as names were originally given on account of some peculiarity in or about a person, so in later times any such peculiarity was apt through ridicule or contempt to result in a nickname.

An inscription, indicating the holders of seats in the theatre of Miletus, reads 'Place of the Jews who are called Θεοσεβίον.' The designation is evidently a nickname given to the Jews on account of their religion. In the times of the Dispersion, many Gentiles were attracted by the monotheism and imageless worship of the Jews, and yet refused to be circumcised or observe all the commands of the Law. Such individuals, loosely attached to the Jews, were nicknamed *φοβούμενοι* or *σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν*. Similarly the followers of Jesus were nicknamed ‘*Christianoi*, “Christ’s people,” a base-Latin improvisation by the people of Antioch, who were notorious in antiquity for impudent wit.’*

---

* *ERE* i. 497.
† Ac 18^{2}.
‡ Ezr 2^{46}, Ac 11^{28}; *ExpT* ix. [1897–98] 567.
§ Ac 17^{34}; *HDB* i. 545.
‖ Ac 9^{36}; G. A. Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, 1901, p. 189.
¶ Ac 12^{13}.
** Ac 4^{6}, etc.
†† Ro 16^{8}.
‡‡ Ph 2^{25}.
§§ Ac 1^{13}.
‖‖ Ro 16^{13}.
¶¶ Ac 25^{13}.
*** Philem ^{10}.
††† 2 Ti 1^{6} 4^{19}.
‡‡‡ Ac 13^{1}; Deissmann, *op. cit.* p. 310.
§§§ Rev 12^{7}; T. K. Cheyne speaks of Michael as 'a degraded (but an honourably degraded) deity,' 'a reflexion, not only of Mithra, but of Marduk,' as the repository of the Name of God—'one might say that he *is* the Name of God' (*Exp*, 7th ser., i. [1906] 299; *ExpT* xvi. [1904–05] 147, 193, 287).
‖‖‖ Lk 1^{19}.
¶¶¶ A. Erman, *Life in Ancient Egypt*, 1894, p. 56.
**** F. Hommel, *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, 1897, pp. 60–72; L. R. Farnell, *Greece and Babylon*, 1911, p. 195.
†††† Hommel, p. 80.
‡‡‡‡ *Critical Review*, vii. [1897] 413.
§§§§ Farnell, *op. cit.* p. 195.

* *Transactions of the Third International Congress for the History of Religions*, 2 vols., 1908, i. 266; R. R. Marett, *The Threshold of Religion*², 1914, p. 62.
† *EBi* iii. 3279.
‡ *Ib.* iii. 3266.
§ Ac 5^{1} 9^{10}.
‖ Ac 1.
¶ Ac 5^{34}.
** Ac 4^{36} 11^{30}.
†† Ac 19^{24}, 3 Jn ^{12}.
‡‡ Gal 6^{17}.
§§ Rev 13^{17} 14^{11}.
‖‖ Rev 7^{2} 9^{4} 14^{1}.

2. Names of sects and parties.—Somewhat akin to nicknames are such names as Herodion,† evidently that of a freedman of one of the Herods. These again lead on to names of sects or parties which are derived from (*a*) persons, *e.g.* ‘Epicureans,’‡ from Epicurus the founder of the school; ‘Nicolaitans,’ most probably from a certain Nicolas,§ the originator of the heresy; ‘Sadducees,’ from Zadok.‖

(*b*) Others again are derived from places, *e.g.* ‘Nazarenes’¶—a term applied to the followers of Jesus from a name given to Him from the town in which He had been brought up; ‘Stoics,’** from the *στοά*, the painted porch in which Zeno the founder taught.

(*c*) Other such appellations are derived from some peculiarity; thus ‘Hellenists’†† is a name given to certain Jews who spoke Greek; ‘Libertines’‡‡ to the descendants of Jews who had been slaves; ‘Pharisees’§§ from the Hebrew פְּרוּשִׁים (Aram. פְּרִישִׁין, stat. emphat. פְּרִישַׁיָּא), meaning ‘the separated,’ those who had separated themselves from all uncleanness and illegality, and from all unclean persons.

3. Names and titles.—It does not fall within the scope of this article to consider how an ordinary word such as *εὐλογητός*,‖‖ ‘blessed,’ almost becomes, if not a name, a title; nor how such a word as ‘apostle’ acquired a restricted meaning, and became a title; or again how such a title as ‘high priest’¶¶ was bestowed on a single individual, as our Lord; nor yet how the name of an individual, as ‘Adam,’*** was applied to Him to bring out some particular function; but we can see the word *Χριστός* passing from a title ‘Jesus the Christ’ into a personal name ‘Jesus Christ.’††† A religion in its attempts to gain men from another faith finds the task easier if it can appropriate and employ names which custom has made familiar to them.‡‡‡ The religion of Jesus, when it entered the Roman world, could not apply to Him the names of the pagan deities—these indeed it degraded into demons—but familiar appellations could be used to convey kindred but higher truths. *Κύριος* is an Oriental term expressing absolute dominion and absolute submission. The LXX used it to translate the exalted name Jahweh.§§§ In Oriental cults it expressed such an abject relation between a worshipper and his deity. ‘The Lord Serapis’ occurs in papyri of the 2nd cent. A.D.‖‖‖ The title came to be given to the Roman Emperors. On an ostracon dated A.D. 63 Nero is called ‘Lord,’ and Festus referring to him speaks of writing *τῷ κυρίῳ*.¶¶¶ An inscription at Philæ dated 62 B.C. calls Ptolemy XIII. ‘the lord king god.’**** We can appreciate at once the necessity and the advantage of the Christians applying this word to Jesus, making Him at once the equal of Jahweh, and making His position intelligible to the whole pagan world.* Hence they proclaimed Jesus to be ‘both Lord and Christ,’ ‘Lord of all,’ ‘Lord both of the dead and of the living,’ ‘the Lord from heaven,’ ‘our only liege and Lord.’† Hence, as the Egyptians of the 2nd cent. A.D. spoke of ‘the table of the lord Serapis,’ St. Paul spoke of ‘the table of the Lord,’‡ just as ‘Sebaste day,’ meaning ‘Emperor’s day,’ is paralleled by ‘the Lord’s day.’§ It is this consciousness of the spiritual proprietorship of Jesus that makes plain the meaning of St. Paul when he says: ‘No one can say Jesus is Lord except in the Holy Spirit,’ and ‘Confess with your mouth that Jesus is Lord, believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, and you will be saved.’‖ *βασιλεύς* was a popular title for princes in the Hellenistic East, and was bestowed on the Emperor. The still higher title *βασιλεὺς βασιλέων* was the lofty designation of great monarchs and was given to the gods. At the beginning of the Christian epoch it was borne by the monarchs of Armenia, the Bosporan kingdom, and Palmyra. It was applied to Jahweh. This exalted name the Christians ascribed to Jesus.¶ The designation *σωτήρ* (‘saviour’) was from an early period attached to Zeus, and in feminine form to Kore, in her case connoting salvation after death. The Alexandrian Greeks used it ‘to sanctify the divine man, God’s representative on earth, the living image of God,’ as the monarch was called.** When Demetrius Poliorcetes restored the Athenian democracy in 307 B.C., the Athenians decreed divine honours to him under the title ‘Saviour God,’ and altars and priests were appointed to him.†† Philip of Macedon was called *σωτήρ*, Ptolemy VIII. (113 B.C.) called himself *σωτήρ*.‡‡ Inscriptions show that on Julius Cæsar and many other Emperors there had been bestowed the title ‘Saviour of the world.’ The word was used in the LXX to translate the Hebrew מוֹשִׁיעַ. This title became a designation of Jesus; He is exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour,§§ and the still more universal title ‘Saviour of the World,’ very common in inscriptions for Hadrian, is also ascribed to Him.‖‖ The title *θεοῦ υἱός* was a technical term familiar in the Empire in the 1st cent. A.D. We have it on an inscription of Olympia, not later than 27 B.C., and in a Fayyum inscription dated A.D. 7. This too the followers of Jesus applied to Him.¶¶ It is an all-important fact that the chief names given to Jesus ‘were precisely those accorded to the Emperors dead and living, his titles the highest which adorned the Imperial ruler.’*** Other names like *Σεβαστός* really come under the designation of titles, and so too *Ἀρεοπαγίτης*, ‘the Areopagite,’ applied to Dionysius.†††

4. Names of divinities.—In the evolution of religion one of the earliest and lowest stages is that in which the spirits, not having attained sufficient individuality to be possessed of personal names, are addressed, as among the Phœnicians, by such common terms as ‘Lord,’ or ‘Chentamentet,’ as among the Egyptians.‡‡‡ This stage is exhibited in the religion of the primitive Aryans, and even in the later cults of the Hindus, Persians, Thracians, Teutons, Greeks, Romans, and Amerinds.[*] Some deities remain in this state, some become departmental deities, others functional deities (*Sondergötter*), while others, who manifest themselves in a plant, animal, planet, or tree, are named after it.[†] In course of time this designation, the meaning having been forgotten, becomes a proper name representing an individual deity. Gods with names become, in this way, a distinct class of divinities.[‡] To a divinity with a distinct name the path of advancement is open. The name would be either masculine or feminine, and that itself would gradually determine status, functions, and ritual.[§] Epithets applied to such a deity, as 'Adon' or 'Melech,' became cult titles (though sometimes they developed into distinct deities). Further, such a divinity might come to exercise functions besides those to which he owed his origin and name, and these outside the locality in which he had been primarily worshipped, thus attaining higher status and greater dignity.[‖] Again, his name and functions might make him so real to his worshippers that they represented him by a human or semi-human figure,[¶] expressing the physical characteristics, and even the moral qualities, of the deity.[**] Such a deity had the chance of becoming a tribal god. On the other hand, a tribal hero or medicine man, having the initial advantage of a name, might be deified and become in time the tribal god in accordance with the Euhemeristic theory.[††] When a tribe with such a deity developed into or was merged in a nation the qualities and functions of the tribal deity might be taken over by another deity (syncretism), or the deity might become one of the members of a pantheon, or even, like Zeus, the supreme national god.[‡‡] In all this we see a trend towards monotheism and the final conception of the unity of the Godhead.[§§] Through some such stages as these Jahweh had advanced till the Hebrews in their conception of Him had become monotheists.[‖‖] In the age of Jesus that name in Greek, Κύριος or simply Θεός, had come to denote the supreme and only God.[¶¶] It was one of the great achievements of Jesus to fill these names with richer, finer meaning by revealing new and higher attributes of the Godhead. The transference of the name Κύριος to Jesus marks the awakening of the Church to a true appreciation of His Divinity (Ac $1^{1.11.14.16}$ in contrast with v.^{21}). While the Jews and Christians were thus monotheists, they still continued to believe in a variety of subordinate spirits, some of whom were but nameless, departmental, or functional deities, while others had attained to distinct names, as Satan, Michael (Jude ^{9}, Rev 12^7), Gabriel (Lk $1^{19.26}$), Raphael (To 12^{15}), Uriel (2 Es 5^{20}). In the Gentile world the development had not reached but only tended towards monotheism, Zeus (Ac $14^{12.13}$) being recognized only as the king of a countless crowd of deities. Among them there stood out local deities who had got distinct names, as Artemis of Ephesus (19^{28}), Mars (17^{19}), and Hermes, the messenger and speaker for the gods (14^{12}), or the Dioscuri, the twin gods Castor and Pollux (28^{11}).

---

* Jos. *Ant.* XIV. vii. 2; Ac $10^{2.22}$ $13^{16.26.43.50}$ 16^{14} $17^{4.17}$ 18^{7}; E. Schürer, *HJP* II. ii. [1885] 308, 314; Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, 1911, p. 446; *HDB* i. 384; Ac 11^{26}; T. R. Glover, *The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire*, 1909, p. 151.

† Ro 16^{11}.

‡ Ac 17^{18}.

§ Rev $2^{6.15}$, Ac 6^{5}.

‖ Ac 4^{1}, etc.; *Exp*, 8th ser., vi. [1913] 158.

¶ Ac 24^{5}, Mt 2^{23}.

** Ac 17^{18}.

†† Ac 6^{1} (9^{29} 11^{20}?).

‡‡ Ac 6^{9}.

§§ Ac 15^{5}, etc.; Schürer, *HJP* II. ii. 19.

‖‖ 2 Co 11^{31}, Ro 1^{25} 9^{5}.

¶¶ He 3^{1}, etc.

*** 1 Co 15^{45}.

††† *DCG* ii. 171, 219; *Exp*, 8th ser., viii. [1914] 205.

‡‡‡ L. R. Farnell, *The Evolution of Religion*, 1905, p. 32.

§§§ Deissmann, *Light from the Anc. East*, p. 353.

‖‖‖ *Ib.* pp. 168, 176.

¶¶¶ *Ib.* p. 353; Ac 25^{26}.

**** Deissmann, *Light from the Anc. East*, p. 356.

* Deissmann, *Light from the Anc. East*, p. 354.

† Ac 2^{36} 10^{36}, Ro 14^{9}, 1 Th 4^{16}, 2 Th 1^{7}, Jude ^{4} (1 Co 15^{47}?); Deissmann, *Light from the Anc. East*, p. 359.

‡ Deissmann, *Light from the Anc. East*, p. 355.

§ *Ib.* p. 361; Rev 1^{10}.

‖ 1 Co 12^{3}, Ro 10^{9}; *Exp*, 7th ser., vii. [1909] 292, 297; *ERE* ii. 378.

¶ Deissmann, *Light from the Anc. East*, p. 367; *Exp*, 7th ser., vii. 296; 2 Mac 13^{4}, 3 Mac 5^{35}, 1 Ti 6^{15}, Rev 17^{14} 19^{16}.

** Farnell, *The Evolution of Religion*, p. 33.

†† J. G. Frazer, *GB*^{3}, pt. i., *The Magic Art*, 1911, i. 390.

‡‡ Deissmann, *Light from the Anc. East*, pp. 373, 374.

§§ Ac 5^{31}, Ph 3^{20}; *Exp*, 7th ser., vii. 293, 298.

‖‖ Deissmann, *Light from the Anc. East*, p. 369; 1 Jn 4^{14}; *DCG* ii. 573.

¶¶ *Exp*, 7th ser., vii. 293, 301; Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, p. 166, *Light from the Anc. East*, p. 350; Ac 8^{37}, etc.

*** *Exp*, 7th ser., vii. 294, 301.

††† Ac $25^{21.25}$ 17^{34}.

‡‡‡ F. B. Jevons, *Comparative Religion*, 1913, p. 129.

5. Name and personality.—At a very early period men came to feel that there was a material and mysterious but essential connexion between the person or thing and its name. To them names were not, as with us, mere meaningless designations, symbols without significance which could be changed without affecting the thing or person; *nomina* were *numina*, not even essential attributes, but possessed of a certain independent existence, yet part and parcel of the personality, and therefore supremely important as affecting and affected by a person's good or evil fortune.[*] The name was a kind of 'alter ego,' a vital portion of the man himself, and to be taken care of accordingly.[†]

Such a belief is found among the Amerind tribes, the Australians, the proto-Aryans, and almost all other races.[‡] The ancient Britons held that the soul and the name were the same.[§] Among the Annamese when a child continues ill, the parents sell it to someone who gives it a new name and it is then, being a completely different person, re-sold to its parents.[‖] A young Caffre thief can be reformed by shouting his name into a kettle of boiling medicated water, clapping on the lid, and allowing the name (*i.e.* him) to steep there for several days.[¶] The Mesopotamians so identified the name and the person that the name was the personality.[**] In their religion, as in the Mandæan, Persian, and other cults, the name of the deity is itself a part of the divine essence.

'The Aryan-speaking peoples "believed at one time not only that the name was a part of the man, but that it was that part of him which is termed the soul, the breath of life."'[††] Among the Egyptians the name was 'an imperishable component of the Ego, on a footing of equality with soul, form, heart, etc.,' for they held 'that an inward and indissoluble connexion subsists between an object and its name.'[‡‡] Hence it was necessary that the name should be kept fresh, for so close was the connexion that the continued existence of the name was essential to the immortality of the person.[§§] A man prayed for his name to be mentioned, or libations poured out in his name, and monuments were raised with the name on them so that it might live. The Pharaoh sacrificed captives to perpetuate his name, and all vassals took the oath by the royal name. In the Papyri, especially in indictments, there occurs the phrase *ἔντευξις εἰς τὸ τοῦ βασιλέως ὄνομα*, a memorial to the king's majesty, the name of the king being the essence of what he is as ruler. Inscriptions mention the fact of purchasing *εἰς τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ὄνομα*, the nominal purchaser purchasing for the god.[‖‖] Sometimes the name became almost a separate personality. 'In the Tabulæ Iguvinæ, . . . the god Grabovius is implored to be propitious to the "Arx Fisia" and to "the name of the Arx Fisia," as if the name of the city was a living and independent entity.'[¶¶]

This practical identification of the person and the name gave rise to a number of practices. The name was honoured equally with the person.

The Egyptian kings made offerings to the names of their predecessors; honour was paid to the name of Pharaoh, while the secret names of the gods of Egypt were specially honoured.[*] Passages in the OT, too numerous to quote, indicate the great place this conception had in the minds of the Hebrews. There is a glory due to Jahweh's name; men are to sing forth the glory of His name, to exalt His name, to sing praises to His name, to bless His name, to fear His glorious and fearful name, and even to love His name.[†]

---

[*] *ERE* i. 462, ii. 285; Jevons, *Comparative Religion*, pp. 125, 129, *The Idea of God in Early Religions*, 1910, p. 85; J. H. Moulton, *Early Religious Poetry of Persia*, 1911, pp. 32, 55.

[†] Jevons, *Comparative Religion*, pp. 91, 92, 117; *ERE* i. 382, ii. 35; see also the classification of Rose quoted in *PEFSt* xlvi. [1914] 206.

[‡] Jevons, *Comparative Religion*, p. 129.

[§] *Ib.* pp. 126–128.

[‖] *Ib.*

[¶] *ERE* ii. 38, 39.

[**] *Ib.* ii. 50; Jevons, *The Idea of God in Early Religions*, p. 26 f.

[††] W. G. Aston, *Shinto*, 1907, p. 8.

[‡‡] *Ib.* p. 10; 2 K 17^{26-29}.

[§§] Jevons, *The Idea of God in Early Religions*, p. 28.

[‖‖] Jevons, *Comparative Religion*, pp. 125–129.

[¶¶] S. R. Driver, 'Recent Theories on the Origin and Nature of the Tetragrammaton,' *Studia Biblica*, 1885, p. 1 ff.; T. G. Pinches, *PSBA* xiv. [1892] 13, 'The Religious Ideas of the Babylonians,' *Transactions of the Victorian Institute*, xxviii. [1896] 11; Thomas Tyler, 'The Origin of the Tetragrammaton,' *JQR* xiii. [1901] 581 ff.

[*] Farnell, *The Evolution of Religion*, p. 32; E. Clodd, *Tom Tit Tot*, 1898, p. 53.

[†] H. J. D. Astley, in *Transactions of the Third International Congress for the History of Religion*, i. 266; Farnell, *The Evolution of Religion*, p. 184; *HDB* v. 640; A. C. Haddon, *Magic and Fetishism*, 1906, p. 22. The close connexion between a name and the thing is echoed in the words of Milton where Adam says of the naming of the animals:

> 'I named them as they passed, and understood
> Their nature' (*Paradise Lost*, viii. 353).

[‡] Frazer, GB^3, pt. ii., *Taboo and the Perils of the Soul*, 1911, pp. 318–320.

[§] C. Squire, *The Mythology of the British Islands*, new ed., 1910, p. 236.

[‖] *ERE* i. 543.

[¶] Frazer, GB^3, pt. ii., *Taboo and the Perils of the Soul*, p. 331.

[**] A. H. Sayce, *Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion*^{3} (*HL*, 1887), 1891, p. 302; cf. *ExpT* xxiii. [1911–12] 9.

[††] J. Rhys, quoted by Haddon, p. 23.

[‡‡] *HDB* v. 181^a.

[§§] *Ib.*; *Exp*, 7th ser., x. [1910] 122.

[‖‖] Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, pp. 146, 147.

[¶¶] Farnell, *The Evolution of Religion*, p. 186.

Our Lord carried forward to deeper meaning the ancient usage when He prayed, 'Father, glorify thy name,' and when He taught His disciples to pray 'May thy name be revered.' Through a process of thought to be explained immediately the name of Jesus came to be similarly honoured. Through certain occurrences at Ephesus the name of the Lord Jesus was magnified, the Thessalonians were entreated to live so that the name of the Lord Jesus might be glorified in them; while the saints are described as those who reverence, fear, and glorify the name.[‡] Here it is necessary strongly to emphasize the fact that similarity of expression does not necessarily imply identity of meaning. In the realm of ideas a word or expression may have its content essentially changed. But the change is ever gradual, hence the exact meaning at any one moment is reached only when the evolution which preceded and which followed becomes clear. This is especially true of the Apostolic Age when through the welter of religions many expressions were in a constant state of flux. The practical identity of the name and the personality implied further that the continuance of the personality depended on the continuance of the name.

In Egypt 'one could do nothing better for any one than by inscriptions and representations to "cause his name to live," and nothing worse than to allow it to perish.'[§] The god Amon assures Ramses III. that 'as long as heaven endures thy name shall endure, and shall grow eternally.'[‖] The Egyptians of all classes erased the names and figures of their enemies from tombs and memorials.[¶] Amenhotep IV. went even further, and through the whole country erased the name of the god Amen whose worship he had forsaken.[**] In Mesopotamia the preservation of names was of unique importance. 'Terrible curses are denounced [by the kings] against those who should destroy or injure "the writing of their names."'[††] This belief in connexion with the worship of ancestors deeply influenced the mind of the Jew. Jahweh is represented as saying of His enemies, 'Let me alone, that I may destroy them, and blot out their name from under heaven.' The Levirate marriage was enforced that the firstborn son of a woman by her deceased husband's brother should 'succeed in the name of his brother who is dead, that his name be not blotted out of Israel.' The writer of Ecclesiastes describes the sad case of a man 'who begets an hundred children, and lives many years, so that the days of his years are many, but his soul is not filled with good, and moreover he has no burial,' *i.e.* has no tomb with his name on it, because 'an untimely birth is better than he, for it comes in vanity, and departeth in darkness, and the name thereof is covered with darkness.' The fiercest hatred is that of those who say 'when will he die, and his name perish,' while the glory of the Messianic King is that 'his name shall endure for ever, his name shall have issue as long as the sun.'[‡‡]

In the Apostolic Age we find this conception linked with another widely spread idea that in heaven there is a register of life, the insertion in which of a person's name ensures to him the certainty of a blessed immortality, and identification in the other world, as with us the insertion of a person's name in a voter's roll entitles the person to exercise his vote, or his enrolment in a society opens to him the privilege of that society. Our Lord calls upon His disciples to rejoice because their 'names are enrolled in heaven.' St. Paul describes his fellow-workers as those 'whose names are in the book of life.' In the same way the omission, or non-insertion, or erasure of the name indicates the exclusion from all such privileges. The friends of the Beast are those 'whose names have not been written from the foundation of the world in the book of life'; while of the victors of Sardis it is said: 'The conqueror shall be clad in white raiment; I will never erase his name from the book of life.'[*]

6. Name and 'mana.'—In the earlier culture man is conscious of two kinds of causation. The first is mechanical, effected by the body itself, or by it through tools or weapons. The second may be named spiritual. Man at this stage of his development is keenly conscious of the unusual, the abnormal, the awful, the uncanny. Objects which in any way exhibit such a peculiarity are to him endowed with a mysterious power, technically called *mana*.[†] A savage suddenly comes on a stone shaped like a yam. 'Ah,' he exclaims, 'you have *mana*.' He buries it beside the yams he has planted, and feels certain of a bountiful crop. Knowing that a lion is strong, *i.e.* has *mana*, he eats its heart, and its *mana* passes into him: for there is in primitive man a strong tendency to imagine that the cause of every phenomenon is a personal one.[‡] In the lower culture, as we have seen, the personality was thought of as something not concentrated, say, in the will, but rather as diffused, hence the *mana* of any living being—whatever its potency might be—was thought of as residing not merely in him, but also in different parts of him, and in things separable from, yet closely connected with, his person, as clothes, shadow, hair, nail-pairings, and spittle. The shadow of St. Peter, the towels or aprons used by St. Paul, the spittle of our Lord were each charged with the *mana* of the person himself.[§] But the personality and therefore the *mana* was specially concentrated in and discharged from the name. In the lower culture any person divine or human has more or less *mana*, and in consequence is anxious to possess, and so be able to use, that of others. Hence arises the absorbing desire to know names, for to know a name is to have power over the person, even to the extent of compelling him, by the proper use of his name, to use his *mana*. 'He who has the name can dispose of the power of its bearer';[‖] for barbaric man believes that his name is a vital part of himself, and 'to know the name is to put its owner, whether he be deity, ghost, or mortal, in the power of another.'[¶] This knowledge could be employed in a variety of ways. The presence and power of a spirit could be ensured by naming it. 'Speak of the devil and he will appear.'

The pontiffs of Rome possessed among their books the *Indigitamenta*, a list of the names of the spirits who guarded every action with which a man was concerned. By invoking any name they could call its power into action against any person and consequently have him at their mercy.[**] Odin won his supremacy over nature by acquiring the 'knowledge of the runes or magical names of all things in earth and heaven.'* Any gate in the Egyptian under world had to open to the person who correctly named it.† In later Judaism 'he who knew how to pronounce this sacred name [Jahweh] was believed to have a magical power over the forces of nature, and was designated among the Rabbis בַּעַל שֵׁם = "the master of the name."'‡

---

[*] *ERE* i. 440b; G. Ebers, *Joshua*, Eng. tr., 2 vols., 1890, i. 79; Sayce, p. 302.

[†] Ps 29^{2} 34^{3} 66^{2} 69^{36} 96^{2} 100^{4} 135^{3}, Dt 28^{58}. For the honour given to the name of God, of Moses, and of a king see *Exp*, 8th ser., viii. 307.

[‡] Jn $12^{27.28}$, Mt 6^{9}, Lk 11^{2}, Ac 19^{17}, 2 Th 1^{12}, Rev 11^{18} 15^{4}.

[§] Erman, p. 162.

[‖] *Ib.* p. 283.

[¶] *Ib.* p. 162; *Exp*, 7th ser., x. 122.

[**] W. M. F. Petrie, *A History of Egypt*, ii. [1896] 212.

[††] Sayce, p. 304.

[‡‡] Dt 9^{14} 25^{6} 29^{20}, Ec $6^{3.4}$, Ps 41^{5} 72^{17}.

[*] Lk 10^{20}, Ph 4^{3}, Rev 3^{5} 13^{8} 17^{8}.

[†] R. H. Codrington's definition is quoted with approval by Frazer, *GB*^{3}, pt. i., *The Magic Art*, i. 227; R. R. Marett, 'The Conception of Mana,' in *Transactions of the Third International Congress for the History of Religions*, i. 48, and practically all the leading anthropologists. δύναμις is possibly the nearest Greek equivalent. In the magical literature of the age of Paul ἐξουσία is not exactly 'power,' but rather 'the supernatural power which depends on a supernatural knowledge' (H. A. A. Kennedy, *Exp*, 8th ser., iv. [1912] 308).

[‡] For the same reason hero warriors were eaten: Clodd, p. 69; *ERE* i. 521, 530, 574; Gilbert Murray, *Four Stages of Greek Religion*, 1912, p. 87; W. R. Halliday, *Greek Divination*, 1913, p. 17.

[§] E. S. Hartland, *Report of the British Association, 1906*, 1907, p. 677; Ac 5^{15} 19^{12}, Jn 9^{6}, Mk 7^{33} 8^{23}; *ERE* i. 542; Clodd, p. 57. After death the *mana* might continue to reside in these and in the bones. The doctrine of relics is based on this idea. Newman says, 'each particle of each relic has in it at least a dormant, perhaps an energetic, virtue of supernatural operation' (*Present Position of Catholics*, 1851, p. 298).

[‖] *HDB* v. 181; T. K. Cheyne, *Traditions and Beliefs of Ancient Israel*, 1907, p. 401 n.

[¶] Clodd, p. 53 f.

[**] F. Granger, *The Worship of the Romans*, 1895, pp. 157, 277; Clodd, p. 177; W. Smith, *DGRA*^{2}, 1875, p. 941.

The extraordinary power of the *mana* of a deity explains the intense desire to know his name. Only then could his *mana* be serviceable, for in all the lower cultures to invocate is not to supplicate, but to call to one's aid the powerful *mana* of the deity invocated.§

The Hindu priests 'could command the gods to do their will by invoking their hidden names.' ‖ In Chaldæa it was believed that the demons who caused disease and death could be expelled only by magical spell through the might of the great gods, who could be compelled to act by using their secret names, which the priests alone knew.¶ In the time of Ḥammurabi the personal names of the deities 'are invoked, apparently as containing, in like manner, a measure of the personality of their divine patrons.'** Heitmüller shows that in the Persian, Mandæan, and other religions the mere utterance of the name of a deity acted as a kind of charm.†† In the under world to know the name of a demon was to be superior to his power. 'To pronounce the name of a deity [the secret names were most efficacious] compelled him to attend to the wishes of the priest or exorcist.' ‡‡ Even in modern times the person who knows 'the most great name of God' can by uttering it kill the living, raise the dead, transport himself wherever he pleases, and perform other miracles.§§ The Arabs and the Chinese believe that he who knows the name of one of the *jinn* can make the *jinn* obey him.‖‖

A person who knows the name of another can utilize this knowledge in three ways. He does not require such knowledge to aid or bless another, for he can do so directly; but—

(1) When A knows B's name, A can injure B.

This is true of the Australians, for example.¶¶ The people of Torres Straits when they wish to injure anyone make a rude effigy of the person, and deal with it as they would have the hated person dealt with; but the very first action is to call it by the name of the person who is to be injured.*** The Greeks and Romans wrote on a tablet the name of one whom they wished to hurt, and then 'defixed' it with nails, believing that what was done to the name would be experienced by the person bearing the name. This was called *κατάδεσις* or *defixio*. One inscription reads *ὄνομα καταδῶ καὶ αὐτόν* ('I nail his name, that is, himself').†††

(2) When A knows B's name, A can compel B to act in a good way towards C.

It was part of the duty of Aaron and his sons to bless in the name of Jahweh. Naaman thought that his cure would be effected by Elisha calling on the name of Jahweh. Jacob invokes the name of the God of his ancestors, his own name, and the name of his progenitors, to bless his grandchildren. A prescribed formula puts Jahweh's 'name upon the children of Israel so that he blesses them.' David blesses the people in the name of Jahweh, and a not unusual good wish came to be, 'We bless you in the name of Jahweh.' ‡‡‡

(3) When A knows B's name A can compel B to injure C.

Hence among the Jews thoughtlessly to invocate the name of Jahweh in a curse was blasphemy.§§§ When Goliath cursed David by his gods he was solemnly invoking these deities to destroy his antagonist; and when David retorted, 'I come to thee in the name of Jahweh Sabaoth,' he meant that he had invoked the aid of his God against the giant. Elisha in cursing the lads of Bethel did so 'in the name of Jahweh.'

When St. Paul called down on Elymas the doom of blindness, the words indicate that he did it by means of a solemn invocation of the Divine name.*

This invocating of the name of a deity marks a stage in the developing of one element in religion. There is (*a*) the wish to injure, taking a stronger form in (*b*) a purely magical act as nailing,† to which is added (*c*) an invocation of the name of a deity; then gradually (*d*) the act becomes symbolical, and the invoking of the name more important, till (*e*) the act is omitted and there remains the simple cursing in the name of the deity.‡ Or again there is (a) the wish to bless, taking expression in (b) a formal act as the laying on of hands, to which is added (c) a calling on the name of the god; then gradually (d) this act becomes merely symbolical and the petitioning of the deity all-important, till at the end the act is omitted and (e) what remains is the pure invoking of the deity by name in a blessing or a prayer.

It has been pointed out, *e.g.*, by B. D. Eerdmans that the primitive Israelites 'assumed the existence of a mysterious power, that dwelt in all things that lived, and in all things that appeared to contain unseen sources of action. . . . The name of this power was Elohim or El.' This Hebrew conception, which corresponds to *mana*, can be traced in such expressions as 'the El of my hand.'§ As Jahweh advanced to the supreme place among the gods, all such power became attributed to Him, and His name, as embodying this and His other attributes, attained unique importance. His worship is described as 'calling on the name of Jahweh.' ‖ 'To proclaim his name' is to reveal the essence of His character; the Levites are those who 'minister in his name,' and 'bless in his name,' while the ark was holy because there had been called over it the name of Jahweh.¶ His מַלְאָךְ, 'messenger' or 'angel,'** who was to guide the Israelites to Palestine, was to be treated with profound reverence, 'for my name is in him,' *i.e.*, he is the representative of my being.†† It follows, as E. Kautzsch remarks, that to know it [the name of Jahweh] is of vital importance, for this is the condition of being able to use it in invocation; and invocation has, according to primitive notions, a real efficacy, giving to the invoking party a kind of power over the name invoked, so that he can compel its aid.' This we have seen in the case of David.‡‡ Hence the most solemn oath was taken in the name of Jahweh, for the *mana* of Jahweh fell on the breaker of such an oath.

An allusion to the ancient practice is found in the words of St. Paul: 'Every one who invokes the name of the Lord shall be saved. But how are they to invoke one in whom they do not believe, and how can they believe in one of whom they have not heard?'—as well as in the custom of the primitive Christians of invoking the name of Jesus.§§

The close connexion between the person and the name of a deity comes out in primitive ideas of creation. 'To pronounce a name is to call up and conjure the being who bears it. The name possesses personality. . . . To name a thing is to create it: that is why creation is often represented as accomplished by the word.' ‖‖

The Egyptians believed that the god created himself by uttering his own name, and that when he named a thing it immediately sprang into existence.¶¶ In the Babylonian cosmogony there is not so much a period of chaos as a period when things were not named and therefore did not exist.

> 'When in the height heaven was not named,
> And the earth beneath did not bear a name,
> When none of the gods had come forth,
> They bore no name.' ***

A reference of a similar kind lingers in such Hebrew myths as 'Elohim said let there be light, and light was,' or that which tells that in order to meet the loneliness of the first man Jahweh made the brute creation and brought them to him to see what he would name them.[*]

---

* Frazer, *GB*^{3}, pt. i., *The Magic Art*, i. 241; Clodd, p. 176 f.

† *HDB* v. 181^a.

‡ *Ib.* v. 280.

§ *Ib.* v. 181.

‖ J. A. MacCulloch, *Religion, its Origin and Forms*, 1904, p. 70.

¶ *Ib.* p. 100.

** *ExpT* xxv. [1913–14] 128.

†† W. Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu*, 1903, pp. 190, 192.

‡‡ *HDB* v. 181; Sayce, p. 302.

§§ E. W. Lane, *Modern Egyptians*, 1895, ch. xii.

‖‖ Frazer, *GB*^{3}, pt. ii., *Taboo and the Perils of the Soul*, p. 390.

¶¶ *Ib.* p. 320.

*** Haddon, p. 19; also *Exp*, 7th ser., x. [1910] 122.

††† On the *defixionum tabellæ* see F. B. Jevons, in *Transactions of the Third International Congress for the History of Religions*, ii. 131 ff., 'Græco-Italian Magic' in R. R. Marett, *Anthropology and the Classics*, 1908, p. 106; Ovid, *Amores*, III. vii. 29; Tacitus, *Ann.* ii. 69. For similar conceptions among the Chaldæans, Egyptians, and Scots, see Clodd, pp. 65, 66, 86.

‡‡‡ 1 Ch 23^{13}, 2 K 5^{11}, Gn 48^{16}, Nu 6^{27}, 2 S 6^{20}, Ps 129^8.

§§§ Lv 24^{11}.

* 1 S 17^{45}, Ac 13$^{10.\,11}$.

† Tacitus, *loc. cit.*

‡ Ovid, *loc. cit.*

§ *Exp*, 8th ser., vi. [1913] 38^5, 386; Gn 31^{29}; J. Skinner, *ICC*, 'Genesis,' 1910, p. 398; Dt 28^{32}, etc.; *HDB* v. 640.

‖ Gn 12^8 4^{26} 26^{25}.

¶ Ex 33^{19} 34^5, Dt 18^5 21^5, 2 S 6^2.

** Ex 23$^{20.\,23}$.

†† *HDB* v. 640^b, 1 S 17^{45}.

‡‡ 1 S 20^{42}.

§§ Ro 10$^{13.\,14}$, Ac 2^{21} 9$^{14.\,21}$ 22^{16}.

‖‖ *HDB* v. 181; Tiele, quoted by J. M. Robertson, *Pagan Christs*, 1911, p. 220.

¶¶ *HDB* v. 181; Budge, quoted by Farnell, *The Evolution of Religion*, p. 188; G. Maspero, *The Dawn of Civilization*, 1897, p. 187.

*** Maspero, p. 537; G. Smith, *The Chaldean Account of Genesis*, 1876, p. 62; T. G. Pinches, *The OT in the Light of the Historical Records of Assyria and Babylonia*^{2}, 1903, p. 16; J. Skinner, *ICC*, 'Genesis,' 1910, p. 43.

In the writings of the Apostolic Age this conception has passed into that of creation by word. 'The world was fashioned by the word of God'; 'the earth by the word of God was formed of water and by water'; for 'God calls into being what does not exist.'[†]

7. Name and tabu.—As primitive man regarded his name as a vital portion of himself he took extraordinary care of it; he kept it secret. This was necessary, for if it was known and properly used in a correct formula by an enemy, the wish of his enemy immediately took effect.[‡]

The Amerinds believed in a personal soul which was neither the bodily life nor yet mental power, but a kind of third soul, or spiritual body. This had a very intimate connexion with the name. It was believed by many of the tribes to come into existence with the name; hence the personal name was sacred and rarely uttered, for it was part of the individuality, and through it the soul could be injured.[§] Savages have strong objections to uttering their own names. This is true of the Australians, the Tasmanians, the Amerinds, and the primitive Scots and Irish. In Abyssinia the real, *i.e.* the baptismal, name is kept secret, and is only used in church services, such as prayers for the dead. The people of Torres Straits, like those of the west of Ireland, refuse to tell their names; for their doing so would put them in the power of the person to whom they were told, who could thus work his will upon them.[‖] A person's name must not be uttered by one related to him by blood and especially by marriage. This prevails among the South African tribes, those of Borneo, and North America. Among the Ainus a woman must not pronounce her husband's name; to do so would be to bring harm on him.[¶] An Abipone will not commit the sin of uttering his own name, for that would be literally 'to give himself away,' though he does not object to mention that of other people.[**] Cases are known where a man had completely forgotten his own name, and was thus saved from the possible mistake of inadvertently letting it become known.[††] Among the Battaks . . . a man, on becoming the father of a boy, N.N., is henceforth known only as 'father of N.N.'[‡‡] An Amazulu woman must not name her husband, but calls him 'the father of N.,' meaning the child.[§§] So the Hindu wife speaks of her husband as 'he,' the English wife of hers as 'my man' or 'my master,' while the Scotch woman uses 'oor ain.' The expressions 'the mother of Sisera,' 'Peter's wife's mother,' 'the mother of Zebedee's children,' are familiar instances of the same practice.[‖‖]

In the Apostolic Age we meet with the same thing. Nothing so preserved a man from evil as keeping his name strictly sacred. The Christian of Pergamum who, fighting his moral battle in the place 'where Satan sits enthroned,' has not renounced his faith but adhered to God's name, is assured of his ultimate triumph, for to him is given 'a new name, unknown to any except him who receives it.' He who is known to men as the 'Logos of God,' or the 'King of kings and Lord of lords,' is assured of victory as He rides forth on His white horse, for 'he bears a written name which none knows but himself.'[¶¶]

The fact that the Flamen Dialis was forbidden not only to touch but even to name certain animals and things carries the tabu on names forward into other regions.[***]

The names of the dead were kept secret, for if a dead man heard his name, he would at once return.[†††]

Among the Greeks, therefore, it was customary to pass graves, especially those of heroes, in silence.[*] Among the Abipones all mention of the dead was avoided, and the relatives of the dead changed their names.[†] This custom prevailed among the Amerinds, Australians, Albanians, Tasmanians, Shetlanders,[‡] etc. Our Lord in calling Lazarus from the dead expressly named him.[§] The Amerinds and others, by solemnly conferring the name of a dead person on a living one, thereby caused the latter to become an incarnation of the dead.[‖] Certain ceremonies of naming and a certain type of name may have sprung from this custom.

Secrecy in regard to the name was also observed in the case of exalted personages. Instances of this in the case of kings have been collected from many parts of the world.[¶]

The British sovereign is rarely spoken of by his name, 'His Majesty' or 'the King' being generally employed. In the British House of Commons a member is not addressed by his name, but as 'the member for N.,' and the first step in punishing a member is 'to name him,' thus bringing the offender out of his impersonal sacredness.

The tabu on the name was still more important in the case of those connected with divinities and in that of the divinities themselves, as the nearer to the divine, or the more divine a person was, the greater the potency dwelling in his name.

A priest of Eleusis on taking office assumed a holy and hidden name which was written on a tablet and cast into the sea, and when he died that name became the one by which he was known.[**] The real name of Confucius is so sacred that it is a punishable offence to utter it.[††] The Oyampis never name a waterfall till they have passed it, lest the sacred snake in it might on hearing the name attack them.[‡‡] The Egyptians relate that the name of the god Ra was uttered by his parents and then concealed in him by them in such a way that it was impossible for any spell to bewitch him. But Isis managed to worm it out of him and thus became his superior in power.[§§] We do not know how the real name of Ra or Amon was pronounced. In a Leiden papyrus a magician says, 'I am he to whom . . . thou didst grant the γνῶσις of thy mighty name, which I shall keep secret, sharing it with no one.'[‖‖] Examples from various parts of the world have been collected showing that the true names of the gods were kept secret.[¶¶] Heroes, giants, and fairies all kept their names secret.[***] The Algonquins venerated a woman who came down from the skies, and whose name was too sacred to be spoken.[†††] Allah is but an epithet in place of the Most Great Name; for the secret of the latter is committed to prophets and apostles alone.[‡‡‡] In the vocabulary of the original Aryan language, the real names of the gods cannot be proved.[§§§] This holds true in all the religions of the Mediterranean race, for the divine name was felt to be part of the divine essence and itself of supernatural potency.[‖‖‖] The Romans called their chief goddess the Dea Dia, but this was a mere adjectival description employed because of the fear of mentioning the real name.[¶¶¶] The Roman pontiffs concealed the true names of their gods, and especially of the guardian deity of Rome, lest they should be wrongly used by unauthorized persons or an enemy.[****] 'It was improper to mention the personal name of the δᾳδοῦχος at Athens on account of his sacred character.'[††††] Many divinities were invoked as πολυώνυμε ('thou god of many names'), all possible titles of power being summed up in one word.[‡‡‡‡] Æschylus speaks of 'Zeus, whoever the god is,' and Euripides refers to the enlightened man 'who knows the silent names of the gods.'[§§§§] Pausanias, speaking of Pallantion, says 'There is a temple of Θεοί still standing on the top of the ridge: they are called Καθαροί, and oaths on matters of the greatest import are taken before them. The people do not know their names, or knowing them are unwilling to pronounce them.'[‖‖‖‖] On a tablet of lead found at Hadrumetum occurs the phrase ὁρκίζω σε τὸ ἅγιον ὄνομα ὃ οὐ λέγεται ('I adjure thee by the sacred name which is not uttered'). On a papyrus a demon is adjured κατὰ τῶν φρικτῶν ὀνομάτων.[*] When Herodotus says that the Pelasgian deities were nameless, he means that the names were kept secret, for a god is not nameless because he is not named or addressed only by a simple appellation.[†] The writer of a Babylonian penitential psalm invokes a deity 'whom he knew not' because probably he is thus deprecating the wrath of some offended deity with whose name he was unacquainted.[‡]

---

[*] Gn 1^3 2^{18-25}. Cf. Ahuna-Vairya (*ERE* i. 238).

[†] He 11^3, 2 P 3^5, Ro 4^{17}; C. Clemen, *Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources*, 1912, p. 82.

[‡] Frazer, *GB*^{3}, pt. ii., *Taboo and the Perils of the Soul*, p. 318; *HDB* v. 181.

[§] Haddon, p. 23; Frazer, *GB*^{3}, pt. ii., *Taboo and the Perils of the Soul*, p. 319; *Anthropological Essays*, ed. W. H. R. Rivers, R. R. Marett, N. W. Thomas, 1907, p. 91.

[‖] *Exp*, 8th ser., v. [1913] 311; Frazer, *GB*^{3}, pt. ii., *Taboo and the Perils of the Soul*, p. 327; Clodd, pp. 81, 82, 83, 84, 92, 94; Haddon, p. 22.

[¶] Frazer, *GB*^{3}, pt. ii., *Taboo and the Perils of the Soul*, p. 335; Clodd, p. 115; *ERE* i. 251.

[**] Frazer, *GB*^{3}, pt. ii., *Taboo and the Perils of the Soul*, p. 328.

[††] *HDB* v. 181.

[‡‡] Quoted by Robertson, p. 49 n.

[§§] Clodd, p. 117.

[‖‖] Jg 5, Mt 8. 20.

[¶¶] Rev 2^{17} $19^{12. 13. 16}$.

[***] Granger, p. 142 f.

[†††] Frazer, *GB*^{3}, pt. ii., *Taboo and the Perils of the Soul*, pp. 349, 353.

[*] *Anthropological Essays*, p. 92.

[†] *ERE* i. 29.

[‡] Frazer, *GB*^{3}, pt. ii., *Taboo and the Perils of the Soul*, pp. 349, 354; Clodd, pp. 166, 168, 171.

[§] Jn 11^{43}.

[‖] Frazer, *GB*^{3}, pt. ii., *Taboo and the Perils of the Soul*, p. 365.

[¶] *Ib.* pp. 374–382; Clodd, p. 157.

[**] Frazer, *GB*^{3}, pt. ii., *Taboo and the Perils of the Soul*, p. 382; Clodd, p. 162 ff.

[††] Clodd, p. 190.

[‡‡] Frazer, *GB*^{3}, pt. i., *The Magic Art*, ii. 156.

[§§] Maspero, p. 162; Erman, p. 265 ff.; Frazer, *GB*^{3}, pt. ii., *Taboo and the Perils of the Soul*, p. 387; *HDB* v. 181; Clodd, p. 180 ff.

[‖‖] *Exp*, 8th ser., iv. [1912] 309.

[¶¶] Frazer, *GB*^{3}, pt. ii., *Taboo and the Perils of the Soul*, p. 387.

[***] Clodd, pp. 27, 49, 50.

[†††] *ERE* i. 322^b.

[‡‡‡] Haddon, p. 24; *ERE* i. 326; Clodd, p. 189.

[§§§] *ERE* ii. 35.

[‖‖‖] Farnell, *The Evolution of Religion*, p. 32.

[¶¶¶] *ERE* ii. 11.

[****] Farnell, *The Evolution of Religion*, p. 185; Clodd, p. 174; Frazer, *GB*^{3}, pt. ii., *Taboo and the Perils of the Soul*, p. 391.

[††††] *Anthropological Essays*, p. 91.

[‡‡‡‡] Farnell, *The Evolution of Religion*, pp. 185, 187, and the reference there to Agni.

[§§§§] Quoted by Farnell, *ib.*

[‖‖‖‖] *Anthropological Essays*, p. 83.

Among the inhabitants of Palestine the name of Jahweh was invoked at the different shrines.[§] But gradually the rites of the cult were concentrated at the Jerusalem Temple. There Jahweh caused His name to dwell.[‖] It thus became the only place in which that name could be pronounced, another being used in ordinary places and at ordinary times.[¶] Tradition says it was uttered even in the Temple only once in the year when the high priest entered the Holy of Holies.[**] But the name did not, as in some other cults, develop into a separate deity. Among the Palestinian Jews the name speedily became an ὄνομα ἄῤῥητον.[††] It was not to be blasphemed,[‡‡] nor profaned as by using it in swearing falsely,[§§] nor 'taken in vain,'[‖‖] for Jahweh would only be further and more fiercely enraged by any attempt to conjure with His name.[¶¶] 'Rabbinic mysticism was deeply concerned with the history of the hidden divine name.' In the Ethiopic Enoch one of the evil angels asks Michael 'to show him the hidden name.' 'The mystical name of God is *Ani we-hu*, "I and he," a combination signifying the most intimate relation conceivable between God and His people.'[***] The opposite of this respectful reverence for the name of a deity is *blasphemy*, which may be the claim in either word or deed to do what can be done only by a god, or done in his name—a crime the Jews preferred against our Lord,[†††] or the actual heaping of abuse on the name. When the fourth angel of the plagues poured out his bowl upon the sun, and men were scorched by its fierce heat, they 'blasphemed the name of the God who had control over the plagues.' The Beast revealed his true character in that he uttered 'blasphemies against God, to blaspheme his name.'[‡‡‡] The conduct of the Jews who prided themselves in God, relying on the Law, and teaching it, while violating it in daily life, caused the Gentiles to 'blaspheme the name of God'; similarly Christian slaves who failed in their duty to their masters caused the name of God to be blasphemed.[§§§] It is noticeable that immediately after our Lord's death His followers considered His name as sacred as that of Jahweh. St. Paul looking back on his pre-conversion attitude to Jesus calls himself a blasphemer, a designation the meaning of which becomes clear when we learn that the cruelty of his persecution of the Christians consisted in his compelling them to blaspheme, to pour abuse on the name of Jesus. St. James points out that the powerful plutocrats not only abused the Christians to whom he wrote but openly blasphemed the noble name they bore.[‖‖‖]

8. Exorcism in the name.—A divinity exercised power over another divinity if he possessed stronger *mana* than the other. When men believed that all disasters and diseases of the body and mind were caused by demons they also believed that these fell workers were controllable by powers still more mighty. 'The devils also believe [in one God], and shudder' when they think of Him.[*]

Disease-demons among the Malays could be cast out by invoking the spirit of some powerful beast, as an elephant or tiger.[†]

The *mana* of a superior divinity lay in his name, especially his secret name.[‡]

Among the Australians the name of Daramulun (a high god) was so potent, that 'Tundun' was used in place of it.[§] There is peculiar virtue in the three-fold repetition of the name of Ukko in the *Kalevala*.[‖]

A person, by getting to know the name and using it properly, practically identified himself with, and for the time being exercised control over, the particular divinity.[¶]

By pronouncing the Most Great Name a person could be transported from place to place, could kill the living, raise the dead, and work other miracles.[**] On a tablet from Hadrumetum a magician threatens, in order to win over a demon to obey him, that he will pronounce the unutterable name of God, the very sound of which fills the demons with shuddering dread.[††] Lilith, Adam's first wife (says Jewish tradition), refused to obey him, pronounced the ineffable Name, and then flew away. Neither Jahweh nor the three great angels could therefore force her to return. But she was persuaded to swear by the Living God that she would not injure infants who had on them something with the names of the angels written on it; hence the infants had slips bearing their names on them. This custom is still observed among some of the Jews of London. To obtain complete power over a demon it is also necessary to learn his name; hence the question of Jesus.[‡‡] In the magical papyri mystic names are used for expelling demons and compelling incantations.[§§] Among the Jews the most powerful of all names was that of Jahweh. From a right use of it amulets could be obtained, anathemas launched, the sick healed, and demons put to flight;[‖‖] indeed the overwhelming effect of the Divine name upon the demons was a very familiar idea in post-biblical Judaism.[¶¶] Josephus speaks of φρικτὸν ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ.[***] In the *Book of Enoch* an evil angel asks Michael 'to show him the hidden name.'[†††] The Jews became noted throughout the Roman Empire as magicians, mathematici, etc.[‡‡‡] Jewish ideas as to the name became connected with similar conceptions in pagan cults. 'Strong arguments' have been advanced 'for the Egyptian origin of this belief.'[§§§] We need not therefore be astonished to find that casting out ordinary disease-demons by the princely demon Beelzebul was not an uncommon practice among the Jews in the time of our Lord.[‖‖‖] Herod[¶¶¶] was not astonished at the miracles of Jesus because he imagined that He was John the Baptist risen from the dead and therefore possessed of very powerful *mana*.[****] Jesus Himself was keenly conscious that there was within Him δύναμις which could pass out from Him, as well as be exercised by Him.[††††]

In accordance with the opinion of His time, Jesus looked on some diseases as caused by the intrusion of demons, though in the great majority of His works of healing there is no reference to them. Some who were so afflicted He cured by casting out the demons.[‡‡‡‡] It is noticeable, however, that He did this not by invoking any name, not even the Tetragrammaton; He did it 'with a word.'[§§§§] These deeds aroused immense curiosity among the populace, and it was felt that, in some way, the *mana* displayed in them must be accounted for.[‖‖‖‖] The theory of the scribes and Pharisees was that Jesus was able to act thus through His exercise of the *mana* of Beelzebul.[¶¶¶¶] Another theory was that Jesus, like John the Baptist, was possessed by a demon.[*] Jesus Himself, in explaining how He effected the cures, uses three expressions. He did them 'by the Spirit of God,' or 'by the finger of God,' or 'in the name' of His Father.[†] All these expressions indicate that Jesus was conscious that He had power to master and control the demons, and that He had this given Him by God; that, far from being dependent on any demon, He had entered their house to spoil it.[‡]

---

[*] Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, pp. 273 ff., 288, and the reference there to Josephus.

[†] Farnell, *The Evolution of Religion*, p. 185; *Anthropological Essays*, p. 91.

[‡] Sayce, pp. 304, 351, 353.

[§] Ex 20^{24}.

[‖] Dt 12^{5} 26^{2}; *HDB* iii. 479, v. 641.

[¶] Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, p. 287.

[**] *HDB* iv. 604, v. 280.

[††] Lv 24^{16}; *HDB* v. 280^{a}.

[‡‡] Lv 24^{16}.

[§§] Lv 18^{21} 19^{12} 21^{6} $22^{2.\ 32}$.

[‖‖] Ex 20^{7}; *HDB* v. 640^{b}, n.; Gesenius, *Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*, 1859, p. 807.

[¶¶] Am 6^{10}; *HDB* v. 640^{b}, n.

[***] *Exp*, 8th ser., iii. [1912] 435.

[†††] Mt 9^{3} 26^{65}, Lk 5^{21}, Jn $10^{33.\ 36}$.

[‡‡‡] Rev 13^{6}.

[§§§] Rev 16^{9}; cf. vv.$^{11.\ 21}$ $13^{1.\ 6}$ 17^{3}, Ro 2^{24}, 1 Ti 6^{1}.

[‖‖‖] 1 Ti 1^{13}, Ac 26^{11}, Ja 2^{7}.

[*] Ja 2^{19}; Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, p. 288.

[†] Marett, *The Threshold of Religion*^{2}, p. 62, quoting Skeat.

[‡] Erman, p. 354; Sayce, p. 302.

[§] Marett, *The Threshold of Religion*^{2}, p. 167.

[‖] Quoted by Farnell, *The Evolution of Religion*, p. 184.

[¶] Erman, p. 353.

[**] Haddon, p. 24.

[††] Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, p. 273.

[‡‡] Mk 5^{9}, Lk 8^{30}; Deissmann, *Light from the Anc. East*, p. 257; Clemen, p. 236.

[§§] Deissmann, *Light from the Anc. East*, p. 255; *Exp*, 8th ser., iii. 435.

[‖‖] A. Hausrath, *History of NT Times*, 2 vols., 1878–80, i. 125.

[¶¶] Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, p. 255.

[***] Jos. *BJ* v. x. 3.

[†††] *Exp*, 8th ser., iii. 439.

[‡‡‡] Ac 19^{13} and Roman authorities.

[§§§] *Exp*, 8th ser., iii. 439.

[‖‖‖] Mt 12^{27}, Lk 11^{19}.

[¶¶¶] Mk 6^{14}, or, according to BD and the Old Lat. Version, 'the people.'

[****] Mt $14^{1.\ 2}$.

[††††] Lk 8^{46}, Mk 3^{10} 5^{30}, Lk 6^{19}.

[‡‡‡‡] Mk $1^{27.\ 39}$; Heitmüller, p. 241; Clemen, p. 234.

[§§§§] Mt 8^{16}; F. C. Conybeare, 'The Demonology of the NT,' in *JQR* viii. [1895–96] 586.

[‖‖‖‖] Mk $5^{20.\ 42}$, Mt 8^{27} 9^{8} 21^{20}, Jn 5^{20} 7^{21} 8^{56}, Lk 4^{36}.

[¶¶¶¶] Mt $12^{24.\ 26}$, Mk 3^{22}, Lk $11^{15.\ 18}$ (Mt 9^{34} is probably a later insertion).

In accordance with the ideas of the time, this extraordinarily powerful *mana* exhibited by our Lord was supposed to be lodged in His name, and immediately magicians began actually to effect cures by the invoking of His name.[§] Jesus refused to interfere with those who did so, though they were not His professed followers,[‖] and even intimated that some did such miracles 'whom he knew not.'[¶] The Twelve after being chosen were ordained to be with Jesus, in order that they might go forth (*a*) to preach, (*b*) to have power to heal diseases, and (*c*) ἐκβάλλειν τὰ δαιμόνια.[**] When Jesus did send them forth He gave them power to cast out all unclean spirits.[††] The Twelve were able to cast out the demons, though they sometimes failed in their efforts because they had so little faith.[‡‡] Jesus also sent out the Seventy to heal, giving them power 'of trampling down all the power of the enemy,' and when they returned they reported that the spirits were subject to them in His name.[§§] Finally, Jesus bequeathed to those who should believe power to cast out demons in His name.[‖‖]

After the death of Jesus the apostles continued to cure those annoyed (or roused, ὀχλουμένους) with unclean spirits and to do other wonderful works in His name.[¶¶]

As the Church spread through the Roman Empire it came more and more into contact with Oriental and Greek magic, and under this stimulus formulæ of exorcism in His name rapidly became popular. The origin of the Jewish belief in the efficacy of the name has been sought in Babylon[***] and Egypt,[†††] but it possibly goes back to older Semitic ideas. Among the pagans the disciples effected cures through the Name, and a similar power was exercised by other Christians over spirits which came out 'shouting with a loud cry.'[‡‡‡] Heitmüller argues: 'Not only the name, the outspoken, invoked name of Jesus, but also the name itself, as formula, was, according to the representation of these passages, the instrument of the miracles of the apostles. The idea underlying the passages is . . . belief in the magical potency of the name of Jesus.'[§§§] Clemen is forced to admit that a magical effect is attributed to the Name in Ac 4^{10}, and practically in Ac $3^{6.\ 16}$ $4^{7.\ 10}$ 16^{18}, and escapes from admitting the same thing in regard to Mt 7^{22}, Mk 16^{17}, Lk 10^{17} 13^{26} only by declaring them unhistorical.[‖‖‖] He produces not an iota of evidence for the unhistoricity of these passages, and the history of the use of the Name gives their true meaning.[¶¶¶] The πρεσβύτεροι in the churches of the Diaspora are instructed by St. James in cases of illness to pray over the patient, 'anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord.'[****] Certain Jewish exorcists in Ephesus took upon themselves to effect cures, using the formula, 'I adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preacheth.'[††††] The standpoint of the post-Apostolic Church is put thus: 'Before we believed in God the habitation of our heart was corrupt and weak . . . for it was full of idolatry, and was a habitation of demons. . . . Having received the forgiveness of sins and placed our trust in the name of the Lord, we became new creatures.'[‡‡‡‡] Hermas implies a similar use of the Name when he says, 'You can be saved from the great beast by no other than by His great and glorious name. A man cannot otherwise enter into the kingdom of God than by the name of His beloved son,' for 'whosoever does not receive His name shall not enter into the kingdom of God.'[*] Justin is still more explicit. Jesus was conceived 'for the sake of believing men, and for the destruction of the demons.' The evidence for this is 'that numberless demoniacs throughout the whole world, and in your city many of our Christian men exorcize them in the name of Jesus Christ . . . rendering helpless and driving out of men the possessing devils.'[†] The power of Jesus' name, even the demons do fear, and at this day, when they are exorcized in His name, they are overcome. 'His Father has given Him so great power by virtue of which the demons are subdued by His name.'[‡] 'God made it manifest that through Jesus . . . the demons would be destroyed and would dread His name.'[§] 'And now we, who believe on our Lord Jesus, . . . when we exorcize all demons and evil spirits, have them subjected to us.'[‖] 'Every demon, when exorcized in the name of this very Son of God, . . . is overcome and subdued.'[¶] Origen again writes thus: 'The names Sabaoth, Adonai, and other names . . . when pronounced with that attendant turn of circumstances which is appropriate to their nature, are possessed of great power; and other names again, current in the Egyptian tongue, are efficacious against certain demons.'[**] 'It is not by incantations that Christians seem to prevail [over evil spirits] but by the name of Jesus, accompanied by the announcement of the narrative which relates to Him, for the repetition of these has frequently been the means of driving demons out of men, especially when those who repeated them did so in a sound and genuinely believing spirit.'[††] 'Christians employ no spells or incantations, but the simple name of Jesus, and certain other words in which they repose faith.'[‡‡] The name of Jesus 'has expelled myriads of evil spirits from the souls and bodies of men.'[§§] Tertullian observes 'that though names be empty and feigned, yet when they are drawn down into superstition, demons and every unclean spirit seize them for themselves.'[‖‖] The name of Jesus, with other biblical names, was used as an amulet in the 3rd or 4th century.[¶¶] The Maronites still cure the insane by exorcizing the evil spirit, adjuring him in the name of God, and beating the patient on the head.[***] 'In Christian rituals, from about the year 300 on, an altar, shrine, and any other sort of building, and also "the natures" of oil, water, salt, candles, even of hassocks, have been consecrated by repeating over them the formula "*in the name of Jesus Christ*," or "*in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.*"'[†††] 'In Abyssinia, Biblical sacred names, together with a large number of fanciful appellations, . . . were magically pronounced for the purpose of warding off the power of demons and all kinds of diseases.'[‡‡‡] In the *Directorium Anglicanum* a form is given for the exorcism of water, salt, and flowers for decoration, in the Triune Name.[§§§] The practice, if we may so term it, has not yet ceased. Baroness de Bertouch tells us that Ignatius is said on one occasion, over a girl who had died of typhoid fever, to have pronounced the words, 'In the name of Jesus Christ, I say unto thee, Arise,' and the dead girl came back to life; on another, using the same formula, to have raised to life a man who had been crushed by a crate of stone 'to a mass of pulp.'[*] And the ancient expression, if not the old magic meaning, still lingers in popular religious phrases, and in such hymns as 'All hail the power of Jesus' name.'

---

[*] Mt 11^{18}, Jn 7^{20} $8^{48.\ 52}$ 10^{20}.

[†] Mt 12^{28}, Lk 11^{20} (cf. Jn 3^{2}, Ac 2^{22} 10^{38}), Jn 10^{25}.

[‡] Mt 12^{29}.

[§] Lk $9^{38.\ 49}$.

[‖] Mk 9^{39}, Lk 9^{50}.

[¶] Mt 7^{22} (cf. Lk 13^{26}; Heitmüller, p. 241).

[**] Mk $3^{14.\ 15}$, Mt 10^{1}.

[††] Mt 10^{8}, Mk 6^{7}, Lk 9^{1}.

[‡‡] Mk 6^{13}, Lk 9^{6}, Mt $17^{16.\ 19.\ 20}$.

[§§] Lk $10^{17.\ 19}$.

[‖‖] Mk 16^{17}.

[¶¶] Ac 5^{16}.

[***] Heitmüller, p. 185.

[†††] *Ib.* p. 218; Farnell, *The Evolution of Religion*, p. 189.

[‡‡‡] Ac 8^{7} 16^{18} $19^{11\text{-}13}$.

[§§§] P. 236.

[‖‖‖] Clemen, pp. 234–236.

[¶¶¶] F. C. Conybeare, *Myth Magic and Morals*, 1910, ch. xiii.

[****] Ja 5^{14}.

[††††] Ac 19^{13}.

[‡‡‡‡] *The Epistle of Barnabas*, xvi. 7, 8.

[*] Hermas, *Vis.* IV. ii. 4; *Sim.* IX. xii. 5, 4.

[†] Justin Martyr, *Apol.* ii. 6.

[‡] *Dial.* 30.

[§] *Ib.* 131.

[‖] *Ib.* 76.

[¶] *Ib.* 85.

[**] *c. Cels.* i. 25.

[††] *Ib.* i. 6.

[‡‡] *Ib.*

[§§] *Ib.* i. 25, v. 45.

[‖‖] *de Idol.* 15.

[¶¶] Deissmann, *Light from the Anc. East*, p. 415.

[***] *PEFSt*, 1892, p. 144.

[†††] Conybeare, *Myth Magic and Morals*, p. 243.

[‡‡‡] *ExpT* xxi. [1909–10] 403.

[§§§] *Directorium Anglicanum*^{3}, ed. F. G. Lee, 1866, p. 327.

9. Baptism in the Name.—At a very early period man discovered that water removed physical impurities. Evil was primarily thought of as physical, hence water cleansed from it. When evil came to be regarded as something spiritual, washing with water developed into a ceremonial rite.[†] As such it removed tabus, purified from evil and acted 'as a kind of magic armour which turns aside the attacks of a visible or invisible foe.'[‡] Such ceremonial or religious washing was a common practice among the nations of antiquity and remains so among the peoples of the lower culture to-day. It was a well-known rite among the Jews.[§] Among the Essenes a candidate for admission to the Order, after one year's trial, entered on a second year's probation and was then allowed to share their bath of purification.[‖] Proselytes were admitted to the fold of Judaism by baptism, which was at once a purification from heathenism and an initiation or consecration of the convert. At this baptism there was a 'solemn invocation of the Lord as Protector.'[¶]

When John began his ministry he also practised baptism, explaining that it symbolized such a repentance and confession as resulted in a remission of sins.[**] To the Pharisees this baptism appeared illegitimate and impotent, because John was destitute of *mana*, as was evidenced by the fact that he did not perform any sign, and that he admitted he was not the Messiah, nor Elijah, nor the Prophet.[††] John's explanation was that he was merely baptizing with water, but that his successor's baptism would be baptism with the Holy Spirit and fire.[‡‡]

In strict conformity with this Jesus did not use water-baptism. So far as we know, He baptized none of His disciples, though His disciples (some of whom had been baptized by John) continued John's practice. This was during the early Judæan ministry.[§§] After that baptism is never mentioned. There is no indication that it was practised, and of those who are said to have believed on, or followed, Jesus, there is no hint that any were baptized, though it can scarcely be doubted that the followers of Jesus, like the Jews and the Essenes, continued the ceremonial washings.

When therefore at Pentecost flames resting on the heads of those present and the descent of the Spirit fulfilled the prediction of John and of Jesus, and seemed to herald the catastrophe predicted by Joel when he only would be saved 'who invoked the name of the Lord,' St. Peter instinctively summoned his hearers to repentance, signified and symbolized by a baptism in which the name of Jesus Christ was solemnly invoked. We may well conclude that subsequent Jewish converts were baptized into the name of Jesus.[‖‖] When Philip preached to the Samaritans 'good tidings concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ' the converts were 'baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.'[¶¶] When St. Paul was converted he was baptized 'invoking the name' of Jesus.[***] When the Holy Spirit descended on the Gentiles at Cæsarea, Peter 'ordered them to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ.'[†††] When the disciples of John at Ephesus believed, 'they had themselves baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.'[*] That baptism into the name of Jesus was the regular practice is clear from such expressions as 'baptized into Christ Jesus,' 'was it in Paul's name that you were baptized?,' 'no one can say you were baptized in my name,' 'baptized into Moses,' 'baptized into Christ';[†] while other passages in the Epistles tend to confirm this.[‡] In the case of the eunuch, Lydia, the jailor, Crispus and the other Corinthians, their baptism is recorded, but it is not said that the name of Jesus was invoked; but a study of the case of the eunuch makes such invocation almost certain, and in the other cases there is no reason to doubt that the usual practice was followed.[§] Of Apollos and others it is not said that they were baptized.[‖] The references to a name in connexion with baptism in the Apostolic Fathers tend to confirm this view. Hermas portrays the Church as a 'tower built upon the waters . . . founded on the word of the almighty and glorious name.' Referring to the state of a man before his baptism, it is said, 'before a man bears the name of the son of God he is dead.'[¶] The *Didache* speaks of 'those baptized into the name of the Lord.'[**] The practice of baptizing into the name of Jesus continued into the 3rd cent., when Pope Stephen, in opposition to Cyprian and the Apostolic Canons, declared such baptism to be invalid.[††]

In Mt 28^{19} there is recorded a command of Jesus to baptize 'in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit.' The earliest mention we have of this is in the *Didache*, where a similar direction is given.[‡‡] Justin Martyr says that baptism was administered in the Triune Name.[§§] Irenæus, who mentions baptism in the Triune Name, bases this not on the command in Matthew but on the traditional faith handed down to him '"by the elders, the disciples of the apostles."'[‖‖] That baptism in the Triune Name was universally current about A.D. 150 is scarcely in accordance with the evidence. The discrepancy between the command of Jesus and the practice of the Apostolic Church has been accounted for in various ways, some of which are worthy of consideration. (1) Its historicity as part of Matthew's Gospel and its authority as a command of the Lord have been maintained,[¶¶] the argument adduced being that the words did not constitute a formula to be used, and that baptism into the name of Jesus was virtually the same as baptism into the Triune Name—an explanation that does not account for the fact that the words of Jesus were not in one single case obeyed. (2) The historicity of the words as those of Jesus, questioned by Neander,[***] who declares it undeniable that the account 'does not bear so distinct a historical stamp as other narratives of Christ's reappearance' is denied by Strauss, Weinel, Clemen, Harnack, Robinson, Sabatier.[†††]

---

[*] Baroness de Bertouch, *Life of Father Ignatius*, 1904, pp. 87, 117, 373, 493.

[†] *ERE* ii. 367.

[‡] *Ib.* ii. 368.

[§] *Ib.* ii. 408; Mk 7^{2-6}, Lk 11^{38}.

[‖] Jos. *BJ* II. viii. 7.

[¶] *ERE* ii. 376.

[**] Mt 3^{6}, Mk 1^{4}, Lk 3^{3}, Ac 13^{24}.

[††] Jn 10^{41}, Mt 21^{25}, Jn 1^{25}.

[‡‡] Jn $1^{26.\ 31-33}$, Mk 1^{8}, Mt 3^{11}, Lk $3^{15.\ 16}$, Ac 1^{5} 11^{16} $19^{3.\ 4.\ 5}$.

[§§] Jn $4^{2.\ 35-40}$; cf. Lk 7^{29}, Jn 3^{22} 4^{2}.

[‖‖] Ac $2^{21.\ 38.\ 41}$.

[¶¶] Ac 8^{12-16}.

[***] Ac 9^{18} 22^{16}.

[†††] Ac $10^{47.\ 48}$.

[*] Ac $19^{3.\ 4.\ 5}$.

[†] Ro 6^{3}, 1 Co $1^{13.\ 14}$ 10^{2}, Gal 3^{27}.

[‡] 1 Co 6^{11} 12^{13}, Eph 4^{5}, Col 2^{12}, 1 P 3^{21}. In none of these cases would the 'ceremonial formula have been out of place' (*Exp*, 6th ser., iii. [1901] 411).

[§] Ac 8^{25-40} 16^{14-15}.

[‖] Ac 18.

[¶] *Vis.* iii. 3; *Sim.* ix. 16 (cf. ix. 13); the Athos MS reads 'name of God.'

[**] Ch. ix.

[††] Cyprian, *Ep.* lxxiii. 17–18; F. C. Conybeare, *EBr*^{11} ii. 365.

[‡‡] Ch. vii.; but see J. H. Bernard, *Exp*, 6th ser., v. [1902] 51.

[§§] *Apol.* i. 61.

[‖‖] *Exp*, 7th ser., iv. [1907] 42; A. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, ii. [1896] 22.

[¶¶] Resch, *ExpT* vi. 247; J. T. Marshall, *ib.* p. 395; *Critical Review*, v. [1895] 42; F. H. Chase, *JThSt* vi. [1904–05] 481 ff., viii. [1906–07] 161 ff.; W. C. Allen, *ICC*, 'Matthew'^{3}, 1912, p. 305 ff.; J. V. Bartlet, *ERE* ii. 376; A. Plummer, *HDB* i. 242; J. H. Bernard, *Exp*, 6th ser., v. [1902] 51.

[***] *Life of Jesus Christ*, 1880, pp. 131, 484 n.

[†††] D. F. Strauss, *Life of Jesus*^{2}, 1892, p. 745 f., says: 'The formula in Matthew sounds so exactly as if it had been borrowed from the ecclesiastical ritual, that there is no slight probability in the supposition that it was transferred from thence into the mouth of Jesus.' H. Weinel, in *Jesus*

(3) The historicity of the words as part of the First Gospel, questioned by Sanday,[*] who says 'they belong to a comparatively late and suspected part of the Gospel,' is assailed by Conybeare,[†] who holds that the command to baptize in the Triune Name was interpolated for dogmatic reasons in some copies of the Gospel, and that its place in the text was not fully assured till after the Council of Nicæa, instancing the fact that Eusebius of Cæsarea (A.D. 313–339), when quoting or referring to it, continually omits or stops short of the words which refer to baptism. This practically is the opinion of such scholars as Moffatt and Kirsopp Lake.[‡] Of singular interest are the opinions of Bruce. At first maintaining that this and other post-Resurrection sayings 'bear internal evidence of being last words from their fitness to the situation,'[§] he comes to favour an idea of Keim that Mt 28^{19}, an authentic logion spoken by Jesus before His death, was transferred by Matthew to what he deemed a specially suitable place—the final leave-taking, the trinitarian formula simply summing up 'in brief compass the teaching of Jesus';[‖] then he accepts the idea that the apostles knew the formula but 'did not consider themselves under bondage to a form of words, but felt free to use an equivalent form,'[¶] and comes at last to think that the words 'are not so much' a report of 'what the risen Jesus said . . . as a summary of what the Apostolic Church understood to be the will of the exalted Lord.'[**] But even if the passage be a genuine logion of Jesus, the knowledge of which may have been confined to only a few, preserved only in one Gospel which is dated *c.* A.D. 80,[††] it cannot be used as evidence against what, so far as one knows, was an actual and universal custom. The slight variety in the words which record the baptism in the name of Jesus—clearly of no significance[‡‡]—shows that there was indeed no stereotyped formula which must not be departed from, but raises no doubt as to the fact that baptism was in the name not of three persons, but of one.

The meaning of such baptism is clear. When we remember the use of the name in the exorcism of demons, when we remember that the world into which the religion of Jesus came was 'a world without natural science, steeped in belief in every kind of magic and enchantment, and full of public and private religious societies, every one of which had its mysteries and miracles and its blood-bond with its peculiar deity,' that 'it was from such a world and such societies that most of the converts came and brought with them the thoughts and instincts of countless generations, who had never conceived of a religion without rites and mysteries,'[*] when we remember the magical use of the Name in the Jewish and Gentile worlds, the words of Robinson state the true position: 'The Name of God among the Jews was . . . an instrument of awful power. That such divine power could be brought into play by the use of the Name of the Lord Jesus was clearly the belief of the early Christians. . . . Those who were authorized to use "the Name" were regarded as having at their disposal the supernatural power of the Being whom they so named.'[†] The exact effect of baptism 'into the name' is not easily determined. If the words in Mt 28^{19} are not a genuine logion of Jesus, the meaning which He might have attached to them need not be discussed, and hence we are concerned with the view not of Jesus but of His followers. 'No trace remains of the baptism of the initiated "into the name" of any of the mystery-deities,'[‡] and so they afford us no help. It has been suggested that the baptism into the Name merely 'indicates to whom the baptized person will thenceforward adhere,' and therefore that 'the theory of a magical virtue in baptism cannot be proved':[§] such baptism 'constitutes the *belonging* to God or to the Son of God.'[‖] Such a view does not do justice to the facts; much nearer the truth is the conception that such baptism 'reveals the name as a religious potency into which as into a spiritual atmosphere the adult catechumen or the initiated infant is brought.'[¶] This was clearly St. Paul's view. He indicates that baptism in the name of Jesus constituted a mystical union between the baptized and Jesus through which the baptized received (*a*) a share in His death and specially in His resurrection,[**] (*b*) the gift of the Spirit,[††] and (*c*) a cleansing from sin which involved their consecration and justification;[‡‡] and 'baptism can produce these effects because it works "in the name," and so links up baptism with the view, prevalent at the time in almost every circle, that the pronunciation of the name of any one could, if properly used, enable the user to enjoy the benefit of the attributes attached to the original owner of the name. . . . This it accomplishes by the power of the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by the sacramental effect of the water, according to the well-known idea that results could be reached in the unseen spiritual world by the performance of analogous acts in the visible material world.'[§§] It is this efficacy of the water given it by the Name that enables us to understand the meaning of the words of Barnabas: 'We descend into the water full of sins and defilement, but come up bearing fruit in our hearts, having the fear (of God) and trust in Jesus in our spirits.'[‖‖] For a similar reason Justin Martyr connects the life with the name.[¶¶]

10. Prayer in the Name.—As we have seen, primitive man gradually came to realize that in him, in other beings and things, lay the extraordinary, the supernormal—what Hartland calls 'theoplasm,' god-stuff; and that this, whether in himself or others, was a power able to be exercised by him and them—*mana*. When, for example, such a man met an enemy, and willed to kill him, it was his *mana* that enabled him to do so. His will,

---

or Christ (*HJ Suppl.*), 1909, p. 30, says: 'It is most assuredly post-Pauline.' Clemen, p. 214, says: It 'cannot be historical, at all events in its present form. . . . Jesus cannot, I think, have instituted a form of baptism in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.' Harnack, *History of Dogma*, i. [1894] 79, says: 'Matt. xxviii. 19 is not a saying of the Lord.' Robinson, *EBi* i. 474, practically accepts the view that 'Matthew does not here report the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus, but transfers to him the familiar language of the Church of the evangelist's own time and locality'; cf. A. Sabatier, *The Religion of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit*, 1904, p. 51 ff.

[*] W. Sanday in *HDB* ii. 213^b.

[†] *HJ* i. [1902–03] 102. See also M. Arnold, *Literature and Dogma*^{5}, 1876, p. 292.

[‡] J. Moffatt, *The Historical NT*, 1901, p. 647, *The Theology of the Gospels*, 1912, p. 32; K. Lake, *ERE* ii. 380^b, says the cumulative evidence of the textual, literary, and historical criticism 'is thus distinctly against the view that Mt 28^{19} represents the *ipsissima verba* of Christ'; see also M. Arnold, *Literature and Dogma*^{5}, p. 292, and *ExpT* xv. [1903–04] 294.

[§] A. B. Bruce, *The Training of the Twelve*^{2}, 1877, p. 519.

[‖] *The Kingdom of God*^{4}, 1891, p. 257 f.

[¶] *Ib.* p. 260.

[**] *Apologetics*, 1892, p. 463.

[††] In Mt 28^{15} 'down to the present day' implies a considerable lapse of time.

[‡‡] Though B. F. Westcott (*Exp*, 3rd ser., v. [1887] 257) says: 'Certainly I would gladly have given the ten years of my life spent on the Revision to bring only these two phrases of the New Testament ["into the name" in Mt 28^{19} and "in Christ" in Ro 6^{23}] to the heart of Englishmen.'

[*] Glover, p. 158 f.; *ERE* ii. 381.

[†] J. A. Robinson, *JThSt* vii. [1905–06] 196, 197.

[‡] H. A. A. Kennedy, *Exp*, 8th ser., iv. 539.

[§] Clemen, pp. 238, 370.

[‖] Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, p. 147.

[¶] Farnell, *The Evolution of Religion*, p. 189 f.

[**] Ro $6^{3.4}$, Gal 3^{27}, Col 2^{12}.

[††] 1 Co $12^{12.13}$.

[‡‡] 1 Co 6^{11}.

[§§] *ERE* ii. 382; Heitmüller, pp. 320, 329.

[‖‖] Ch. xi.

[¶¶] *Apol.* i. 61.

moving 'on a supernormal plane,'[*] projected itself against the foe; his *mana* went forth as an act of will. Such a 'will to power' was almost inevitably accompanied by, and expressed itself in, two things: (1) an act, as the flinging of a spear; and (2) a hurling forth of words, such words being 'the very type of a spiritual projectile.'[†] When the enemy is not present, and there arises the wish to kill, then, when there speeds forth the *mana* that destroys, the more emotional side of the man's nature asserts itself and expresses itself in the throwing of the spear and the hurling of the words in the direction in which the enemy is supposed to be. A man does this when what is to be influenced is not, to us, a person.

A British Columbian Indian, wishing to stop the rain, holds a stick in the fire, describes a circle with it, then holds the stick towards the east and addresses the rain in these words: 'Now then, you must stop raining.'[‡]

Reflexion causes two changes. Man realizes that many of such acts are more or less symbolical, and this, especially under priestly influence, leads to detailed and dramatic symbolism, such as sacrifice and ritual. Again—and this is important in the present connexion—he comes to realize that for some of the harder tasks he must use not only the *mana* which is his own, but *mana* superior to his own. He therefore turns to beings superior to himself, to the divinities. There is thus gradually developed a body of doctrine as to the divinities, more or less esoteric, both intricate and complicated, which influenced and still continues to influence religion. This influence is seen in its simplest form when a human being exercises power over a divinity.

The king of the Matabele, in order to get rain, offers sacrifices and says, 'O great spirits of my father and grandfather, . . . make us to be the best-fed and the strongest people in the world!'[§]

When it becomes clearly understood that such divinities do possess power, they are naturally invoked during the performance of the symbolic acts, and then we have the spell.

The ancient Peruvians on the eve of war starved some sheep, killed them, saying as they did so: 'As the hearts of these beasts are weakened, so let our enemies be weakened.'[‖] Here from the beasts, the symbols, to the enemy, the reality, the *mana* is transferred. But the words 'so let' indicate the consciousness that it is the deities who 'are putting the thing through.'[¶] Westermarck quotes with approval Renan's dictum that with the Romans 'prayer is a magic formula, producing its effect by its own inherent quality,' and adds: 'They wanted to compel the gods rather than to be compelled by them';[**] but Warde Fowler asserts that the prayers of the gild of brethren at Iguvium to Jupiter Grabovius 'retain some of the outward characteristics of spell, but internally, *i.e.* in the spirit in which they were intended, they have the real characteristics of prayer.'[††]

When a god attains such a degree of personality as to have a name, this enables the human suppliant to influence him personally, by using his name.

This is seen in its simplest form when a human being exercises power over a divine being by the proper use of his name. The Torres Straits islanders summon a local bogey or a spirit by mentioning his name.[‡‡] A Malay prays at the grave of a murdered man: 'Hearken, So-and-So, and assist me. . . . I desire to ask for a little magic.'[§§] When the Angoni desire rain, they go to the rain-temple and in connexion with certain ceremonies pray: 'Master *Chauta*, . . . give your children the rains.'[‖‖]

The *mana* of a deity who has attained to a name becomes specially lodged in his name, and can be commandeered by the proper use of it.

In Gn 4^{26} it is said of Enoch, 'He was the first to call by (means of) the name Jahweh.' This expression 'denotes the essential act in worship, the invocation (or rather *evocation*) of the Deity by the solemn utterance of His name. It rests on the wide-spread primitive idea that a real bond exists between the person and his name, such that the pronunciation of the latter exerts a mystic influence on the former.'[*] In Elijah's time the question was whether Jahweh or Baal was the proper name for the Divine Being, and 'the test proposed by Elijah is *which name*—Baal or Yahwe—will evoke a manifestation of divine energy.'[†]

From the conception of the *mana* of the deities specially lodged in their names there was developed the doctrine that the proper use of the name set in motion and brought into real operation all the powers of the deity.

The Kei women when their men are fighting pray: 'O lord sun and moon let the bullets rebound from our husbands.'[‡]

Thus the name which had been added to the spell to cause it to work gradually supersedes all other methods of entreaty in the prayer, and becomes that by which the effective appeal is made to the deity. The liturgies of all the more advanced peoples show that 'prayer gains potency from the solemn utterance of the true divine name.'[§]

Throughout the OT we have many instances of men calling on the name of Jahweh. Jesus dropping that name taught His disciples to pray to the Father.

The account of St. Paul's prayers[‖] indicates that this was his custom, and neither in these cases, nor in the account which he himself gives of his prayers,[¶] nor yet in those actually recorded,[**] is this custom departed from. But in the Fourth Gospel, Jesus, reminding His disciples that previously they had asked nothing in His name,[††] instructs them so to ask and they shall receive,[‡‡] indicating that the Father will grant whatever they ask in His name,[§§] and promising that the day was coming when He would let them know plainly about the Father, and on that day they would ask in His name,[‖‖] for He Himself was going to the Father and would do whatsoever they asked in His name.[¶¶] It cannot be inferred from these passages that Jesus taught His disciples to pray not to Him, but to the Father in His name.[***] Whether these words were actually spoken by our Lord before His death, or represent the views of the Christians of the 2nd cent. matters little for our immediate purpose. They indicate clearly that the addition of the name 'is not a mere devotional form, but a new ground on which the worshipper stands, a new plea for the success of his petitions.'[†††] Further, they indicate that 'when His disciples have entered into complete union with Him they will lose the sense that He is intermediary between them and the Father. They will be so identified with Him that all prayer of theirs will be the prayer of Christ Himself, offered immediately to God.'[‡‡‡] We have in the case of Stephen prayer addressed to Jesus,[§§§] and there are indications that the invoking of His name was common.[‖‖‖] This invoking of the Name would seem to have been associated not so much with petitions, as we might have expected, as with thanksgiving.[¶¶¶] When we think of the use of the Name in preaching, in exorcism, in the persecutions of the primitive Christians, we can understand how fervour led them to add to their prayers, and to pray in what they had come to think of as the name above every name, the one which was with the Father the all-prevailing name.[*] In this way we see that 'the name-formulæ, which close most of the prayers of the Christian Church, were originally 'words of power to speed the prayer home.'[†] 'In the apocryphal acts of St John we find a long list of mystical names and titles attached to Christ giving to the prayer much of the tone of an enchantment.'[‡] Hence we see that the conception of *mana* 'yields the chief clue to the original use of names of power in connection with the spell, from "in the devil's name" to "Im Namen Jesu."'[§]

---

[*] Marett, *The Threshold of Religion*^{2}, p. 51.

[†] *Ib.* p. 54.

[‡] Frazer, *GB*^{3}, pt. i., *The Magic Art*, i. 253; J. E. Carpenter, *Comparative Religion*, 1913, p. 148, 'The Prayer of the Todas.'

[§] Frazer, *GB*^{3}, pt. i., *The Magic Art*, i. 352; see also Carpenter, pp. 35, 151.

[‖] Marett, *The Threshold of Religion*^{2}, p. 55.

[¶] *Ib.* p. 30.

[**] W. Warde Fowler, *The Religious Experience of the Roman People*, 1911, pp. 185, 186.

[††] *Ib.* p. 189.

[‡‡] Haddon, p. 24.

[§§] Marett, *The Threshold of Religion*^{2}, p. 62.

[‖‖] Frazer, *GB*^{3}, pt. i., *The Magic Art*, i. 250.

[*] J. Skinner, *ICC*, 'Genesis,' p. 127.

[†] *Ib.*

[‡] Marett, *The Threshold of Religion*^{2}, p. 67.

[§] Farnell, *The Evolution of Religion*, p. 184.

[‖] See, *e.g.*, Eph 1^{17} 2^{18} 3^{14} 5^{20}, Col 1$^{3.\,12}$ 3^{17}; also Ja 3^{9}, 1 P 1^{17}, 1 Jn 2^{1}.

[¶] 1 Co 1^{4}, 1 Th 1^{2}.

[**] Ph 1^{3}.

[††] Jn 16^{24}.

[‡‡] 16$^{23.\,24}$.

[§§] 15^{16}.

[‖‖] 16^{26}.

[¶¶] 14$^{13.\,14}$.

[***] H. P. Liddon, *The Divinity of our Lord*^{8}, 1878, note F; also G. A. Chadwick, *Exp*, 3rd ser., vi. [1887] 191.

[†††] *HDB* iv. 44.

[‡‡‡] E. F. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel*, 1906, p. 316.

[§§§] Ac 7^{59}.

[‖‖‖] Ac 22^{16} 2^{21} 9^{14}, 1 Co 1^{2}.

[¶¶¶] Ac 4^{10}, Eph 5^{20}, Col 3^{17}, Ro 1^{8}.

Literature.—This has been indicated in the art.

P. A. Gordon Clark.

NAPHTALI.—See Tribes.

NAPKIN.—See Handkerchief, Napkin.

NARCISSUS (Ναρκίσσος, a common Latin name).—In Ro 16^{11} St. Paul salutes 'them of the household of Narcissus, which are in the Lord' (*τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ναρκίσσου τοὺς ὄντας ἐν κυρίῳ*), *i.e.* the Christians in his *familia* or establishment of freedmen and slaves (perhaps known as *Narcissiani*, for which the Greek phrase would be equivalent). J. B. Lightfoot (*Philippians*^{4}, 1878, p. 175) thinks that the Narcissus referred to was the powerful freedman of that name, whose wealth was proverbial (Juv. *Sat.* xiv. 329), whose influence was very great in the intrigues of the reign of Claudius, and who had been put to death by Agrippina shortly after the accession of Nero (Tac. *Ann.* xiii. 1; Dio Cass. lx. 34), in A.D. 54. It was customary in such cases for the household to become the property of the Emperor while it retained the name of its old master (cf. probably 'the household of Aristobulus' [*q.v.*], whose Christian members are saluted in v.^{10}). If Ro 16 be an integral part of Romans, and therefore directed to Rome, this may indeed be the household referred to; for although there may have been other establishments whose master's name was Narcissus, this must have been the most famous. If so, some three years had elapsed since it had passed into the hands of Nero. For the occurrence of the name Narcissus on inscriptions see Sanday-Headlam, *ICC*, 'Romans'^{4}, 1900, p. 425 f. The Christians in the household would naturally form one of the distinct communities of which the Church at Rome was apparently made up (cf. v.^{10} and the phrases in vv.$^{5. 15}$). 'The master was not a Christian, and therefore it was not his whole household, but in each case an indefinite number of his servants who had been converted. Plainly therefore the conversion of one of them had at once created a centre for the diffusion of the gospel. We have here at any rate a proof, not only that the closer social connections in general contributed to the spread of the truth, but that the servile class were especially susceptible' (C. von Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age*, Eng. tr., i.^{2} [1897] 397). As the salutation to these Christians is preceded by a greeting to 'Herodion my kinsman,' it is conjectured that Herodion was a member of the household of Narcissus and the nucleus of the community or church. Some scholars think that the mention of this household is conclusive in favour of the Roman destination of Ro 16, but to others, in view of the strong probability that the chapter belongs to a letter to the Church at Ephesus, it seems quite reasonable to suppose that there was a 'household of Narcissus' known to St. Paul in that city.

T. B. Allworthy.

NATION.—In Mk 7^{26}, Gal $1^{14m.}$ the RV rightly changes 'nation' to 'race' (*γένει*); cf. Ac 4^{36} $18^{2. 24}$, 'a Cyprian by race,' 'an Alexandrian,' 'a Pontican.' In the NT *ἔθνος* generally designates a non-Jewish nation; but it is also used of the Jewish nation when spoken of *officially* (Lk 7^5 23^2, Jn $11^{48f.}$ 18^{35}, Ac 10^{22} $24^{2. 10. 17}$ 26^4 28^{19}), and even of the Christian society (Mt 21^{43}, Ro 10^{19}). In 1 P 2^9 Christians are called both 'an elect *γένος*' and 'a holy *ἔθνος*.'

Jesus spoke to the Jewish nation as a collective personality, a community bearing a common responsibility. As 'they that were his own' they 'received him not' (Jn 1^{11}), and the national crime of His crucifixion was the precursor of their downfall, although it did not result in their being 'cast off' (Ro 11^1). His passionate love for His own nation was evidenced by the fatigues, the privations, the 'contradictions' that He endured, by the tears of woe that gushed from His eyes (Lk 19^{41}; cf. Ro 9^3). He seldom referred to other nations till near the close of His earthly course; yet He spoke of the Ninevites as having acted in their corporate capacity when they repented (Mt 12^{41}; cf. Jon 3^7). He recognized the right of the common law of the Empire of which He was a subject (Mt 22^{21}). 'All the nations,' He said, should finally appear before Him as their Judge, and He would reward the works of love done by those whom He set on His right hand as having been done to Himself (Mt $25^{31f.}$). When He appeared to His disciples on the mountain in Galilee, He said, 'All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth: Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations'; and it is significant that He did not say 'of all men' but 'of all the nations'—thus pointing out that the object to be aimed at was national religion, the national confession of His authority (cf. Martensen, *Ethics*, 'General,' p. 443 f.). Further, if in Ac 2^{9-11} the words *Ἰουδαίαν, Κρῆτες καὶ Ἄραβες* be omitted as being probably ancient glosses on the text, we are left, as Harnack says (*Acts*, p. 65 f.), with a list of twelve nations, whom St. Luke may have specified as 'heralding the great theme of his book'—how Jesus was brought to all the nations of the known world, the new Israel (cf. Ac 19^7).

The great missionary successes of the Apostolic Age prepared the way for the reception of the Christian faith on a grand national scale. St. Paul, before his death, 'had planted more churches than Plato had gained disciples' (Bossuet, *Panégyrique de Saint Paul*, 1659)—*ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως ἐλθών*, as Clement says (*ad Cor.* i. 5). Besides the Dispersion (*q.v.*), there were other two co-operating factors that assisted the progress of the gospel—the political unity of the Empire, and the influence of the Stoic creed. In the ancient heathen world, national life had been particular and exclusive: the nations were isolated from and ignorant of each other. But when they all looked to Rome as mistress and mother, they were on their way to the belief in the spiritual unity of mankind proclaimed by Christianity (cf. Flint, *History of the Philosophy of History*, pp. 26, 61). The influence of the Stoic doctrine of 'world-citizenship' is well attested by the fragment from Cicero (*de Rep.* iii. 22) quoted by J. Adam, *Vitality of Platonism*: 'Hymn of Cleanthes,' p. 146:

> 'And there will not be one law at Rome and another at Athens, one law to-day and another law to-morrow; but the same law everlasting and unchangeable will bind all nations at all times; and there will be one common Master and Ruler of all, even God, the framer, the arbitrator, and the proposer of this law.'

This noble utterance justifies the remark of S. Dill

---

[*] Ph $2^{9. 10}$.

[†] Farnell, *The Evolution of Religion*, p. 190.

[‡] *Ib.*

[§] Marett, *The Threshold of Religion*^{2}, p. 62.

(*Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, London, 1904, p. 328): 'The Stoic school has the glory of anticipating the diviner dream, yet far from realised, of a human brotherhood under the light from the Cross.' This 'diviner dream' will be realized when all nations, now united by bonds far surpassing those of blood-relationship, or common speech, customs, or history—the bonds of a common love and obedience to Christ—shall form together one august Kingdom of God (Rev 11^{15}).

LITERATURE.—J. Adam, *The Vitality of Platonism and other Essays*, Edinburgh, 1911, pp. 113 n., 142, 146–147; R. Flint, *History of the Philosophy of History*, do., 1893, pp. 26, 48, 61, 63, 449; T. von Haering, *The Ethics of the Christian Life*, London, 1909, p. 403 f.; A. Harnack, *Acts of the Apostles* (NT Studies, iii.), Eng. tr., do., 1909, pp. 49, 64, 65 f.; H. Martensen, *Christian Ethics*, 'General,' Edinburgh, 1873, pp. 214, 442 f., 'Social,' do., 1882, p. 88 f.; G. Uhlhorn, *Christian Charity in the Ancient Church*, Eng. tr., do., 1883, pp. 40–42.

JAMES DONALD.

NATURAL.—1. In Ro 1$^{26f.}$ 11$^{21.\,24}$ (cf. Jude^{10} 'naturally') 'natural' is the rendering of *φυσικός*. In Ro 1 St. Paul denounces certain forms of sexual vice as 'against nature.' To indulge in them is to pervert and degrade human nature. Its constitution is violated when the lower impulses refuse to be controlled. History confirms the Apostle's judgment that 'natural' instincts and passions unbridled by reason and conscience lead to unnatural crimes which are dishonouring alike to man and to God. To Renan's outburst, 'Nature cares nothing about chastity,' the true reply is, 'Instead of saying that Nature cares nothing about chastity, let us say that human nature, *our* nature, cares about it a great deal' (Matthew Arnold, *Discourses in America*, London, 1896, p. 60). In Ro 11 St. Paul, using figurative language, describes the Jews as 'natural branches' in contrast with the Gentiles, who are represented as artificially grafted into the tree of God's people. The process described is 'one that in horticulture is never performed. The cultivated branch is always engrafted upon the wild stock, and not *vice versa*. This Paul knew quite well (see *παρὰ φύσιν*, v.^{24}), and the force of his reproof to the presuming Gentile turns on the fact that the process *was* an unnatural one' (J. Denney, *EGT*, 'Romans,' 1900, p. 680).

2. In 1 Co 2^{14} 15$^{44.\,46}$, 'natural' is the rendering of *ψυχικός*. It is also used twice in RVm as an alternative to another translation of the same word. In 2 P 2^{12} 'mere animals' is in the RV text, but in Jude^{19} 'sensual' is found, 'animal' being a second marginal rendering. In all these passages *ψυχικός* 'has a disparaging sense, being opposed to *πνευματικός* (as *ψυχή* is not to *πνεῦμα*), and almost synonymous with *σάρκινος* or *σαρκικός* (1 Co 3$^{1f.}$). . . . This epithet describes to the Corinthians the unregenerate nature *at its best*, the man commended in philosophy, actuated by the higher thoughts and aims of the natural life—not the sensual man (the *animalis* of the Vulg.) who is ruled by bodily impulses. Yet the *ψυχικός, μὴ ἔχων πνεῦμα* (Jude^{19}) may be lower than the *σαρκικός*, where the latter, as in 1 Co 3^{3} and Gal 5$^{17.\,25}$, is already touched but not fully assimilated by the life-giving *πνεῦμα*' (G. G. Findlay, *EGT*, '1 Cor.,' 1900, p. 783, note on 1 Co 2^{14}). To this helpful discrimination may be added a brief quotation from T. C. Edwards' *Commentary on First Ep. to Corinthians*^{2}, London, 1885: 'the word *ψυχικός* was coined by Aristotle (*Eth. Nic.* III. x. 2), to distinguish the pleasures of the soul, such as ambition and desire of knowledge, from those of the body.' As used by St. Paul, 'the *ψυχικός*, contrasted with the *ἀκρατής*, is the noblest of men. But to the *πνευματικός* he is related as the natural to the supernatural. . . . The indwelling spirit is the Holy Spirit; and he in whom that Spirit dwells is at once supernatural and holy' (p. 65 f., note on 1 Co 2$^{14f.}$). *ψυχικός* is sometimes rendered 'psychic,' and sometimes 'soulish' in 1 Co 15^{44}, with the intention of emphasizing the contrast between the 'natural' and the 'spiritual' body. But 'though inadequate, "natural" is the best available rendering of this adjective; it indicates the moulding of man's body by its environment, and its adaptation to existing functions; the same body is *χοϊκόν* in respect of its material (v.^{47}).' In this context, however, '*ψυχικον* is only relatively a term of disparagement; the "psychic" body has in it the making of the "spiritual"' (G. G. Findlay, *op. cit.* p. 937). The body which, in our present state, is adapted for the service of *the soul*, is contrasted by St. Paul with the body which, in the future state, will be adapted for the higher service of the spirit. 'An organism fitted to be the seat of mind, to express emotion, to carry out the behests of will is already in process of being adapted for a still nobler ministry.' Hence in v.^{46} the history of man is said to be 'a progress from Adam to Christ, from soulish to spiritual, from the present life to the future' (T. C. Edwards, *op. cit.* pp. 441, 445).

3. (*a*) In two passages (Ro 1^{31}, 2 Ti 3^{3}) the phrase 'without natural affection' is the rendering of *ἄστοργος*. By this word St. Paul describes those who are so regardless of the claims of nature as to be lacking in love for their own kindred. He assumes that love of kindred (*στοργή*) should naturally arise from such human relationships as parent and child, husband and wife, brother and sister. Here, as in those passages in which 'natural' is the rendering of *φυσικός*, the word denotes not what is in harmony with our environment, but what is in accord with our own true nature or constitution.

(*b*) In Ja 1^{23} 'his natural face' is the rendering of the phrase *πρόσωπον τῆς γενέσεως*, lit. 'the face of his birth' (RVm). The meaning is the face which is 'native' to man. The contrast is between 'the face which belongs to this transitory life,' of which a reflexion may be seen in a mirror, and 'the character which is being here moulded for eternity,' of which a reflexion may be seen in the Word (J. B. Mayor, *Epistle of St. James*^{3}, London, 1910, p. 71, note on 1^{23}).

LITERATURE.—J. Laidlaw, *Bible Doctrine of Man*, new ed., Edinburgh, 1895; H. Wheeler Robinson, *The Christian Doctrine of Man*, do., 1911.

J. G. TASKER.

NATURE.—1. The revelation of God in Nature.—The basis of St. Paul's appeal to the men of Lystra (Ac 14$^{15ff.}$) is that 'the living God' manifests Himself in creation. In Ro 1$^{19ff.}$ the Apostle elaborates the same argument, drawing out its sterner implications and showing that the Gentiles were under condemnation because they had repressed the knowledge of God imparted to them in the works of His hands. No countenance is given to either of the two modern extremes of thought: there is no disparagement of Nature's teachings; and, on the other hand, they are never set forth as sufficient for man's spiritual needs. St. Paul's purpose is answered when he has asserted 'the fact that the Gentiles possessed lofty conceptions of God which nevertheless had not proved to them the way of salvation. This true knowledge had been attained very largely through a right apprehension of the natural world which in all ages has been the "living garment" men have seen God by' (R. D. Shaw, *The Pauline Epistles*, Edinburgh, 1903, p. 210). Naturalism and Nature-worship which substitute Nature for God are alike remote from apostolic thought. God's invisible attributes have been revealed in the universe which proclaims His wisdom and His power. He is, therefore, to be worshipped with adoration and thanksgiving. In Ro 8^{19} St. Paul poetically personifies Nature and represents it as sympathizing with humanity's hopes. 'He conceives of all creation as involved in the fortunes of humanity. . . . Creation is not inert, utterly unspiritual, alien to our life and its hopes. . . . With the revelation of the sons of God humanity would attain its end, and nature too' (J. Denney, *EGT*, 'Romans,' 1900, *in loc.*).

2. The light of Nature.—The revelation of God in Nature implies a corresponding responsibility on the part of those to whom it is given; it affects man's moral condition according as he is or is not guided by its light. In Ro 2^{14} St. Paul grants that Gentiles may do 'by nature' the things of the law. There is, therefore, a standard by which they may be judged although they do not possess the written Law which is the Jews' glory. 'For whenever any of them instinctively put in practice the precepts of the law, their own moral sense supplies them with the law they need' (Sanday-Headlam, *ICC*, 'Romans'^{5}, 1902, p. 54). To appreciate the force of the Apostle's argument, it is important to remember that although he regards the light of Nature as insufficient, he recognizes that the knowledge of God derived from Nature is true and good. 'The hinge on which everything turns is the forsaking of the knowledge. . . . The Theism of the Gentiles failed not because its light was delusive, but because its light was not used.' St. Paul is not, therefore, 'to be understood to mean that the Gentile world of which he wrote was lying in universal wickedness, unredeemed by even a single ray of human goodness' (R. D. Shaw, *op. cit.* p. 216 f.). St. Paul taught that in the visible creation men may discern the workings of a supreme Mind and Will; he also taught that the revelation of God in His Son is the climax, not the contradiction, of His revelation in Nature. He knew that from the depths of man's spiritual being questions arise to which Nature can give no clear and unambiguous answer. Unless men pass from the light of Nature into the presence of Him who is the Light of life, theirs will be the disappointment of all who seek in converse with Nature what can be attained only in communion with God through Christ. In the NT 'nature' is never used in what may be called its prevailing meaning in modern thought; the early Christians had no conception of 'nature' such as is implied in definitions which make it 'co-extensive with science, which deals with sequences only, reserving all beyond for philosophy, which deals with causes also. Thus nature will not be the sum of things, except for one who maintains that phenomena have no true causes at all' (H. M. Gwatkin, *The Knowledge of God*^{2}, Edinburgh, 1908, i. 47).

3. Nature and grace.—The Pauline antithesis between 'natural' and 'spiritual' has been dwelt upon above (see NATURAL). Most frequently, however, man's natural condition, moral and spiritual, is, in the NT, contrasted with his experience in a state of grace. 'St. Paul had an altogether persuasive and beautiful word for the supernatural, which he was never weary of using, and which the Church should count one of her chief treasures—the Grace of God' (J. Watson, *The Doctrines of Grace*, London, 1900, p. 6). St. Paul described Barnabas and himself as 'of like nature' with the men of Lystra (Ac 14^{15} RVm). He was disclaiming the ascription to men of divine honours, and acknowledging that he was not exempt from human feelings and infirmities (cf. Ja 5^{17}). But when St. Paul says to the Ephesians: 'we were by nature children of wrath, even as the rest' (2^{3}), he associates himself with those who before they were quickened and became partakers of grace were 'dead in trespasses and sins.' He regards sin as 'a constitutional malady. There exists a bad element in our human nature.' 'Our trespasses and sins are, after all, not forced on us by our environment. Those offences by which we provoke God, lie in our nature; they are no mere casual acts, they belong to our bias and disposition' (G. G. Findlay, *Expositor's Bible*, 'The Epistle to the Ephesians,' London, 1892, p. 104). In the context of this passage St. Paul explains what it is to be 'saved by grace.' His teaching agrees with the statement in 2 P 1^{4} that the promises of grace are given in order that men who inherit a sinful nature may 'become partakers of a divine nature.'

LITERATURE. — J. Ward, *Naturalism and Agnosticism*, London, 1899; P. N. Waggett, *Is there a Religion of Nature?*, do., 1902; W. L. Walker, *Christian Theism and a Spiritual Monism*, Edinburgh, 1906; J. O. Dykes, *The Divine Worker in Creation and Providence*, do., 1909; C. F. D'Arcy, *Christianity and the Supernatural*, London, 1909; R. Eucken, *Naturalism or Idealism?*, Cambridge, 1912.

J. G. TASKER.

NAVIGATION.—See SHIP.

NAZARENE.—In 18 passages of the Gospels and Acts Jesus is called 'the Nazarene' (the reading fluctuating between *Ναζαρηνός* and *Ναζωραῖος*). The use of this designation agrees with the fact that Nazareth was His home until He entered on His public ministry. The incident of the census was the occasion of His birth taking place at Bethlehem according to prophetic intimation. After the Egyptian episode, the family returned to Nazareth. After the Temptation, Jesus returned and remained there until the violence of the people drove Him to Capernaum, which henceforth was known as 'his own city' (Mt 9^{1}). The behaviour of the people (Lk 4^{29}) illustrates what is suggested respecting the repute of Nazareth in Jn 1^{46}. In Ac 24^{5} 'the sect of the Nazarenes' refers to Christians as a body, and is no doubt meant in a disparaging sense.

As indicated above, the name 'Jesus of Nazareth,' in the Eng. version, is universally used to translate without distinction two Greek names, *Ἰησοῦς Ναζαρηνός* and *Ἰησοῦς Ναζωραῖος*. A recent essay by E. A. Abbott makes it necessary to ask if both terms 'Nazarene' and 'Nazoræan' connote simply 'belonging to Nazareth.' He holds and argues very successfully that the name *Nazoraios* is significant of more than mere place-origin. His thesis is that *Nazarene*, meaning a man of Nazareth, and *Nazoræan*, meaning the *Nēṣer* or Rod of Jesse mentioned by Isaiah, were probably interchanged by a play on the two words; so that the populace, acclaiming Jesus as the Lifegiver and Healer, altered 'Jesus the Nazarene' into 'Jesus the Nazoræan.' To state the theory more exactly, we should say that they called Him Jesus the *Nēṣer*, or the Na(t)zoræan, partly because there was a pre-existing belief that the Messiah would be the *Nēṣer*, and partly because they vaguely felt what Matthew ventured definitely to express, that His residence from childhood onward in Nazareth had been ordained to fulfil the prophecy, 'He shall be called Nazoræan (*i.e.* *Nēṣer*).'

This theory involves the conclusion that the use of 'Nazarene' by Mark and Luke was an error, except in special contexts which may prove that the place-name, not the Messianic title, was meant.

There can be no doubt that the *Nēṣer* (the Branch) of Is 11^{1} was interpreted of the Messiah, the Targum on the passage making that quite definite; and it is quite probable that among the many names in popular use for the Messiah in the 1st cent. *Nēṣer* had a place.

The evidence from hostile sources is confirmatory. Christians were contemptuously called 'Nazarenes' by the Jews. But the actual word used was *Nôṣrî*. This does not closely resemble Nazareth, but it does resemble *Nôṣer* as used in Ben Sira xl. 15, referring to 'the branch of violence which is not to be unpunished.' That the enemies of Jesus should call Him *Nôṣrî*, 'Branch of violence,' is intelligible if His friends called Him *Nêṣer*, 'the true Branch.'

The question, as Abbott admits, is a difficult one, but it must be acknowledged that he has made out a strong case for regarding the name Nazoræan as more than a mere variant of Nazarene (see Edwin A. Abbott, *Miscellanea Evangelica*, II. i., Cambridge, 1913).

We find 'Nazarenes' used at a later period as the name of a Jewish Christian sect having some affinity with the Ebionites (see EBIONISM). The greatest obscurity envelops these Jewish Christian parties. The information coming down to us is meagre, and there is little likelihood of additions being made to it. The Jewish side of Christianity, which gave so much trouble to St. Paul, declined rapidly, especially after the fall of the Jewish State, and eventually disappeared. Our best course will be to summarize the views of two authorities of our day.

R. Seeberg (*Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, i. [1895] 50) endorses the ordinary opinion that there were two sects, the Nazarenes and the Ebionites, agreeing with one another in some things, differing in others. Justin Martyr refers to the former when he speaks of some Jewish Christians who keep the Jewish Law strictly themselves, but do not impose it on all Christians. Jerome also says that they believe in Christ as the Son of God, who was born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, and rose again. They recognized St. Paul and his work, and used a Hebrew Gospel. Eusebius distinguishes them sharply from Ebionites, but says that they did not accept the pre-existence of the Logos. Seeberg thinks that Eusebius was mistaken in the last statement, confusing the Nazarenes with the Ebionites, who did deny Christ's Deity. The Nazarenes, Seeberg thinks, simply put aside Logos speculations. The Ebionites, on the other hand, required all Christians to conform to the Jewish Law of rites and ceremonies, rejected St. Paul as an apostate, and regarded Christ as the son of Joseph and Mary. Origen seems to know a second Ebionite party, who, while holding these Ebionite tenets, said that Christ at His baptism received the fullness of the Holy Spirit, constituting Him a Prophet and Son of God in a high degree. They also held millennarian views. If the Nazarenes had so much in common with the Church, it is strange that Jerome should say that, 'while they claim to be both Jews and Christians, they are neither.' Seeberg says that the Nazarenes were Jewish *Christians*, the Ebionites Christian *Jews*.

F. Loofs (*Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte*^{4}, 1906, p. 83) agrees in the main with the above account, but thinks that too sharp a distinction is drawn between the Nazarenes and the Ebionites. He holds that the recognition by the latter of the Holy Spirit who fell on Christ at the Baptism, and who is pre-existent and Divine, comes near to the acknowledgment of Deity in Christ. But this implies that Christ was not Divine before and became Divine through the descent of the Spirit. Does the same effect follow in us? Both writers agree that the sects ran to seed in the syncretism of the day and in mythological speculations. To Irenæus the Ebionites were heretics. The Elkesaites were an offshoot from the same trunk, and appealed to the book Elkesai as a new revelation, bringing new forgiveness of sins, even the grossest, and new remedies of disease. Alcibiades of Apamea about A.D. 220 appeared in Rome as the apostle of this gospel, and met with temporary success. The Clementine romances were still later products of the same movement.

(The Nazirites had no connexion, linguistic or other, with Nazareth and the Nazarenes. See *HDB* and *EBi*, *s.v.* 'Nazirite'; also following article.)

LITERATURE.—Art. 'Ebionism' in *ERE* and *DAC*; A. Hilgenfeld, *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums*, Leipzig, 1884, pp. 426 f., 435, 443; H. L. Mansel, *Gnostic Heresies*, London, 1875, p. 125; J. A. W. Neander, *History of the Christian Religion and Church*, Eng. tr., 1831–41, ii. 18; E. B. Nicholson, *The Gospel according to the Hebrews*, London, 1879.

J. S. BANKS.

NAZARETH.—The 'city called Nazareth' (Mt 2^{23}), in which Jesus lived from childhood to manhood, lay in a beautiful valley of Southern Galilee, due west of the southern end of the Lake of Galilee, and about midway between that Lake and the Mediterranean. After the Gospels, it is expressly mentioned only in the phrase Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ, 'Jesus of Nazareth' (Ac 10^{38}), but an equivalent of this expression, Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος, also translated 'Jesus of Nazareth,' but lit. 'the Nazaræan,' or 'Nazarene,' is found six times in Acts; while the followers of Jesus are once called 'the Nazarenes' (οἱ Ναζωραῖοι, 24^5). The name 'Jesus of Nazareth' has various shades of meaning, according to the spirit in which it is uttered. On the Day of Pentecost St. Peter uses it with an amazed sense of the identity of the lowly Nazarene, who met a felon's death, with the glorious Being who, Risen and Exalted, has been made Lord and Christ (2^{22}; cf. 3^6 4^{10}). The accusers of Stephen refer with contemptuous anger to 'this Jesus the Nazarene' (6^{14}), whom the heretic would fain set above Moses. St. Paul recalls the time when his unenlightened conscience drove him to take active measures against 'Jesus the Nazarene,' a name which he used at that time with fierce scorn (26^9). But on the road to Damascus he learned its true meaning, when his question 'Who art thou, Lord?' was answered, 'I am Jesus the Nazarene' (22^8). The Galilæan town, valley, and hills were for ever graven on the Saviour's heart, and His own use of the familiar title made it doubly sacred. His followers could never object to be named 'the Nazarenes,' as they were, *e.g.*, by Tertullus (24^5), just as they could not but glory in being called 'the Christians' (11^{26}). While the former name was of Jewish origin, and came to be their standing designation among the unbelieving Jews, the latter was a Gentile coinage. 'The Nazarene' and 'the Nazarenes' correspond to the terms which are used in the Talmud—הַנּוֹצְרִי (*Sanh.* 43*a*, 107*b*; *Sot.* 47*a*) and הַנּוֹצְרִים (*Ta'ăn.* 27*b*); and to the present day the word *Nôṣrî* is habitually applied in Jewish literature to Jesus' followers, whom a strict orthodoxy can no more name 'Christians' than it can call their leader 'Christ.' The name 'Nazarenes' still designates the Christians in all Muslim lands.

It is a significant fact that Nazareth, which is so dear to Christendom, is never named in the OT, Josephus, or the Talmud. Though it was a city (πόλις, Mt 2^{23}), not a village (κώμη), it was a place without a history, and Nathanael of Cana—who may not have been quite free from the jealousy of neighbourhood—had great difficulty in imagining that it might produce the Messiah (Jn 1^{46}). But many things have been said, and uncritically repeated, about Nazareth, which are not well grounded on fact; *e.g.*, that Jesus lived for thirty years 'in the deep obscurity of a provincial village . . . not only in a despised province, but in its most disregarded valley' (F. W. Farrar, *The Life of Christ*, new ed., 1894, p. 41), and that 'probably public opinion looked upon the little town as morally degenerate' (Meyer on Jn 1^{47}). There is no reason to believe that the Nazarenes were less brave, less devoted to their country's cause, less zealous for the law, less inspired by Messianic hopes than the other Galilæans. And one of the hills that 'girdle quiet

Nazareth' was a perfect watch-tower, set in the midst of the Holy Land and the mighty Roman Empire, for the young Prophet who was to give the city so great a place in history. His feet climbed its summit easily and—as His love of hills would indicate—probably often; and while His eyes ranged over one of the fairest prospects on earth, He had 'ears to hear' the murmur of the world. If His youth was inwardly, it could scarcely be outwardly, peaceful. He loved solitude, and the words 'in secret' (ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ, Mt 6[4. 6]) were dear to Him; yet He was destined for society, and His early years were passed in no backwater, but in the full current of the events of His time. He was never far from the crowds, often (such were Roman oppression and Jewish sedition) the madding crowds of Galilee, and 'all the rumour of the Empire entered Palestine close to Nazareth' (G. A. Smith, *HGHL*, 1897, p. 434; cf. Selah Merrill, *Galilee in the Time of Christ*, 1885, p. 123 f.). All the time that His talent (if the word may here be used) was growing in stillness, His character was being formed in the stream of the world. Nazareth was in truth the best of all places for the education of the Messiah (cf. W. M. Ramsay, *The Education of Christ*^{2}, 1902).

Various etymologies of 'Nazareth' have been proposed. The idea that it means 'consecrated,' 'devoted to God' (from נָזַר, whence Nazirite), or that it denotes 'my Saviour' (נוֹצְרִי), may be dismissed at once. Equally improbable is the notion that it embodies a Messianic name, 'the Shoot,' or 'the Sprout' (נֵצֶר), which is found in Is 11[1]. The most likely suggestion is that it signifies 'Watch-tower' (from נֹצֶרֶת, Aram. נָצְרָה, נָצְרַת, a name which would be given first to the hill, and then to the town built on its flank.

Acting on a hint of Wellhausen's (*Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 1894, p. 222, footnote 3), T. K. Cheyne has tried to conjure 'the city of Nazareth' out of existence, leaving the sacred name as a mere synonym of 'Galilee' (*EBi* iii. 3358 f.), but his reasoning, as G. A. Barton remarks in *JE*, is 'in the highest degree precarious.'

LITERATURE.—A. P. Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*^{23}, 1912; V. Guérin, *Description géog. de la Palestine*, pt. iii.: 'Galilée,' 1880; F. Buhl, *GAP*, 1896; W. Sanday, *Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, 1903; K. Baedeker, *Palestine and Syria*, 1912, p. 246.

JAMES STRAHAN.

NAZIRITE.—A Nazirite (AV incorrectly 'Nazarite') was one dedicated to God and bound by a vow, the nature of which is explained below.

1. The name.—The primary significance of the Hebrew נָזַר *nāzar* (not used in Qal) is 'to separate.' Hence the נָזִיר *nāzîr* is 'the separated, consecrated, or devoted one.' The same word in the form *nᵉzîr* is found in Syriac, where it is used, *e.g.*, of maidens consecrated to the service of Belthis (see W. R. Smith, *RS*^{2}, p. 483). In Gn 49[26] *nāzîr* is applied to Joseph, 'him who was *separate* from his brethren.' In La 4[7] 'her Nazarites' (AV) probably means 'her nobles' (RV). Usually, however, the name *nāzîr* is to be understood in the technical sense of one separated by the taking, or imposition, of a peculiar vow. One of the marks of the Nazirite was his unshorn locks. Hence the word *nāzîr* was sometimes used in the general sense of 'untrimmed' or 'unshorn.' In Lv 25[5. 11] it is used of an undressed vine, and in Jer 7[29] it refers probably to unshorn hair, without implying the Nazirite vow.

2. The vow.—In Nu 6[1-21] we have the law of the Nazirite. He was bound (1) to abstain from the use of wine, strong drink, and all products of the vine 'from the kernels even to the husk' (vv.[3. 4]); (2) to 'let the locks of the hair of his head grow' unshorn (v.[5]); (3) to avoid contact with any dead body (vv.[6. 7]). From the instructions given to the mother of Samson (Jg 13[4]) some add, as a fourth mark of the Nazirite, abstinence from unclean food. But this was a precept for all Jews, and cannot be regarded as in any way a peculiar mark of the Nazirite. No doubt it may be said to follow from the third point above, that the Nazirite would be careful to guard against all ceremonial defilement.

If by mishap the Nazirite were defiled by contact with the dead, he had to go through a process of ceremonial cleansing, shaving his head and bringing a sin-offering, a burnt-offering, and a trespass-offering, and then begin the original period of his Naziriteship *de novo* (Nu 6[9-12]). From the same passage it is clear that both men and women might take the vow (v.[2]).

3. Development of Naziritism.—It does not lie within the scope of this article to set forth completely the probable rise and evolution of Naziritism, or to argue fully the various problems involved. The reader must consult *HDB* or *JE*. Here we simply indicate the most likely way along which Naziritism advanced till it became the complicated phenomenon it presents in the period with which we deal.

It is quite clear, and may be said to be generally admitted, that the legislation of Nu 6 does not create Naziritism, but regulates it. It is already in existence, with probably a long history behind it. Premising that its earliest history is quite unknown to us, we may say that it makes its first recorded appearance with Samson (Jg 13). He was a 'Nazirite unto God from the womb.' Now the only part of the regulations of Nu 6 that we can affirm with certainty to have been observed by Samson is that prohibiting the cutting of the hair. Quite certainly all the stress is laid on that in his history. His mother, indeed, is commanded to abstain from wine till he be born, but there is no evidence in the stories that there was anything of the ascetic about Samson himself. It is clear that the prohibition against contact with the dead could not have held for him (Jg 14[19]).

When we come to the time of Amos, we find that abstinence from wine is most emphasized. 'Ye gave the Nazirites wine to drink' (2[12]). It is quite clear that by this time abstinence from wine is essential to the Nazirite. Nu 6 gives equal emphasis to both points, and adds the requirement of ceremonial purity with reference to the dead.

Probably, then, we have three stages in the historical development of Naziritism, but we may take it that the mark of the Nazirite *par excellence* all through was the unshorn locks, as the use of *nāzîr* in Lv 25[5.11] seems to prove. The root idea of Naziritism is 'separated unto God,' and in the three prohibitions we have a triple expression of that separation. The first and second came to be merely conventional signs of Naziritism, but it is not difficult to conjecture what significance they had originally. During the period of his vow the Nazirite left his hair unshorn; at the close he burned it at the sanctuary as an offering. The custom of sacrificing the hair was widespread among many nations, the view doubtless being that part of the body may be sacrificed as representing the whole. The hair was unshorn during the vow because, being designed for sacrifice to God, it must be kept inviolate till the set time. Among the ancient Arabians there were several groups bearing a strong resemblance to the Hebrew Nazirites, and it was for purposes of war or blood-feud that they consecrated themselves. Quite probably the earliest type of Naziritism was of similar import. To be a hero against his people's enemies is the end of Samson's consecration.

In the ascetic abstinence from wine and the abhorrence of everything connected with the vine, we find probably the remnant of a protest on the part of those who regarded themselves as true Jews against the adoption by Israel of Canaanitish culture. In this the Rechabites were closely allied to the Nazirites. Though this protest had been long forgotten, the ascetic principle would persist in its own strength. The Nazirite, being specially consecrated to God, had a certain affinity with the priests, who were also specially consecrated. Hence it was natural that regulations against defilement, similar to those which applied to priests, should be imposed on Nazirites likewise. (For full discussion of all those points the reader is referred to *HDB* iii., art. 'Nazirite.')

4. Naziritism in the 1st cent. A.D.—By this time the law of the Nazirite had been minutely developed and expanded into a whole treatise in the Mishna. From the number and variety of the regulations we may infer that the taking of the vow was a very common occurrence. Men and women, both high and low in rank, became Nazirites. Berenice (Ac 25^{13}) took a vow (Josephus, *BJ* II. xv. 1). Queen Helena of Adiabene was a Nazirite for many years (*Nāzîr*, iii. 6), as was also Miriam of Palmyra. Women and slaves could take the vow, but only with the consent of their husbands or owners (*ib.* iv. 1–5). Fathers might dedicate minors, mothers were forbidden to do so (*ib.* iv. 29). If one saw a woman convicted of sin by the process of Nu 5^{11-31}, he was admonished to become a Nazirite, on the ground that the law of the Nazirite follows immediately in Nu 6.

The vow was taken for a variety of reasons, such as deliverance from or prevention of sickness (Josephus, *BJ* II. xv. 1), the fulfilment of a wish (*Nāzîr*, i. 7), or as a penance (*Nedārîm*, 9*b*). We may suppose that the same variety of reason as might induce a Catholic to undertake a pilgrimage—penance, discipline, thanksgiving, or the acquisition of merit—would lead the Jew to take a Nazirite vow.

The vow might be for a lifetime or any shorter period that the devotee might choose. In practice the shortest period was 30 days, and this was also the period in an indefinite vow (*Nāzîr*, i. 3). The vow might be taken outside Palestine, but, so long as the Temple stood, had to be ended in Palestine. The followers of Hillel maintained that though a vow might be observed outside the Holy Land, the whole period must be observed over again in Palestine. The school of Shammai held that it was necessary to observe only 30 days in Palestine.

A man became a Nazirite simply by declaring his intention or wish to become one (*ib.* i. 1), but there were many formulæ connected with the taking of the vow, some of which are not intelligible. It was not a valid vow to say 'Let my hand be *nāzîr*,' it was valid to say 'Let my liver be *nāzîr*'; but what was the meaning of saying either we cannot tell. The three restrictions of Nu 6 remained in force. If one said, however, 'Let me be a Nazirite on the day that Messiah appears,' one might drink wine on Sabbaths and feast days, since it was held Messiah would not appear on any of them (*'Erubîn*, 43*a*). A life-long Nazirite might cut his hair once a year, unless he were a Samson-Nazirite (*Nāzîr*, i. 4*a*). This permission followed from the recognition of Absalom as a Nazirite (2 S 14^{26}). The Nazirite was denied the use of a comb, but might dress his hair by other means (*Nāzîr*, i. 6). On the expiry of his vow the Nazirite had to offer sacrifices (Nu $6^{13ff.}$) at the Temple while it stood, and 'take the hair of the head of his separation, and put it on the fire which is under the sacrifice of peace offerings.' The necessary expenses were heavy, and it was considered a meritorious thing for the wealthy to defray the expenses of poor Nazirites. The technical term for this charity was 'having so many Nazirites shorn' (*Nāzîr*, ii. 5, 6). King Agrippa, 'coming to Jerusalem in much greater prosperity than he had before, . . . ordered that many of the Nazirites should have their heads shorn' (Josephus, *Ant.* XIX. vi. 1).

The destruction of the Temple was no doubt a fatal blow to Naziritism. It gradually disappeared in asceticism, and there is no trace of its survival beyond the early Christian centuries. (For a fuller account of Naziritism in Rabbinical literature see *JE* ix. 195 ff.)

5. Naziritism in the NT.—Nazirites are not definitely mentioned in the NT, and there is difference of opinion as to the number of indirect references.

(*a*) *Jesus.*—Jesus had no connexion with Naziritism technically considered. Yet the names Nazarene and Nazoræan applied to Him bear some resemblance to Nazirite. Late ecclesiastical writers like Eusebius, Tertullian, and Jerome show a tendency to confuse the three terms. And if *Nazir* were taken, not in its technical sense, but as meaning 'holy one' (it is actually so rendered twice in LXX, Jg 13^7 16^{17}), we can see how Jesus might popularly be called *Nazir*. By a play on words the people might say, 'Jesus—not *Nazarene* but *Nazir*.' (For a full discussion of this point see E. A. Abbott, 'Nazarene and Nazoræan,' in *Miscellanea Evangelica* I., Cambridge, 1913.)

(*b*) *John the Baptist.*—Some hold that the Baptist was a Nazirite, but there is not evidence sufficient to justify this. It cannot be accepted that he 'is described as a Nazirite for life (Lk 1^{15})' (*HDB* iii. 500). The only point in which it is predicted or enjoined that John shall resemble the Nazirites is his abstinence from wine, but there is no ground for believing that all who practised that self-denial were Nazirites. This verse describes him no more as a Nazirite than as an Essene, which some, as groundlessly, have held him to be.

(*c*) *James the Just.*—With full confidence we might recognize a life-long Nazirite in James 'the brother of the Lord,' if we could trust the description of him quoted from the *Commentaries* of Hegesippus, bk. v., in Eusebius, *HE* II. xxiii.: 'This Apostle was consecrated from his mother's womb. He drank neither wine nor strong drink, nor ate animal food. A razor never came upon his head.' But the succeeding incredible statement, 'he alone was allowed to enter the Holy of Holies,' and the improbable account of his martyrdom which follows, and contrasts unfavourably with the account given by Josephus (*Ant.* XX. ix. 1), cast doubt on the trustworthiness of the historian, who probably took his information in part from the Ebionitic *Ascents of James* (see *HDB* ii. 542).

(*d*) *Ac 18^{18}.*—This verse presents various difficulties. We may decide the grammatical difficulty by saying that, though the construction is ambiguous, it is St. Paul whose head was shorn at Cenchreæ, 'for he had a vow.' Was it a Nazirite vow? There is no inherent improbability in the thought that St. Paul should take a Nazirite vow, rather the reverse. As we have seen, the vow was a common thing among Jews, and we could easily conjecture plausible grounds for St. Paul's taking it, *e.g.* deliverance from danger at Corinth (Ac 18^{1-17}) or recovery from sickness, the 'thorn in the flesh' to which he was subject. But the supreme difficulty in holding that this was a Nazirite vow is that his head was shorn at Cenchreæ, not at Jerusalem, where alone a Nazirite vow could be completed. None of the various explanations that have been offered seems to be adequate. We have noted above that the Nazirite was permitted to cut his hair once a year, if his vow were for a lifetime. But this will hardly suit St. Paul's case. Again, he is on his way to keep a feast in Jerusalem (v.^{21}). Why he should have his head shorn in Cenchreæ when in a few weeks he would be in Jerusalem is a mystery, if his was a Nazirite vow. Nor does it meet the case to suggest that this shearing was to purify himself on account of his sojourn among the heathen. For, once again, why should he perform that in a heathen land and not wait till he was in Palestine? Some say that it was customary to shear one's locks at the beginning of a vow, and that St. Paul is not completing but beginning the period of his vow at Cenchreæ. Those who say so quote no authorities for their view, and for a good reason. There is not a particle of evidence anywhere that shearing the hair was a token that a vow was beginning. 'To shear the head' was a technical phrase meaning to complete a vow. Hence we must conclude that in all likelihood it was a private, not a Nazirite, vow that St. Paul completed at Cenchreæ (see *EGT*, *in loc.*; cf. A. C. McGiffert, *Hist. of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, Edinburgh, 1897, p. 274, n. 4).

(*e*) *Ac* 21^{23-26}.—In this passage it is quite clear that it was a Nazirite vow that the four men had on them, and we have explained above what is meant by St. Paul being at charges for them, that they might shave their heads, viz. that he should defray the rather high cost of the necessary offerings. What is meant by St. Paul's purifying himself with them (vv.$^{24.26}$)? The shortest period allowed for the duration of a Nazirite vow was 30 days (see above). An explanation like the following is very attractive: 'The law permitted a man to share the vow if he could find companions who had gone through the prescribed ceremonies and who permitted him to join their company. This permission was commonly granted if the new-comer paid all the fees required from the whole company . . ., and finished the vow along with the others' (T. M. Lindsay, *Acts of the Apostles*, Edinburgh, 1884, ii. 113; cf. J. I. Still, *The Early Gentile Christian Church*, Edinburgh, 1913, p. 125). Unfortunately, no authority is quoted in support of this view, nor have we been able to find any. (For a better suggestion, see *HDB* iii. 500.) No view is free from difficulty, but on the whole the suggestion of F. J. A. Hort is most satisfying, that St. Paul himself may have been about to offer sacrifices in connexion with a vow made previously, not necessarily a Nazirite vow (see *Judaistic Christianity*, Cambridge, 1894, p. 109 f.).

LITERATURE.—Artt. in *HDB*, *DCG*, *EBi*, *JE*, *PRE*^{3}, *s.v.*; S. R. Driver, *Cambridge Bible*, 'Joel and Amos,' Cambridge, 1897, p. 152 f.; R. J. Knowling, in *EGT*, 'Acts,' London, 1900, pp. 392 f., 449 f.; J. Grill, in *JPTh*, 1880, p. 645 ff.; G. B. Gray, in *JThSt* i. [1900] 201 ff.; W. R. Smith, *RS*^{2}, London, 1894, pp. 323 ff., 481 ff.; H. Ewald, *The Antiquities of Israel*, Eng. tr., London, 1876, pp. 84–88, 152, 281.

W. D. NIVEN.

NEAPOLIS (Νέα Πόλις).—Neapolis, 'the Naples of Macedonia' (Conybeare-Howson, *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, new ed., 1877, i. 339), was the port to which St. Paul, sailing from Troas in answer to the call of the man of Macedonia, directed his course, and he reached it after a quick passage—a straight run (*εὐθυδρομήσαμεν*, Ac 16^{11}) before a southerly breeze. Here he first set foot on European soil. Neapolis originally belonged to Thrace (Pliny, *HN* iv. 18), but it was now in the province of Macedonia (Strabo, vii. fr. 33; Ptolemy, iii. 13). Its name, 'New Town,' probably implies that it was an old town re-founded and supplied with a fresh colony. Strabo (vii. fr. 36) appears to identify it with Daton, which had 'fruitful plains, a port, streams, dockyards, and valuable gold mines, whence the proverb "A Daton of good things," like "Piles of Plenty."'

The growing importance of Neapolis kept pace with that of Philippi, ten miles inland, which it served as a seaport. During the last stand of the Republicans at Philippi, their galleys were moored off Neapolis (Appian, *de Bell. Civ.* iv. 106; Dio Cass. xlvii. 35). The ancient city is generally identified with the small Turkish village of Kavallo, which stands on a promontory overlooking a bay of the same name, opposite the island of Thasos. Here many Latin inscriptions have been found, and there are the remains of a great aqueduct.

LITERATURE.—See W. Smith, *DGRG* ii. [1868] 411; W. M. Leake, *Travels in Northern Greece*, 1836, iii. 180; W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, 1895, p. 205 ff.

JAMES STRAHAN.

NEIGHBOUR.—In the Hebrew of the OT the words rendered 'neighbour' have less reference to locality than the English word. In קָרוֹב, it is true, the etymological root is 'near,' but it occurs very rarely; in the slightly commoner עָמִית, with the much more usual רֵעַ, the thought is rather that of one's 'fellows' or 'friends.' The fairly frequent שָׁכֵן means 'inhabitant' (*sc.* of the same or some adjacent district), and is thus akin to קָרוֹב, but on the whole, in the words translated 'neighbour,' the idea of fellowship is much stronger than that of proximity, and in a number of passages, as a rendering of רֵעַ, 'fellow' or 'fellows' should perhaps be substituted. At the same time, '*fellow-man*' would be an exaggeration, for it would imply not only humanitarianism, which many of these passages contain, but universalism, which is too much to postulate. This is especially clear in the one passage (Lv 19^{18}) which is of crucial importance as being the source of the main current of NT teaching on the subject. There the injunction 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour (רֵעַ) as thyself' is parallel with 'Thou shalt not bear any grudge against the children of *thy people*.' If this racial limitation is kept in view, its abrogation in the parable of the Good Samaritan (Lk $10^{27ff.}$) becomes far more piquant, for it is precisely the interpretation of Lv 19^{18} which is there the point at issue. True, רֵעַ is rendered by the Greek *πλησίον* ('near'), which, if etymology were everything, would once more emphasize local limitations; but the whole trend of the passage clearly shows that *πλησίον*, in the mouth of Jesus, means any human being within reach of one's help, while for the lawyer it is still a racial term. The same verse from Leviticus is also quoted in Mt 19^{19} 22^{39}, Mk 12^{31}, Ro 13^{9}, Gal 5^{14}, Ja 2^{8}. In the first three of these, the quotation being made by Jesus, 'neighbour' is probably universalistic in accordance with Lk $10^{27ff.}$. In Mt 5^{43} it is laid down that 'enemies' may not be hated in contrast with 'neighbours.' Further, the attitude here enjoined implies, like Lk $10^{27ff.}$ and the Golden Rule (Mt 7^{12}, Lk 6^{31}), an enthusiastic and active, as well as universal, benevolence, as far removed from neglect as from hatred.

In the Gospels occur also *γείτων* and *περίοικος*, both of which mean 'neighbour' in the local sense.

πλησίον is never literal, *i.e.* local, but always ethicized; it varies, however, in the width of its application. In Ro 15^{2} and Eph 4^{25} the context probably favours the interpretation 'fellow-Christian,' in Ro $13^{9.10}$ 'fellow-man'; Gal 5^{14} and Ja 2^{8} are doubtful. Whether wider or less wide, it is always closely related to the thought of love.

The kind of conduct which a man is said to owe to his neighbour out of love comprises mainly the following: consideration for his scruples, tenderness for his weaknesses, the sacrifice of one's own pleasure to his, but with the object of building up his character (Ro 15); abstinence from gratification of lust or of quarrelsomeness at his expense (Gal 5); abstinence from 'respect of persons'—because of the disrespect inflicted by it on other persons (Ja 2)—and from censoriousness (4^{11-12}); the speaking and doing of the simple truth (Eph

$4^{15.25}$); and generally, the rendering to every man of his due (Ro 13).

LITERATURE.—J. R. Seeley, *Ecce Homo*^{11}, 1873, chs. xvii.–xxiv. (cf. especially ch. xviii. with Ro 15^2 and parallels). For the reconciliation of Christian love to one's neighbour with righteous and reasonable self-regard, see A. Plummer, *St. Matthew*, 1909, pp. 84–89, *ICC*, 'St. Luke^2,' 1898, p. 185 f.

C. H. WATKINS.

NEREUS (Νηρεύς, a Greek name, fairly common among slaves and freedmen, and found in inscriptions of the Imperial household).—Nereus is the third of a group of Christians, his sister (probably Nereis or Nerias by name) being the fourth, who with 'all the saints that are with them' are saluted by St. Paul in Ro 16^{15}. The first two names, Philologus and Julia (*qq.v.*) may be those of husband and wife. If so, Nereus and his sister and Olympas may have been their family, which formed the nucleus of a church which met under their leadership at their house in Rome or Ephesus. Cf. possibly the 'household of Stephanas' in Corinth, who were 'the firstfruits of Achaia' and who 'set themselves to minister unto the saints' (1 Co 16^{15}). The relationship is, however, purely conjectural, as nothing further is known of any of these persons. That they formed with the other unnamed persons a household or district (ἐκκλησία), of which they had been the nucleus and therefore became the leaders, is extremely probable, or the men may have been the heads of separate small communities. The name Nereus was that of a minor sea-god, father of the Nereids, and it is significant that a Christian should have had no scruple in retaining it. (Other names of heathen deities borne by Christians mentioned in Ro 16 are Hermes [v.^{14}], Phœbe, [v.^{1}].) The name is connected with legends of the early Roman Church (see Sanday-Headlam, *ICC*, 'Romans^5,' Edinburgh, 1902, p. 428).

T. B. ALLWORTHY.

NERO.—The future Emperor Nero received at birth, 15th December, 37, the names Lucius Domitius Ahenobarbus. His father was Gnæus Domitius Ahenobarbus (consul, A.D. 32), on the mother's side grandnephew of the Emperor Augustus, and his mother was Iulia Agrippina, daughter of Germanicus (died A.D. 59) and great-granddaughter of Augustus. Both were persons of ungovernable temper and immoral character, and from the first their son had little chance of leading a noble life. Gnæus died in the year 40 when his son was barely three years old, and Agrippina, possessed by limitless ambition, schemed soon after for a second marriage, with no less a person than the reigning Claudius himself (Emperor A.D. 41–54; see under CLAUDIUS), in spite of the fact that he was her uncle. Agrippina became the fourth wife of Claudius in A.D. 49, such marriages having been legalized by the Senate (Tac. *Ann.* xii. 5–6). She procured the recall of the philosopher Lucius Annæus Seneca and made him instructor of her son. At the same time he was betrothed to Claudius' daughter Octavia. In the year 50 Claudius adopted Domitius, who thus became Tiberius Claudius Drusus Germanicus Cæsar (according to another view, Lucius Claudius Nero). Next year the young man assumed the dress of manhood and was given the consulship. At the same time Afranius Burrus, his military instructor, was made prefect of the prætorian guards. In A.D. 53 the marriage with Octavia took place. Claudius' own son Britannicus (born 12th Feb. 41), who had been steadily pushed further and further into the background, happened to have to leave Rome through illness in the year 54. This gave Agrippina her opportunity, and with the help of two professional poisoners Claudius was put to death on 13th October. Nero Claudius Cæsar Augustus Germanicus, or, as he is later called, Imperator Nero Claudius Cæsar Augustus Germanicus, was saluted Imperator by the soldiers, and their acclamation was ratified by the Senate. Among his private relationships during his reign may be mentioned his passion for his Greek mistress Acte, his marriage in A.D. 62 with Poppæa Sabina, wife of M. Saluius Otho (one of his successors in the Empire), and the banishment and murder of his first wife Octavia at her instance. In A.D. 63 a daughter was born to Nero and Poppæa, but the child died shortly afterwards. His marriage with the male Pythagoras took place in A.D. 64, and in 65 the death of Poppæa. In 55 Nero had Britannicus poisoned and in 59 his mother was put to death by his order. She had committed every sin for his advancement, but had become intolerable. Nero died by his own hand or that of a slave on 9th June, 68, leaving no descendant behind him. With him the Cæsarian race, weakened by intermarriage, debauchery, and madness, came to an end.

A brief summary of the chief events of Nero's reign may now be given. It has become customary to repeat that his first five years were a model period of government. There was some difficulty in holding this view, considering what the historians have to tell us. But J. G. C. Anderson and F. Haverfield have recently pointed out (see under Literature) that this opinion, put into the mouth of the Emperor Trajan by the late compiler Aurelius Victor (*Liber de Cæsaribus*, ch. 5), does not refer to the first five years, does not perhaps refer to any specific five years, but if it does, refers rather to the last five years, and in any case touches only Nero's building operations. His reign is best divided into two periods—the first from 54 to 62, when the State was under the joint administration of Seneca and Burrus, and the second from 62 to 68, when it was under the Emperor's sole rule. Neither period was undistinguished for good, and indeed the machinery of government was so perfected by Augustus that the mad behaviour of an Emperor scandalized only the inhabitants of Rome, and had no effect on the provinces, in which the real life of the Roman Empire lay. The administration of Seneca and Burrus led to the strengthening of the power of the Senate. It also led to the overthrow of Agrippina's influence, which had been most powerful at the first. Nero's policy seems at first to have been one of *laissez faire.* He was very young and fond of pleasure, and gratified his tastes to the full. The historians are occupied with details of his doings, and tell us little about Italian or Roman affairs.

In the year 58 the Emperor proposed to establish 'free trade.' The object of this proposal was to relieve the people and to get rid of a method of taxation attended with much injustice. The producers and capitalists, on whom extra burdens would thus have been imposed, were able to strangle the scheme at birth. The Imperial purse, depleted through extravagance, was replenished by confiscation. About 61 or 62 began the depreciation of the gold and silver coinage, from which Rome never completely recovered. Nero also deprived the Senate of the right to issue copper coinage. This was a serious blow, as the exchange value of the copper always exceeded the value of the metal, and the Senate could thus coin credit-money to any amount. On 19th July, A.D. 64, the great fire in Rome broke out; it lasted for a week, and destroyed an immense area of property. The occasion was used to build broader streets and finer buildings. The reign of Nero is conspicuous for the lives of prominent Stoics, particularly Pætus Thrasea, men of courage and virtue among the noblest the world has ever seen. They stood for the old republican regime, and were particularly in evidence in the Senate. These, as well as rich men in no way connected with them, were victims of a policy of wholesale murder associated with the last six years or so of Nero's reign. It was not surprising that, while the generality of the Senate were paralyzed with terror, a powerful conspiracy should have arisen against the maniac on the throne. The leader chosen was C. Calpurnius Piso, and the plot had been brewing since 62. In 65 all the arrangements were complete, but at the eleventh hour the Emperor was informed, and Piso, Seneca the philosopher, Lucan, the author of the rhetorical epic *De Bello Civili* (often, but wrongly, called *Pharsalia*), and others, met their death. Nero's own fall was the result of the revolt of C. Iulius Vindex, governor of Gallia Lugudunensis, with whom Galba, the governor of Hispania Tarraconensis, allied himself. Vindex was defeated by Verginius Rufus, governor of Southern Germany, but Galba became Emperor.

External affairs during Nero's reign bulk more largely than internal. Two provinces were added to the Roman Empire—Pontus Polemoniacus in Northern Asia Minor, by the gift of Polemo, and the Alpes Cottiæ, on the death of Cottius (Suet. *Nero*, 18). But it was in the extreme east on the one hand, and the extreme west on the other, that the most important events took place—in Armenia and in Britain. Britain had been made a province in 43, but pacification was impossible without hard and exhausting warfare. Real progress was made under the governorship of Suetonius Paulinus, who in 61 captured Mona (Anglesey). There followed a great rising of the Iceni (under Boudicca) and the Trinouantes. Camalodunum (Colchester), the Roman *colonia*, was burnt, and Londinium and Verulamium (St. Albans) were captured by the insurgents. A great slaughter of the Romans and their allies was followed by the victory of Paulinus and the suicide of Boudicca.

The Eastern campaigns of Nero's reign are imperishably connected with Gnæus Domitius Corbulo, one of the greatest generals of the Roman Empire. There had been for some time a struggle between the Romans and the Parthians, their hereditary enemies, for the possession of Armenia. Rival pretenders to the throne of that country were supported, one by Rome, the other by Parthia. When Nero came to the throne, a Parthian prince, Tiridates, was ruling over Armenia. Corbulo's troops at first were insufficient and many of them were unfit for service. Much time was lost in training them and in parleying with Tiridates. Artaxata was captured in 58. The surrender of Tigranocerta resulted in the defeat of Tiridates and the establishment of a new king in 60, but circumstances led to an arrangement with Parthia by which Tiridates was permitted to return in the next year. This arrangement was not ratified by the home government, and Armenia had to be conquered again. The new governor of Cappadocia, Lucius Cæsennius Pætus, proved incompetent, and his army had to capitulate. Corbulo declined to interfere. Pætus was recalled, and Corbulo undertook the government of Cappadocia. The result was that Tiridates had to go to Rome and receive his crown from Nero as a suppliant (A.D. 66). Corbulo's success throughout seems to have been due in part to his skilful subordinate, Vettius Bolanus (Statius, *Siluæ*, v. ii. 31–47), but it did not prevent his suicide by Nero's command in Greece (A.D. 67). The severe discipline and hardship of these Oriental campaigns provide a contrast to the Imperial excesses at Rome. The spread of Christianity to Western Europe presents another.

The latter part of St. Paul's missionary activity coincides with Nero's reign. It was to Nero's tribunal that St. Paul appealed (Ac 25^{11}); it was also among the slaves and freedmen of his household that he found many of his fellow-Christians in Rome (Ph 4^{22}; cf. Ro 16). It was on a capital charge that St. Paul had been arraigned, and in such cases a Roman citizen could appeal from the court of a *procurator* to the Emperor himself. There are inconsistencies in the Acts narrative (cf. Mommsen's article mentioned below, pp. 92, 93 = p. 443) of the preliminaries, but we need have no doubt that St. Paul did as a matter of fact appear before the Emperor in Rome. Whether acquittal or condemnation was the result, and whether in the former case St. Paul had to stand a second trial, which resulted in condemnation, are questions which lie outside the scope of the present article. Whatever be the truth in this matter, there is a consensus of opinion that Nero was the first Emperor to persecute the Christians. The Church always believed this (cf. Ambrosiaster, writing in Rome about 375, *in 2 Thess.* 2^7: 'mysterium iniquitatis a Nerone coeptum est, qui zelo idolorum et apostolos interfecit,' etc.), and, according to a very early interpretation of the number of the Beast in the Apocalypse (13^{18}), Neron Ḳesar is there referred to (confirmed by a Western variant, 616, which means the Latin form Nero, as against the Greek form Neron, 666–616 being = 50, represented in Greek by ν [*n*]). The narrative of Tacitus (*Ann.* xv. 44) connects the evil treatment of the Christians with the great fire of the year 64. The Emperor's behaviour on that occasion was in many ways to be commended, but the story that he sat on the roof of his palace playing the harp during the conflagration (add Augustine, *Sermons*, ccxcvi. 7, to the authorities usually quoted) makes the narrative of the horrible death of the Christians, condemned for incendiarism, quite credible. The first Christians met their death in Rome as scapegoats, not because it was illegal to be a Christian. That stage is later; how much later is debated.

Some summing up of Nero's character may be attempted, though it seems hardly fair to judge a man who was only thirty-one at his death, and was undoubtedly afflicted with madness. There is perhaps less good that can be said of him than of any other Roman Emperor. That he was prodigal and licentious to an astounding degree cannot be denied. All the savings of the Emperor Claudius were dispersed by his wastefulness, as were those of Tiberius by his successor Gaius (Caligula). It may also be truly said that he had no conception of the Imperial dignity. He had much of the mountebank about him, and his musical and other performances on the public stage made him ridiculous. He was childish enough to enter into poetic rivalry with his subject Lucan. Though lazy by contrast with his class in governmental duty, he might have attained some eminence in the arts, and in these only, under other circumstances.

LITERATURE.—The chief ancient authorities are Tacitus, *Ab Excessu Diui Augusti*, bks. xiii.–xvi.; Suetonius, *Life of Nero*. The best modern book is B. W. Henderson, *The Life and Principate of the Emperor Nero*, London, 1903 (particularly good on Corbulo's campaigns); J. B. Bury, *A History of the Roman Empire*, do., 1893, chs. xvi., xvii., xviii. On the *quinquennium Neronis*, see the epoch-making art. 'Trajan on the Quinquennium Neronis,' by J. G. C. Anderson (with note by F. Haverfield), in *JRS* i. [1911] 173–179. On the Neronian household, see J. B. Lightfoot's excursus in the *Epistle to the Philippians*^{4}, London, 1878; on St. Paul's legal position under Nero, see Mommsen's art. 'Die Rechtsverhältnisse des Apostels Paulus,' in *ZNTW* ii. [1901] 81–96 = *Gesammelte Schriften*, iii. [Berlin, 1907] 431–446; on Nero as persecutor of Christians, cf. C. F. Arnold, *Die Neronische Christenverfolgung*, Leipzig, 1888; W. M. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*^{3}, London, 1894, ch. xi.; E. G. Hardy, *Studies in Roman History*, do., 1906, ch. iv.; on Nero and Lucan, W. B. Anderson, in *Queen's Quarterly*, xiv. [1906–07] 196–214.

A. SOUTER.

NERVA.—M. Cocceius Nerva, who on being chosen Emperor was henceforth known as Imperator Nerva Cæsar (sometimes Cæsar Nerva)

Augustus, son of M. Cocceius Nerva, a jurisconsult, and Sergia Plautilla, was born at Narnia on the Via Flaminia in Southern Umbria on 8th November, probably in A.D. 35. He was elected prætor for the year 66. He gained favour with the Emperor Nero by his interest in poetry and his help in the detection of the Pisonian conspiracy. After election to various priesthoods he attained the consulship (with the Emperor Vespasian) in the year 71 (for the second time in 90 with the Emperor Domitian). Under the Emperor Domitian he was falsely charged by astrologers with being in possession of the Emperor's horoscope, and was banished, it is said, to Tarentum.

On the murder of Domitian on 18th September, 96, he was, at the instance of Petronius Secundus, prefect of the prætorian guard, and Parthenius, the murderer of Domitian, elected Emperor, though over sixty years of age. He held the consulship for the third time in 97, for the fourth in 98. In the autumn of 97 he adopted M. Ulpius Traianus. He died in his sixty-third year (25th [or 27th] Jan. 98), having ruled for sixteen months and ten days.

His reign was auspicious, though short. Anyone would have been welcome after the reign of terror under Domitian, and the Senate gave him a hearty reception. Some of the informers of Domitian's reign were put to death, but in general a policy of clemency was followed, and some of the leading partisans of Domitian continued to enjoy places of honour. Many who had been unjustly banished under the Domitianic regime were recalled, amongst them the well-known rhetorician, Dio Cocceianus of Prusa, best known to us as Dio Chrysostom. It is highly probable also that the apostle John was automatically released from confinement in Patmos, as the death of Domitian of necessity constituted his *acta* null and void (Eus. *HE* III. xx. 8; cf. W. M. Ramsay, *The First Christian Century*, London, 1911, p. 45). Nerva also recalled to public service worthy men who had been driven into retirement by the policy of Domitian. His task at home was nevertheless one of very great difficulty, and he was wisely guided in adopting Trajan (*q.v.*). There was also external trouble—a war with Germany. Our reports are difficult to reconcile and to understand, but at any rate both Nerva and Trajan received the honorary title Germanicus about the end of the year 97.

Nerva depended for support upon the Senate, and took an oath to put no senator to death. He had to replenish the exchequer, which had been much depleted by the folly of Domitian, and he proved a master of finance, not shrinking from great personal sacrifices in his efforts to right the situation. He appointed a commission of five men, *minuendis publicis sumptibus*, and was able to remit a good deal of taxation. Most remarkable of all his achievements from the modern point of view was his alimentary foundation, which there is reason to believe was the perpetuation of a scheme inaugurated by Domitian. In most of the Italian towns he provided contributions from the privy purse for the education of the children of freeborn parents of slender means. The money for this special purpose seems to have been derived from land. The Emperor's plan was followed not only by his successors, but also by private persons like the younger Pliny. Nerva also had an agrarian law passed to relieve agriculture, and carried out a land-purchase scheme which enabled the poor to obtain small-holdings. Further, he established *coloniæ* in various parts of the Empire, and conferred advantages, both material and political, on a number of towns, particularly in the Greek East (*e.g.* Berœa). Like all the Emperors, he had the food problem of Rome to cope with, and in this he was successful. Other wise and beneficent legal provisions are attributed to him.

Though careful of expenditure, he did not neglect building, and the *Forum Nervæ* (or *Forum Transitorium*) in Rome attests his activity in this direction. Part of the Temple of Minerva in it still stands *in situ*. Considerable improvement and development of roads and aqueducts both in Italy and in the provinces are also associated with this principate. Nerva died a natural death at Rome, the result of old age and illness. The burial in the Mausoleum of Augustus was superintended by Trajan, and Nerva was deified by the Senate. His reign began a new era of liberty and good government, which lasted for about eighty years.

LITERATURE.—Xiphilinus (*Epitome of Dio Cassius*, lxvii. 15–lxviii. 3), Aurelius Victor (*Epitome de Cæsaribus*), Pliny the Younger (*Letters* and *Panegyric of Trajan*), Philostratus (*Apollonius of Tyana*), Dio Chrysostom (*Orations*), Frontinus (*De Aquis Urbis Romæ*) are the chief ancient authorities. Of modern authorities, the Histories of the Roman Empire should be consulted, also E. Klebs, *Prosopographia Imperii Romani*, sæc. i., ii., iii., pars i. [Berlin, 1897], no. 974, p. 429 f., and Stein in Pauly-Wissowa, iv. 133–154.

A. SOUTER.

NEW JERUSALEM.—1. References.—(*a*) *In canonical writings.*—In the NT the name 'New Jerusalem' occurs only twice, and these references are both in the Apocalypse of John, viz. Rev 3^{12}: 'He that overcometh . . . I will write upon him . . . the name of the city of my God, the new Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God'; 21^{2}: 'And I saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God' (cf. v.^{10}). But other phrases with the same reference occur elsewhere in the NT, as Gal 4^{26}: 'But the Jerusalem that is above is free'; and He 12^{22}: 'But ye are come . . . unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem.' It is a city of heavenly origin and full of fresh life, the metropolis of the new earth (cf. Rev 21^{1}). This hope of a new order of things (cf. Mt 19^{28}, 2 P 3^{13}), with Jerusalem as the centre, is not confined to the NT; it occurs also in the OT, *e.g.* in Is 65^{17}: 'For, behold, I create new heavens and a new earth: and the former things shall not be remembered, nor come into mind,' and in Is 66^{22}: 'For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain.' But the metropolis that appears in Isaiah is not the New Jerusalem; it is the old city as before, only purified and blessed by God in a special manner. The basis of the new conception within the OT is found in such passages as Ezk 40^{2}: 'In the visions of God brought he me into the land of Israel, and set me down upon a very high mountain, whereon was as it were the frame of a city on the south,' with the whole description of the city in the following chapters (40–48); Is $54^{11\text{ff.}}$: 'O thou afflicted, tossed with tempest, and not comforted, behold, I will set thy stones in fair colours and lay thy foundations with sapphires'; $60^{10\text{ff.}}$: 'And strangers shall build up thy walls, and their kings shall minister unto thee: for in my wrath I smote thee, but in my favour have I had mercy on thee'; Hag 2^{7-9}: 'I will fill this house with glory. . . . The latter glory of this house shall be greater than the former, saith the Lord of hosts'; Zec $2^{4\text{f.}}$ (EV): 'Jerusalem shall be inhabited as villages without walls. . . . For I, saith the Lord, will be unto her a wall of fire round about, and I will be the glory in the midst of her.'

(*b*) *In non-canonical writings.*—Jewish writings, mainly apocalyptic, fill up the gulf between the Old and New Testaments with regard to the new city and the conception underlying it. The new order of things appears in *1 En.* xlv. 4, 5: 'And I will transform the heaven and make it an eternal blessing and light: and I will transform the earth and make it a blessing'; lxxii. 1: 'till the new creation is accomplished which dureth till eternity'; xci. 16: 'And the first heaven shall depart and pass away, and a new heaven shall appear, and all the powers of the heavens shall give sevenfold light.' In the *Book of Jubilees* the new creation is mentioned; cf. i. 29: 'And the angel of the presence who went before the camp of Israel took the tables of the divisions of the years . . . from the day of the [new] creation when the heavens and the earth shall be renewed and all their creation according to the powers of the heaven, . . . until the sanctuary of the Lord shall be made in Jerusalem on Mount Zion.' There is the same implication in *2 En.* (*Slavonic Enoch*) lxv. 6 ff.: 'When all creation visible and invisible, as the Lord created it, shall end, then every man goes to the great judgement, and then all time shall perish, . . . they (*i.e.* the righteous) will live eternally. . . . And they shall have a great indestructible wall, and a paradise bright and incorruptible, for all corruptible things shall pass away, and there will be eternal life.' Again the renewal of creation appears in *2 Bar.* (*Apoc. Bar.*) xxxii. 6: 'For there will be a greater trial than these two tribulations when the Mighty One will renew His creation'; and in *4 Ezr.* vii. 75: 'Thou shalt renew the creation.' The hope of an ideal city, too, finds frequent mention in Jewish literature, *e.g.* in *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Dan, v. 12): 'And, in the New Jerusalem shall the righteous rejoice, and it shall be unto the glory of God for ever'; this is the earliest occurrence of the expression 'New Jerusalem,' but here it simply implies the rebuilding of the old city. The idea emerges fully for the first time in *1 En.* xc. 28, 29, where the pre-existence of the New Jerusalem is implied though not specifically assigned to the new house brought and set up by God Himself: 'They folded up that old house. . . . And I saw till the Lord of the sheep brought a new house greater and loftier than that first, and set it up in the place of the first which had been folded up: all its pillars were new, and its ornaments were new and larger than those of the first, the old one which He had taken away, and all the sheep were within it' (cf. liii. 6). The heavenly Jerusalem in *4 Ezra* is described as 'the city that now is invisible' (vii. 26), 'a City builded' (viii. 52, x. 27), 'the [heavenly] pattern of her [the earthly city]' (x. 49); its descent from heaven is mentioned in xiii. 36: 'And Sion shall come and shall be made manifest to all men, prepared and builded, even as thou didst see the mountain cut out without hands,' while its preservation in heaven is referred to in *2 Bar.* iv. 2–7: 'This building now built in your midst is not that which is revealed with Me, that which was prepared beforehand here from the time when I took counsel to make Paradise, and showed it to Adam before he sinned, but when he transgressed the commandment it was removed from him, as also Paradise. And after these things I showed it to My servant Abraham by night among the portions of the victims. And again also I showed it to Moses on Mount Sinai when I showed to him the likeness of the tabernacle and all its vessels. And now, behold, it is preserved with Me, as also Paradise.' The idea of the new city as simply a purification of the old appears in *1 En.* x. 16–19: 'Destroy all wrong from the face of the earth. . . . And then shall all the righteous escape, and shall live till they beget thousands of children, and all the days of their youth and their old age shall they complete in peace. And then shall the whole earth be tilled in righteousness, and shall all be planted with trees and be full of blessing'; also in xxv. 1–6: 'This high mountain which thou hast seen, whose summit is like the throne of God, is His throne, where the Holy Great One, the Lord of Glory, the Eternal King, will sit, when He shall come down to visit the earth with goodness. And as for this fragrant tree . . . it shall be transplanted to the holy place, to the temple of the Lord, the Eternal King. Then shall they rejoice with joy and be glad, and into the holy place shall they enter; and its fragrance shall be in their bones, and they shall live a long life on earth, such as thy fathers lived'; and again in *Pss.-Sol.* xvii. 25, 33: 'And that he may purge Jerusalem from nations that trample (her) down to destruction'; 'and he shall purge Jerusalem, making it holy as of old.' Tobit mentions the ideal city in $13^{16.\ 17}$: 'For Jerusalem shall be builded with sapphires and emeralds and precious stones; thy walls and towers and battlements with pure gold. And the streets of Jerusalem shall be paved with beryl and carbuncle and stones of Ophir.'

2. Rise and development of the conception.—The Jews at first had no thought of any change in the present order of things: 'One generation goeth, and another generation cometh; and the earth abideth for ever' (Ec 1^{4}); 'Who laid the foundations of the earth, that it should not be moved for ever' (Ps 104^{5}); 'The world also is stablished, that it cannot be moved' (93^{1} 96^{10}); 'He hath also stablished them [the heavens] for ever and ever' (148^{6}). The heavens and the earth formed an established order of things that would be eternal in duration. According to the prophetic teaching, the scene of the Messianic Kingdom was to be the present earth, and that Kingdom was to last for ever; cf. Is $1^{25\text{f.}}$: 'And I will . . . throughly purge away thy dross, and will take away all thy tin: and I will restore thy judges as at the first, and thy counsellors as at the beginning: afterward thou shalt be called The city of righteousness, the faithful city'; Zeph $3^{12\text{f.}}$: 'But I will leave in the midst of thee an afflicted and poor people, and they shall trust in the name of the Lord. The remnant of Israel shall not do iniquity, nor speak lies . . . for they shall feed and lie down, and none shall make them afraid'; Jer $23^{5\text{f.}}$: 'Behold . . . I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and he shall reign as king and deal wisely. . . . In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely; 12^{15}: 'After that I have plucked them [the hostile nations] up, I will return and have compassion on them; and I will bring them again, every man to his heritage, and every man to his land'; Ezk $37^{26\text{f.}}$: 'I will place them [Israel], and multiply them, and will set my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore. My tabernacle also shall be with them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.' Is $2^{2\text{f.}}$ (=Mic $4^{1\text{f.}}$): 'The mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it . . . for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.' The advent of the Kingdom at first was to synchronize with the return from exile, but with that event the hopes of the people were not fulfilled. Haggai and Zechariah expected, however, that whenever the Temple was rebuilt, the Messianic Kingdom would be ushered in (cf. Hag $2^{7\text{-}9}$, Zec $2^{1\text{-}5}$). With Joel, who introduces us into the apocalyptic atmosphere, we find the same conception, as in the Prophets, of the eternity of the Messianic Kingdom with Jerusalem as its centre: 'So shall ye know that I am the Lord your God, dwelling in Zion my holy mountain: then shall Jerusalem be holy, and there shall no strangers pass through her any more. . . . But Judah shall abide for ever, and Jerusalem from generation to generation' ($3^{17.\ 18.\ 20}$). But this conception gradually underwent a change that can already be traced in two late passages of the OT, viz. Is 65^{17} 66^{22}, where the scene of the Messianic Kingdom is no longer this present world but a new heaven and a new earth. Jerusalem will be transformed as the metropolis of the new earth, but not yet created anew as the New Jerusalem: 'For, behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy. And I will rejoice in Jerusalem, and joy in my people: and the voice of weeping shall be no more heard in her, nor the voice of crying. There shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days: for the child shall die an hundred years old, and the sinner being an hundred years old shall be accursed. And they shall build houses, and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards, and eat the fruit of them. . . . The wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and the lion shall eat straw like the ox: and dust shall be the serpent's meat. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, saith the Lord' (65^{18b-25}). The two late passages above imply a gradual transformation of the world—moral and physical—an idea which probably betrays Persian influence (cf. T. K. Cheyne, *Origin of the Psalter* [*BL*, 1889], London, 1891, p. 405). The same idea is perhaps present also in Is 51^{16}: 'And I have put my words in thy mouth, and have covered thee in the shadow of mine hand, that I may plant the heavens, and lay the foundations of the earth, and say unto Zion, Thou art my people,' but if so, it is a foreign element adopted in eclectic fashion from Zoroastrianism (cf. B. Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaia* [=Nowack's *Handkommentar zum AT*, iii.], Göttingen, 1892, p. 359). Nowhere else in the OT is the Messianic Kingdom conceived of otherwise than as eternal on this present earth. The change is, however, prepared for in certain post-Exilic passages, *e.g.* poetically in Is 51^{6}: 'Lift up your eyes to the heavens, and look upon the earth beneath: for the heavens shall vanish away like smoke, and the earth shall wax old like a garment, and they that dwell therein shall die in like manner: but my salvation shall be for ever, and my righteousness shall not be abolished'; also in $34^{3f.}$: 'Their slain also shall be cast out, and the mountains shall be melted with their blood. And all the host of heaven shall be dissolved, and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll: and all their host shall fade away, as the leaf fadeth from off the vine, and as a fading leaf from the fig tree'; and finally in Ps $102^{25f.}$, which, however, may simply be a reflexion of the new conception from the Maccabæan age (cf. C. A. Briggs, *ICC*, 'Psalms,' Edinburgh, 1907, *ad loc.*): 'Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou shalt endure: yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment; as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed.'

Outside the OT in the apocalyptic literature we have to look for the further progress of this conception. The gradual moral and physical transformation of the world that we have noticed as an adopted feature in Isaiah appears again, during the 2nd cent. B.C., in *Jub.* i. 29 (above); also in iv. 26: 'and Mount Zion (which) will be sanctified in the new creation for a sanctification of the earth; through it will the earth be sanctified from all (its) guilt and its uncleanness throughout the generations of the world'; 'And the days shall begin to grow many and increase amongst those children of men till their days draw nigh to one thousand years, and to a greater number of years than (before) was the number of the days' (xxiii. 27); and once more in *Test. Levi*, xviii. 9: 'In his [the Messiah's] priesthood shall sin come to an end, and the lawless shall cease to do evil.' It was during the stern days of the Maccabees that the change began to make itself felt with regard to the inappropriateness of the present world as the scene of the future Kingdom. The first trace of it meets us in *1 En.* lxxxiii.–xc., which Charles dates before 161 B.C. (cf. R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, Oxford, 1912, Introd., p. lii). Here the centre of the Kingdom is no longer the earthly Jerusalem, but the New Jerusalem brought down from heaven (cf. *1 En.* xc. 28, 29, *supra*). A purified city is not enough; a new and heavenly city must take the place of the old and earthly city as the metropolis of the world-wide Messianic Kingdom. It is to be noted that this portion of the *Book of Enoch* is dated very shortly after the Book of Daniel and not long after *1 Enoch* vi.–xxxvi., in neither of which does the New Jerusalem yet appear. The implication in the new idea, however, was not logically carried out until during the 1st cent. B.C. There is mention in *1 En.* xci. 16 of a new heaven but not of a new earth, but it is in *1 En.* xxxvii.–lxxi. (94–64 B.C.) that we have for the first time the conception of a new heaven and a new earth consistently set forth. In *1 En.* xlv. 4, 5 the idea is accepted in its entire significance implying the immortal blessedness of man: 'And I will cause Mine elect ones to dwell upon it: but the sinners and evil-doers shall not set foot thereon' (cf. Is 65^{20}, where rather illogically the wicked still live on the new earth). The author of the Parables (*i.e.* *1 En.* xxxvii.–lxxi.) stands apart from his contemporaries in this new conception of the scene of the Messianic Kingdom and also apart from the writers of the 1st cent. A.D., with regard to the duration of the Kingdom; for while most other writers left behind the OT idea of an everlasting Kingdom and expected only a temporary one on the present earth, he holds to the eternal duration of the Kingdom, contributing the new and fruitful conception of a new heaven and a new earth as the scene of it. It is here, therefore, in the apocalyptic literature that we find the immediate source of the Christian hope of a new heaven and a new earth which meets us in the NT. During the first seven decades of the 1st cent. A.D., *i.e.* up to the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, the prevalent thought was that of a temporary Messianic Kingdom with the earth as its scene, described sometimes in a very materialistic fashion, as in *2 Bar.* xxix. 5: 'The earth also shall yield its fruit ten thousandfold and on each vine there shall be a thousand branches, and each branch will produce a thousand clusters, and each cluster will produce a thousand grapes, and each grape will produce a cor of wine.' The spiritual change too in the members of the Kingdom seems to be wrought in a mechanical fashion, for sin disappears suddenly rather by Divine fiat than by any gradual process, in striking contrast to what we saw in *Jubilees*, Isaiah, and *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.* The duration of the temporary Kingdom appears in *4 Ezr.* vii. 28, 29 as 400 years, but in *2 En.* xxxii., xxxiii. as 1,000 years, to which the Christian view of the Millennium owes its origin. Even the thought of a temporary Messianic Kingdom is at times given up, especially after the destruction of Jerusalem, for the present earth is wholly unfit for the advent of the Messiah; a renewal of the world is felt to be necessary—a renewal that will be everlasting and incorruptible (cf. *4 Ezr.* vii. 75). It is in these last decades of the 1st cent. A.D., after the earthly Jerusalem has gone, that the thought of the New Jerusalem reappears as the centre of the renewed world to which all hopes are turned, and here we encounter the writings of the NT, which contain that sublimest of descriptions of the New Jerusalem in the

Christian Apocalypse. The conception of the Millennium, or the reign of Christ for a thousand years on the present earth, with Jerusalem as the metropolis of this temporary Kingdom, occurs only in the Apocalypse (cf. Rev 20^{4-6}), no place being found for it elsewhere in the NT. It is a conception with an exclusively Jewish basis, but one that opens the way for the idea of a new era of blessedness, not on the present earth but in a renewed world; at the close of the Millennium the present order of things passes away—'And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat upon it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them' (Rev 20^{11}); 'And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth are passed away' (21^{1}). This is the scene of the final consummation, and the centre of it is no more the earthly Jerusalem or a purified Jerusalem, but the New Jerusalem that comes down from heaven—from God Himself (v.^{2}). It is the same city that the author of Hebrews, writing some time before the author of the Apocalypse, has in mind when he refers to Abraham, who 'looked for the city which hath the foundations, whose builder and maker is God' (He 11^{10}); it is 'the heavenly Jerusalem' (12^{22}), the centre of that Kingdom 'that cannot be shaken,' for 'yet once more will I make to tremble not the earth only, but also the heaven. And this word, Yet once more, signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things that have been made, that those things which are not shaken may remain' (12^{26-28}). Even earlier in the century St. Paul has the same thought, not yet, however, developed, of the new city, 'the Jerusalem that is above' (Gal 4^{26}), and the same idea is present when he says, 'Our citizenship is in heaven' (Ph 3^{20}).

3. The description of the New Jerusalem (Rev 21^{9}–22^{5}).—The details of this sublime description are typically Jewish, but the thought is pre-eminently Christian. The earthly Jerusalem had been in ruins for a quarter of a century, Hadrian's new city was not yet in existence, and the Christian Seer had no thought of the possibility of rebuilding the old. The new city must come down from heaven to be a fitting abode for Christ and the saints. The Seer represents himself as being shown 'the holy city' from a high mountain by one of the seven angels ($21^{9.\,10}$). 'Her light was like unto a jasper stone, clear as crystal: having a wall great and high; having twelve gates, and at the gates twelve angels; and names written thereon, which are the names of the twelve tribes of the children of Israel: on the east were three gates; and on the north three gates; and on the south three gates; and on the west three gates. And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and on them twelve names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb' (vv.$^{11-14}$). As in Ezekiel's city, the twelve gates of the New Jerusalem bear the names of the twelve tribes—three names on each side of its foursquare order (cf. Ezk 48^{30-35}). But besides these, there appear twelve other names on the city wall; between each pair of gateways above the surface of the rock is a foundation stone, and each stone bears the name of an apostle. The same connexion of the twelve tribes and the twelve apostles appears in Mt 19^{28}, where Jesus says of His disciples: 'in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.' St. Paul has a similar thought when speaking of the Ephesians: 'Ye are fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner stone' (Eph $2^{19.\,20}$). The heavenly city is measured by the angel with a golden measuring rod (Rev 21^{15}). 'And the city lieth foursquare, and the length thereof is as great as the breadth: and he measured the city with the reed, twelve thousand furlongs: the length and the breadth and the height thereof are equal. And he measured the wall thereof, a hundred and forty and four cubits, according to the measure of a man, that is, of an angel' (v.$^{16f.}$). Moffatt translates: 'he measured fifteen hundred miles with his rod for the City, for its breadth and length and height alike; he made the measure of the wall seventy-two yards, by human, that is, by angelic reckoning' (*The New Testament: A New Translation*, London, 1913). It is a huge cube, as high as it is broad and long, like the Holy of Holies in Solomon's Temple (cf. 1 K 6^{20}), only the measurements are hyperbolical. The wall is out of all proportion to the height of the city, but both heights, it ought to be noted, are multiples of twelve, the number of the tribes and of the apostles.

Rev 21^{18-21}: 'And the building of the wall thereof was jasper: and the city was pure gold, like unto pure glass. The foundations of the wall of the city were adorned with all manner of precious stones. The first foundation was jasper; the second, sapphire; the third, chalcedony; the fourth, emerald; the fifth, sardonyx; the sixth, sardius; the seventh, chrysolite; the eighth, beryl; the ninth, topaz; the tenth, chrysoprase; the eleventh, jacinth; the twelfth, amethyst. And the twelve gates were twelve pearls; each one of the several gates was of one pearl: and the street of the city was pure gold, as it were transparent glass' (cf. also Is $54^{11f.}$ and To $13^{16f.}$). Similar lists occur in Ezk 28^{13} of the precious stones with which the king of Tyre was covered, and in Ex 28^{17-20} 39^{10-13} of the gems set in the breastplate of the high priest; the latter are reproduced in the Apocalypse evidently from memory, as the lists do not completely coincide. What was exclusively for the high priest's breastplate is now for the whole city of the New Jerusalem—the foundation stones with the names of the apostles are brilliant with all manner of sparkling gems, and each gate consists of a single monster pearl.

Rev $21^{22f.}$: 'And I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God the Almighty, and the Lamb, are the temple thereof. And the city hath no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine upon it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the lamp thereof is the Lamb.' The actual presence of God and the Christ in the City forms the sanctuary; similarly in 2 Co 6^{16} St. Paul says: 'we are a temple of the living God; even as God said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people'; only what St. Paul says of individuals the Seer says of the ideal city as a whole. No need in such a place for any created light, since the Divine presence is there illuminating all; its sun is the glory of the Father, and its lamp the glorified Son. There is here a fulfilment of the ideal in Is $60^{19f.}$: 'The sun shall be no more thy light by day; neither for brightness shall the moon give light unto thee: but the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God thy glory. . . .'

Rev 21^{24-27}: 'And the nations shall walk amidst the light thereof; and the kings of the earth do bring their glory into it. And the gates thereof shall in no wise be shut by day (for there shall be no night there): and they shall bring the glory and the honour of the nations into it: and there shall in no wise enter into it anything unclean, or he that maketh an abomination and a lie: but only they which are written in the Lamb's book of life.' The traits are all found in Isaiah: 'And nations shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising' (60^3); 'Thy gates also shall be open continually; they shall not be shut day nor night; that men may bring unto thee the wealth of the nations, and their kings led with them' (v.^{11}); 'henceforth there shall no more come into thee the uncircumcised and the unclean' (52^1).

The description closes in Rev 22^{1-5}: v.$^{1f.}$: 'And he shewed me a river of water of life, bright as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb, in the midst of the street thereof. And on this side of the river and on that was the tree of life, bearing twelve manner of fruits, yielding its fruit every month: and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations.' The old Jerusalem had been in a waterless region, but already Ezekiel saw 'waters' issuing out 'from under the threshold of the house eastward,' and falling into the Kedron valley, and finally making their way to the Dead Sea (cf. Ezk 47^{1-12}); and in Zec 14^8 there is the expectation that, when the day of the Lord cometh, 'living waters shall go out from Jerusalem; half of them toward the eastern sea, and half of them toward the western sea: in summer and in winter shall it be.' In the New Jerusalem the source of the river is in the throne of God and the Lamb, and on its banks is the tree of life, the generic singular here going back to Gn 2^9, though the representation has its origin in Ezk 47^{12}: 'And by the river upon the bank thereof, on this side and on that side, shall grow every tree for meat, whose leaf shall not wither, neither shall the fruit thereof fail: it shall bring forth new fruit every month, because the waters thereof issue out of the sanctuary: and the fruit thereof shall be for meat, and the leaf thereof for healing.' A fragrant tree is mentioned in *Enoch*, xxv. 4 f., which 'no mortal is permitted to touch till the great judgement, when he shall take vengeance on all and bring (everything) to its consummation for ever. It shall then be given to the righteous and holy. Its fruit shall be for food to the elect: it shall be transplanted to the holy place, to the temple of the Lord, the Eternal King.' For the Christian Seer, the river flows through the heavenly city and the leaves of the trees on its banks serve to heal the nations.

Vv.$^{3-5}$: 'And there shall be no curse any more: and the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be therein: and his servants shall do him service; and they shall see his face; and his name shall be on their foreheads. And there shall be night no more; and they need no light of lamp, neither light of sun; for the Lord God shall give them light: and they shall reign for ever and ever.' The throne of God and of the Lamb takes the place of the Temple; there is nothing needed to symbolize the Divine Presence in the Heavenly City, for that Presence itself is visible. Nowhere else do we find it stated that there will be no temple in the New City. It is the climax of the Christian hope. The faithful shall see His face and abide with the Christ for ever.

The whole description is in some respects still a material one, like the Jewish descriptions we have cited, but it soars above its Jewish basis and presents us with the ancient hope of the people of God glorified and transformed by the Christian Seer.

LITERATURE.—R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the OT in English*, 2 vols., Oxford, 1913, *Eschatology, Hebrew, Jewish, and Christian*^{2}, London, 1913; W. Bousset, *Die Offenbarung Johannis*^{6} (Meyer's *Kommentar zum NT*, xvi.), Göttingen, 1906; H. B. Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*^{2}, London, 1907; J. Moffatt, *EGT*, 'Revelation,' do., 1910.

J. ROBERTSON BUCHANAN.

NEW MOON.—The term *νεομηνία* or *νουμηνία* ('new moon') as the name of a festal season occurs only once in the NT—Col 2^{16}. It is not used as a purely chronological term.

The Vulg., it may be observed, uses a simple transliteration (*neomenia*) in the passage named, as also in some other places (*e.g.* Is 1^{13}, Jth 8^6), whilst elsewhere it uses *calendæ* as='new moon' (*e.g.* in 1 S 20). The usage is not altogether consistent, but a rough distinction is perhaps intended between 'new moon' as denoting a festival and as simply a note of time. In ancient times the beginning of the month was proclaimed amongst the Jews by the high priest or president of the Sanhedrin when two witnesses had satisfactorily testified to the appearance of the new moon. The Romans had a parallel custom in the proclamation of the month by the Pontifex Maximus. Hence in this respect *calendæ*, the Roman name for the first day of the month (the day of *proclamation*), was a good Lat. equivalent for the Hebrew *rōsh-hā-ḥōdesh*, or 'new moon.' Note also Tertullian's use of *neomenia* when referring to the new moon as a festival (*de Idol.* 14). 'In later usage *νουμηνία* signifies generally the first day of the month, even when, according to the calendar employed, the months did not begin with the new moon' (Schürer, *HJP* II. i. 377).

The NT stands in great contrast to the OT in its paucity of reference to the 'new moon.' 'New moon' figures in the OT as a familiar and important season in the time-scheme of Hebrew life (see 1 S 20, 2 K 4^{23}) with some holiday relaxations and customs associated with it. So was it with other peoples from earliest times.

It would be to go beyond our limits to venture on a general treatment of the subject here. For this see, *inter alia*, the art. 'New Moon' by I. Abrahams in *HDB*. Still it may be said that a reference to the moon and its changes naturally and inevitably entered into the first attempts of primitive man to mark periods of time. After the immediate and primary distinction between day and night, arising from the regular appearance and disappearance of the sun, the recognition of the month as the period covered by the surprising and ever-fascinating phenomena of the moon's phases marked an important step in advance. And when due study of the procession of the seasons and the attendant solar phenomena led to the measuring of a year, the moon-period lost none of its importance. The ancients, however, soon found themselves confronted with puzzling problems in the effort to relate the months to the years. The fixed idea that every month must begin with the appearance of the new moon brought endless difficulties in its train. It took centuries to substitute the calendar month for the lunar month and secure as nearly as possible that the year should comprise twelve monthly periods preserving the same order of succession and a fixed correspondence with the seasons.

We can understand, too, how primitive man must instinctively have made the reappearance of the moon after obscuration an occasion for festal rejoicing. Even now we feel the charm of the first sight of the delicate pale crescent in the sky. And how natural it was that the celebration of the new moon should enter into the religion of nature-worshipping men, to whom the sun and moon were veritable gods and the terms 'King of Day' and 'Queen of the Night' more than poetic expressions! (As to the latter, we must not forget that the moon was regarded amongst some people as a masculine deity, as the German *der Mond* bears witness. Grimm [*Teutonic Mythology*, ed. Stallybrass, London, 1882–88, ii. 704] quotes an old Norse incantation, calling upon 'New Moon, gracious Lord' [cf. art. 'Moon' in Chambers's *Encyc.* vol. vii. (1891)].) Traces of such deification are sufficiently present in the OT: see Job $31^{26f.}$, 2 K 23^5, etc.; whilst the phrasing of Gn 1^{16} in the creation-story surely echoes such conceptions of more ancient days.

The incorporation of the New Moon as a festival—both a holy day and a holiday—among Jewish feasts is best explained as the effort of monotheism to take up institutions already long existing, free them from objectionable features, and make them subservient to a worthier faith. Cf. the action taken by the Christian Church in relation to pagan festivals (*e.g.* Yule—Christmas), overlaying them with new religious associations.

When we consider how conspicuously the Sabbath figures in the NT, and what traces we have of such great annual feasts as Passover and Pentecost, it is singular that, save for a passing reference in Col 2^{16} and Gal 4^{10}, we have no hint that a monthly festival was still observed in apostolic times. We might have concluded but for these passages that the New Moon, so prominent in the OT, had fallen into desuetude. But in St. Paul's phrasing in these two passages (especially Col 2^{16}) there reappears the three-fold classification of Jewish feasts which had become fixed in post-Exilic times (see Ezk 45^{17}, 'in the feasts and in the new moons and in the sabbaths'; cf. Ezr 3^{5}). The classification plainly rests on the fundamental time-scheme: year, month, week (see also the particularly interesting grouping in Jth 8^{6}: 'the eves of the sabbaths, and the sabbaths, and the eves of the new moons, and the new moons, and the feasts and joyful days of the house of Israel'). St. Paul would not have spoken of 'new moon' and 'months' were it not that, as we know, the proclamation of new moon and the attendant celebrations were still regular features of Jewish life. But it is a noticeable fact that whilst the Christian Church developed a system of festivals closely parallel to that of the Jews in some of its outstanding features (Sabbath, Passover, Pentecost), it provided no counterpart to the festival of the New Moon.

In the 4th cent., it is true, we find St. Chrysostom vigorously denouncing Christians for observing the *neomenia* (*Hom.* 23: 'in Kalendas' or 'in eos qui novilunia observant'—quoted by Joseph Bingham, *Antiquities*, XVI. iv. 17 [*Works*, new ed., vi. (Oxford, 1855) 226 n.]). He complains of their giving way to intemperance and excess and practising divination in the hope of good luck. The things he condemns, however, were pagan, not Jewish. There is no reason to suppose that St. Paul in deprecating the observance of seasons in this way had the thought of such disorderly practices in his mind. So far as divination, *e.g.*, is concerned, its connexion with the new moon must be of very ancient origin. Babylon had her 'monthly prognosticators' (Is 47^{13}). Some quaint innocuous superstitions still lingering in folk-lore and connected with the first sight of the new moon, notions of good and bad luck attending thereon, no doubt have descended from some such ancient, far-off source. But Judaism has no trace of such features in the history of its New Moon celebration.

The Apostle is thinking of nothing but the observance of a system of times and seasons (the religious observance even) such as the Jews had, and its introduction into the life of the new community. He is apprehensive ('I am afraid' [Gal 4^{11}]) lest harmful results should follow, imperilling their Christian liberty and bringing them under a 'yoke of bondage.' The *Epistle to Diognetus*, iv. (early 2nd cent. ?) speaks disparagingly, if not contemptuously, of Jewish 'superstitions relating to the Sabbaths . . . and their fancies about fasting and the new moon,' and shows that St. Paul's warning was not lost upon Christians of the following generations. Still the Apostle's own doctrine of liberty as touching the observance or non-observance of such seasons (see Ro 14) must not be overlooked; and in Col 2^{16}, as Hort points out (*Judaistic Christianity*, Cambridge, 1894, p. 123), 'the ceremonial distinctions do not appear to be condemned in themselves: the Colossians are simply warned in a strain hardly different from that of Rom. xiv. not to allow anyone to "judge" them in such.'

As to the mode of observing the day of the new moon in NT times, we know that (as in the case of other festivals) substantial changes had taken place as compared with what the OT reveals concerning earlier days. There was a time when, like the Sabbath, New Moon was observed by cessation of business (Am 8^{5}) and labour, although no Pentateuchal legislation provides for this. In the post-Exilic period this disappears except in the case of women. A faint and curious trace survives to this day in the fact that the Jewish house-wife, whilst freely discharging such domestic duties as cooking, makes a point of refraining from needlework and employments related to her personal convenience on the day of the new moon. Again, with the fall of the Temple, the appointed sacrificial rites (Nu $28^{11\text{ff.}}$) disappeared. At the same time the silver trumpets (Nu 10^{10}, Ps 81^{3}) ceased to sound. The only trumpet-blast that has since been heard in the synagogues of Jewry is that of the *shōphār*, which is still sounded on the great New Moon, 'the first day of the seventh month,' *i.e.* the New Year's Day of the civil year. It is pre-eminently a call to repentance.

No doubt St. Paul knew the sound of the *shōphār* well; but there does not seem enough ground for suggesting, as Edersheim does, that Eph 5^{14} ('Awake!') was inspired by the thought of that call, or that in Eph 5^{8} we have an underlying reference to the appearance of the new moon (*The Temple: its Ministry and Services*, London, 1908, ch. xv. p. 300 f.).

The synagogue prayers now used for New Moon reflect in some portions, notwithstanding changes introduced in later periods, the usage of the synagogue whilst yet the Temple was standing. The constant petition that God will 'establish a new altar on Zion' so that 'the burnt-offering of the New Moon' may again be offered, is arrestive and may even seem pathetic to a Christian mind. But all can feel the beauty of the prayer: 'Renew this month unto us for good and for blessing, for joy and gladness, for salvation and consolation, for support and peace, for pardon of sin and forgiveness of iniquity.'

LITERATURE.—Besides the works alluded to in the article, see artt. 'New Moon' and 'Time' in *HDB*; 'New Moon' and 'Month' in *EBi*; 'Festivals and Fasts (Hebrew)' in *ERE*; 'New Moon' in *JE*; J. Meinhold, *Sabbat und Woche im Alten Testament*, Göttingen, 1905; E. Schürer, *HJP* I. ii. [Edinburgh, 1890] App. III.; K. Wieseler, *A Chronological Synopsis of the Four Gospels*, Eng. tr., Cambridge, 1864, p. 401 ff.

J. S. CLEMENS.

NICANOR.—The name is Greek, but was probably prevalent in Syria, as we find one of the generals of Antiochus Epiphanes called by it (2 Mac 8^{9}). It is more than likely, therefore, that he was a Hellenist Jew of Syria. He is mentioned as one of the Seven in Ac 6^{5}, a man of repute among the brethren, but we hear and know no more of him.

W. A. SPOONER.

NICOLAITANS.—The name signifies 'followers of Nicolas,' as Nicolas = 'conqueror of the people.' They are mentioned twice in the NT (Rev $2^{6.\ 15}$) as a party at Ephesus and also at Pergamum, whose tenets were similar, it seems, in the judgment of the writer, to those of Balaam (*q.v.*) in that they enjoined or permitted laxity in ceremonial (the eating of food offered to idols) and in social morals. There is no reason to suppose that the Nicolaitans would have accepted this judgment as anything but an illegitimate inference from their principles. In the Apostolic Church, as ever since, two schools of thought were opposed to each other—that which was more Jewish in character and that which was more Greek. The former speaks in the Apocalypse of John and the latter in the Gospel of John, and the apocalyptic writer in condemning the other party, the Nicolaitans, states not what they held but what he thought their teaching must logically end in. The word is probably a nickname, as are Balaam and Nicodemus.

The party mentioned in the Apocalypse left behind them no historical trace, for there is no good reason for identifying with them the sect mentioned by Irenæus, Hippolytus, Eusebius, pseudo-Tertullian, and Jerome. The last four of these writers merely repeat Irenæus, who in his turn seems to have been elaborating on his own unsupported authority the references in the Apocalypse (I. xxvi. 3); indeed, in one passage (III. xi. 1) he asserts that the Nicolaitans had disseminated their heresy long before Cerinthus, and he makes their founder Nicolas, one of the Seven. Hippolytus (vii. 24) repeats Irenæus and adds nothing of his own, except that he emphasizes the Greek character of Nicolaitan teaching. Tertullian (*de Præscr.* 33) speaks of there being now 'another sort of Nicolaitans,' and he seems to identify them with the Cainites. By the 4th cent. the legend had grown, and pseudo-Tertullian (*adv. Omnes Hær.* 1) bluntly assigns certain Gnostic speculations to the Nicolaitans. The *Apost. Const.* (vi. 8) originated the description of the Nicolaitans as being 'falsely so called,' and it is followed by the interpolator of the Ignatian epistles (*Trall.* 11 and *Philad.* 6). Epiphanius (*adv. Hær.* 25), Georgius Hamartolus (*Chronicon*, iii. 135), and Jerome (*adv. Lucif.* 24) carry on the tradition without adding to it. Clement of Alexandria, however (*Strom.* iii. 4; cf. Eus. *HE* iii. 29), has an independent tradition about Nicolas which vindicates his character. On the whole, all that the evidence justifies us in concluding is that the Nicolaitans of the ecclesiastical writers were among the Gnostics, that their paternity and distinctive doctrines are unknown, and that their identity with the party named in the Apocalypse is doubtful.

W. F. COBB.

NICOLAS.—Nicolas, one of the Seven appointed to look after the ministration of alms to the Hellenist widows, is described in the Acts as a proselyte of Antioch (Ac 6^{5}). He comes last in the list. This description of him is inserted because his admission to office in the Christian Church marks a step taken towards the extension of the Church to the Gentiles. As far as we know, no proselyte, *i.e.* convert to Judaism from the heathen world, had been given office in the Church, up to this point. A. Harnack (*The Acts of the Apostles*, Eng. tr., 1909, p. 172) quotes the description of him as a proselyte of Antioch as a proof that this section of the Acts was probably derived from an Antiochene source—surely a very uncertain inference. On his supposed connexion with the Nicolaitans of Rev $2^{6.15}$ see art. NICOLAITANS.

W. A. SPOONER.

NICOPOLIS (Νικόπολις, 'City of victory').—In days of almost constant warfare, when many triumphs had to be commemorated, this was a favourite name for newly founded cities. T. Zahn enumerates no fewer than nine Nicopoleis (*Introd. to NT*, Eng. tr., 1909, ii. 53 f.), of which one in Cappadocia, a second in Egypt, and a third in Thrace had some importance. Chrysostom and Theodoret took the last of these to be the place referred to in Tit 3^{12}. But by far the most famous Nicopolis was the city in Epirus which Augustus founded after the battle of Actium. He intended it to be 'at once a permanent memorial of the great naval victory and the centre of a newly flourishing Hellenic life' (T. Mommsen, *Provinces of Rom. Empire*, new ed., 1909, i. 295). It was laid out where the victor's headquarters had been stationed just before the battle, at the narrowest part of the promontory which separates the Ambracian Gulf from the Ionian Sea. Augustus peopled it, after the fashion set by Alexander's successors, by uniting the inhabitants of a large number of minor townships in one great urban domain. He made it a free city like Athens or Sparta, and instituted so-called Actian Games, which he put on the same level as the four ancient Hellenic festivals. Nicopolis became the foremost city of Western Greece, and (at some uncertain date) the capital of the new province of Epirus. Tacitus calls it *urbem Achaiæ* (*Ann.* ii. 53, for the year A.D. 18), but Epictetus, its most famous citizen (born *c.* A.D. 60), speaks of an ἐπίτροπος Ἠπείρου residing in Nicopolis and governing the land (*Diss.* III. iv. 1).

It was natural that St. Paul should sooner or later think of this splendid Græco-Roman city and its neighbourhood as a field for evangelistic work. In an epistolary fragment which has been preserved, he bids Titus, who has been labouring in Crete, give diligence to join him at Nicopolis, as he has decided to winter there (Tit 3^{12}). Some MSS of the epistle (A and P) have the subscription, 'It was written from Nicopolis,' and these are followed by the Greek commentators (Chrys. Theod. *et al.*); but the Apostle would have said ὧδε, not ἐκεῖ, if he had been actually writing in the city. It has been generally assumed that St. Paul, after being acquitted by his Roman judges, resumed his labours in the East, and that his letter summoning Titus to Nicopolis belongs to this period. It has further been conjectured that the Apostle made his way, as he intended, to Nicopolis, and that his second arrest took place there (Conybeare-Howson, *St. Paul*, new ed., 1877, ii. 571 f.). But the evidence for a release is far from convincing, and the question arises whether the Nicopolis episode can be fitted into his biography without this doubtful 'final phase.' In reference to Tit $3^{12f.}$, H. von Soden says: 'This is all intelligible in itself and as a part of the life of St. Paul, and the fulness of particulars gives an impression of authenticity' (*The History of Early Christian Literature*, Eng. tr., 1906, p. 316). It seems certain that Titus' work in Crete (Tit 1^{5}) cannot have begun till after the writing of 2 Cor., for he was occupied with the settlement of difficulties in the Corinthian Church. But St. Paul may have visited the island with his fellow-worker, and left him to labour there, shortly before his final visit to Corinth. As regards Ac 20^{3}, it has been suggested that the writer knew very little about the details of St. Paul's life at the time to which this passage refers (A. C. McGiffert, *A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, 1897, p. 411 n.), and a short campaign in Crete may well have been one of his activities during that period. On this hypothesis, the letter to Titus, in its original, comparatively brief form, must have been written before St. Paul's stay of three winter months in Corinth (20^{3}). Titus probably hastened, as directed, to Nicopolis, but some new turn of events prevented St. Paul from carrying out his purpose of wintering in that city, though he may have paid it a brief visit. Nothing is known about its actual evangelization, either at that time or later. After falling into decay, the city was restored by Julian; and Justinian repaired the havoc wrought by the Goths; but in the Middle Ages it was supplanted by Prevesa, three miles to the south. Its ruins are extensive.

JAMES STRAHAN.

NIGER.—See SYMEON (SIMEON) CALLED NIGER.

NIGHT.—See DAY AND NIGHT, TIME.

NOAH (Νῶε).—A number of didactic references to Noah are found in the Epistles. (1) He appears in the roll of 'the elders,' or men of OT times, who had witness borne to them on account of their faith

(He 11^{2}). ‘By faith Noah, being divinely instructed (χρηματισθεὶς) concerning things not yet seen, with reverential care (εὐλαβηθεὶς) prepared an ark to save his household’ (v.^{7}). By his faith (δι’ ἧς, which cannot refer to ‘ark’) he virtually condemned (κατέκρινεν) the careless world, for his belief in the Divine warning threw other men’s lack of faith into strong relief, and his godly life demonstrated what theirs ought to have been and failed to be. He thus became ‘heir of the righteousness which is according to, *or* in consequence of, faith’ (τῆς κατὰ πίστιν δικαιοσύνης, a phrase which is thoroughly Pauline in significance though not quite in diction). Philo (cited by H. Alford, *The Greek Testament*^{5}, iv. [1875] 213) notes that Noah is ‘the first in the holy scriptures who is expressly called righteous’ (δίκαιος); but, while the patriarch is so designated at the very beginning of his history (Gn 6^{9}; cf. Wis 10^{4}), the idea of the writer of Hebrews is rather that he *became* (ἐγένετο) righteous by giving due heed to the Divine warning and building the ark in faith.

(2) 1 Peter (3^{20}) allegorizes, in the Alexandrian manner, the story of ‘the days of Noah, in which the ark was being prepared, wherein eight souls were saved through water’ (διεσώθησαν δι’ ὕδατος). Here ‘through’ may conceivably be instrumental, suggesting merely that the water bore up the ark and so saved its inmates; but this exegesis gives the imagination no striking symbol, or type, of that deliverance by baptism (immersion) to which allusion is made in the following verse. ‘Through’ is therefore rather to be taken as local, Noah and his family being conceived as escaping, when the flood has already begun, through the water into the safety of the ark. Though this conception is not based upon the narrative in Genesis, it is attested in the Rabbinical literature (F. Spitta, *Christi Predigt an die Geister*, 1890, p. 51).

(3) 2 Peter (2^{5}) says that God spared not the ancient world, but preserved Noah with seven others, a preacher of righteousness (δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα). This designation suggests another addition to the sacred narrative, a *haggādā* to which there are many Rabbinical allusions, *e.g.* *Bereshith Rabba*, xxx. 6. Josephus (*Ant.* I. iii. 1) refers to this tradition: ‘But Noah was very uneasy at what they [his contemporaries] did; and, being displeased at their conduct, persuaded them to change their disposition and their actions for the better’; and Clement (*ad Cor.* vii. 6, ix. 4), ‘Noah preached repentance, and as many as hearkened unto him were saved’; ‘Noah, having been found faithful, preached, by his ministry, regeneration unto the world.’ Cf. Theoph. Antioch. *ad Autolycum*, iii. 19, 129; *Visio Pauli*, l. 1, and other passages collected in Spitta’s *Der zweite Brief des Petrus und der Brief des Judas*, 1885, p. 146. The Christian Sibyllines give a complete Sermon of Noah’s (*Sib. Orac.* i. 128 ff.).

James Strahan.

NOBLE.—Two Greek words are thus translated in the AV. (1) εὐγενής, ‘well-born,’ ‘of noble birth,’ and secondarily, as the natural outcome of that privileged condition, ‘of noble mind *or* spirit,’ is used in its primary sense in 1 Co 1^{26}, ‘not many noble.’ The negative phrase is not to be taken as if it meant ‘none’ (see J. Orr, *Neglected Factors in the Study of the Early Progress of Christianity*, 1899, p. 99 ff.). In its secondary sense, it is applied to the Jews of Berœa, who were ‘nobler,’ *i.e.* of a better and more generous spirit, than those of Thessalonica ‘in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, examining the scriptures daily whether these things were so’ (Ac 17^{11}). The use of the comparative does not imply that the Jews of Thessalonica had any nobility of spirit. (2) κράτιστος, ‘most mighty,’ or, as a title of honour, ‘most noble *or* excellent,’ is used by Claudius Lysias in his letter to Felix (23^{26}); by Tertullus in addressing Felix (24^{3}); and by St. Paul in addressing Festus (26^{25}). The RV in all three instances translates it ‘most excellent.’ It was a title usually given to magistrates, and was regarded as a high compliment. An appellation of Achilles was κράτιστος Ἑλλήνων (Soph. *Phil.* 3).

John Reid.

NOON.—See Time.

NOVICE.—The word occurs in the NT only in 1 Ti 3^{6} as a translation of νεόφυτος. A bishop is to be ‘not a novice, lest being puffed up he fall into the condemnation of the devil.’ The word literally means ‘newly planted,’ and describes one recently converted to Christianity. It accords with the Pauline metaphor of ‘planted’ (σύμφυτοι, Ro 6^{5}) as indicating the Christian relation to Christ. The earlier Greek interpreters explained ‘neophyte’ or ‘novice’ as ‘newly baptized’ (*CE*, art. ‘Neophyte’), as it was the custom to baptize converts immediately after conversion. In later times, when converts were subjected to a period of instruction and probation, the term was still applied to them, though the more common designation was ‘catechumens.’ Still later, the word was restricted to those who were on probation for entrance into some monastic or Church Order. The term of novitiate was usually not less than a year, and no one could be received on probation under the age of puberty. The word was used in connexion with the Eleusinian mysteries (M‘Clintock-Strong, *Cyclopedia*, art. ‘Neophyte’), and among the Romans for ‘a newly acquired slave’ (*CE*, art. ‘Novice’; see also Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, Eng. tr., 1901, p. 220 f.).

John Reid.

NUMBER OF THE BEAST.—See Apocalypse.

NUMBERS.—*Introduction.*—Even a casual reader of the Bible is struck with the fact that in many cases—not altogether exclusive of those in which the desire to state facts accurately may be presumed—a preference is given to certain numbers. He will observe particularly the frequency of the numbers 3, 7, 10, and 12, together with their multiples and even their fractions. In regard to 7, the ritual arrangements found in the Pentateuch would alone warrant the conclusion that this number was regarded as in some sense sacred. If we read that ‘God blessed the 7th day and sanctified it’ (Gn 2^{3}), and find that peculiar religious observances or customs with a religious basis attach, not only to the 7th day, but to the 7th month, the 7th year, and the 7×7th year,* we seem warranted in saying that, among the people of the Bible, 7 represents a mystic cycle of work and rest, within which God both accomplishes His purpose in the universe and co-operates with sanctified men. From the starting-point of such a preliminary observation, however, many questions arise, of which the principal are the following. (1) How far is the sanctity of particular numbers peculiar to the people of the Bible? Is its basis, so far as it may be traceable, to be found in nature or in religious theory or custom? If the latter, is the theory or custom borrowed from, or maintained in common with, other peoples (Babylonians, Egyptians, Persians) with whom the Jews came into contact? (2) For what other numbers besides those named may a more or less similar prominence be claimed? (3) How far is the usage as to numbers, which is found in the OT or kindred Jewish literature, found also in the NT? The present article must be concerned with (1) and (2) only in so far as the answer to them is involved in the answer to (3). There can hardly be, even in connexion with the Apocalypse of John, any idea of the NT writers borrowing directly from Babylonians, Egyptians, Persians, or, even in this reference, from Greeks or Romans. If such foreign influences are found in the NT, they have come through the medium of the OT or kindred Jewish writings. The Apostolic Age is cosmopolitan in spirit, yet the ancestry which it owns is strictly Jewish. Among its writers are masters of Greek style like St. Luke and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, yet all the writers are men whose Bible was the OT.

---

* Lv 23^{24} 25$^{3ff.\ 8}$.

It is, however, the cosmopolitanism of the first Christian age and not its Jewish origin that lends interest to its practice as regards the symbolism of numbers. The degree in which this symbolism has passed into the age that begins with our Lord and His apostles offers an obvious standard for measuring its worth.

Before proceeding to particulars, a general statement may be offered of the position of matters which they seem to indicate: the NT practice stands to that of the OT as the latter does to its basis in Babylon, Egypt, or Persia, except for what disturbance of the proportion may arise from the fact that a degree of affinity, both racial and religious, exists between the people of the OT and that of the NT such as does not obtain between the Jews and the heathen neighbours or masters who most influenced them. The practice of *employing* a particular number, where it is, by presumption, at least approximately correct, or of *choosing* it, where the question of accuracy as to matter of fact does not arise, is taken over; but, except—and even here the exception is partial—in a book like the Apocalypse of John, the practice is unconscious. It may be true, *e.g.*, that when a thoughtful mystic of the Apostolic Age used the number 3, he involuntarily thought of the Divine Being or Trinity; it may be probable that when he used the number 4, he thought of the 4 directions and, therefore, of the world. But to say that 3 was to the average Christian the number for God, or 4 the number for the world, or that even one in a hundred Christians thought, in connexion with 3, of Babylonian or Egyptian triad-divinities[*] or of the alleged fact that every Babylonian divinity had its appropriate number, is to say what cannot be proved and is highly improbable.

I. *THE NUMBERS EMPLOYED IN THE APOCALYPSE OF JOHN.*—**1. Three.**—The natural importance of this number is obvious. It is the lowest number to express several, or to denote something that has a beginning, middle, and end. It is the common number of a small deputation. It is the number of the possible dimensions of space, of the natural divisions of the physical cosmos (heaven, earth, and sea), of the day (morning, noon, and evening), of time generally (past, present, and future), and of the human person (body, soul, and spirit).

It is a usual number to express the frequency that makes an action effective, and is a common number of members in a rhythmical sentence, or in a list of adjectives. Such uses are abundantly illustrated in the Bible as in other literature. The number is, moreover, of undoubted frequency in religious connexions: 3-fold invocation (Jer 22^{29}, Is 6^{3}), blessing (Nu $6^{24ff.}$); 3 great Feasts (Ex $23^{14ff.}$); 3 days, months, or years of waiting and preparation for an important event or action (Gn 40^{12}, Ex 2^{2}, Gal 1^{18}); 3 times of prayer or repetitions of the same prayer (Dn $6^{10.\,13}$, Mt 26^{44} ‖, 2 Co 12^{8}). This prominence of 3 in other parts of the Bible makes its comparative infrequency in the Apocalypse the more remarkable. Even where there is a clear indication of the Divine Trinity (Rev 1^{4}) or of the 3-fold time-manifestation of the Creator-God (1^{8}) the numeral is not named. The fraction of the numeral, and 3 as a fraction of 12, are of more frequent occurrence than the numeral itself.[*] Comparing this state of the case with the frequency of 7 and even of 12 (see below) in the Apocalypse, we seem warranted in doubting whether any kind of sacred significance necessarily attached to the number 3 even in the mind of the symbolists of the Bible.

2. Seven.—Examples: 7 churches, spirits ($1^{4.\,11}$ 3^{1}), stars ($1^{16.\,20}$), candlesticks (1^{13}), lamps (4^{5}), seals (5^{1} 8^{1}), horns and eyes (5^{6}), trumpets (8^{2}), angels (8^{2}), thunders ($10^{3f.}$), heads (12^{3} 17^{3}), angels with plagues (15^{1}), vials full of the wrath of God (15^{7}), kings (17^{10}). In view of this pervasiveness of the 7 one need hardly refer to the 7 'spirits of God' which invest Christ (3^{1}) or to the 7 'heads of blasphemy' on the Beast that is Antichrist (13^{1}) in proof of the fact that 7 is pre-eminently the number of perfection or completeness whether on the side of good or evil. The cogency of proof is augmented by the significance undoubtedly attached to the numeral next mentioned.

3. Three and a half.—The actual numeral occurs only twice—'3½ days' ($11^{9.\,11}$). But in 12^{14} we have the 'time and times and half a time' as in Dn 12^{7},[†] and in $11^{2f.}$ 12^{6} 13^{5} the same period—3½ years—appears as 42 months, or (multiplying by 30) 1,260 days. The use of the number both in Daniel (see footnote) and the Apocalypse proves that by a convention, certainly older, probably much older, than the Book of Daniel, and one in all likelihood not peculiar to the Jews, the number indicated a period of stress and tribulation that would be balanced by a period, of at least equal duration, of comfort and prosperity. If 7 represents the perfect work of God in mercy and judgment in relation to men (as well as the total work of creation) and, on the human side, the life of godliness with its twin ingredients of joy and sorrow, the fraction 3½ fitly stands for the factor of the total that signifies God's broken covenant and man's broken hope (see Ps 90^{15}, and, for its equivalent in the nobler apostolic faith, Ro 8^{18}, 2 Co 4^{12}).

4. Twelve and its multiples.—However natural it may seem to think of the 12 signs of the Zodiac[‡] as the basis of the usage which gives prominence to this number in the Bible, it may fairly be doubted whether even such symbolists as the authors of Daniel and the Apocalypse ever had such a reference in their minds. Yet an indication of something of the kind has been found by Gunkel and others in the 24 elders of 4^{4}, whose origin might be a primitive astronomical conception, presumably Babylonian, according to which the sun was surrounded by a circle of light each half of which contained 12 luminaries. Apart from the likelihood that any such association would have seemed to the prophet of the Apocalypse so much sanction given to idolatry, we have surely a hint of the true origin of the 24, so far as he is concerned, in 15^{3}, where the victors over the Beast and his image sing 'the song of Moses the servant of God and the song of the Lamb.' These victors and redeemed ones are those who are true to the religion of both the covenants. A symbolist would naturally reckon their representatives in the immediate presence of God as 12 + 12, *i.e.*, the 12 patriarchs or heads of the 12 tribes of Israel, and the 12 apostles or heads of the Church. He expresses the same idea when he writes of 12 gates with the names of the '12 tribes of the children of Israel,' and of 12 foundations of the wall in which were 'the names of the 12 apostles of the Lamb' (21$^{12.\,14}$).

---

[*] E. Kautzsch denies the affinity in the case of the Babylonian and Greek trinities on the ground that these trinities arise from a division of territory among 3 originally independent divinities (*PRE*^{3} xxi. [1908] 598 ff.).

[*] Rev $8^{7\text{-}12}$ 9^{18}, where the fraction occurs eight times. Take these passages along with 16^{19} and 21^{13} where 3 as a fraction of 12 occurs five times, and compare with 6^{6} 8^{13} 9^{18} 16^{13}, showing four instances of the independent use of the number.

[†] How entirely an apocalyptic symbolist might be governed by the idea of 3½ or the number appropriate to a period of disciplinary tribulation appears particularly in 'Daniel's' manipulation of the 70 years of servitude in Babylon prophesied by Jeremiah (25^{11}) in Dn $9^{26ff.}$. The 70 years = 70 weeks of years, and the 70 is divided into 7+62+1, in order that the one week of years may be halved so as to give 3½ years as the period of the tribulation under Antiochus.

[‡] In his very instructive article 'Siebenzahl,' in *PRE*^{3} xviii. 310 ff., Zöckler quotes the passage (*BJ* v. v. 5) in which Josephus asserts that the 7 lamps of the sacred candlestick indicate the 7 planets, and the 12 loaves of shewbread the circle of the Zodiac. He argues conclusively that the use of 7 by the Babylonians is older than their astrology of the planets and rests on the division of the lunar month into 4 periods of 7 corresponding to the 4 phases of the moon. Josephus' casual theories he characterizes as 'shallow interpretations,' which are to be repudiated as 'idle *Phantasieprodukte*, without historical foundation.' Yet these stray remarks of the Jewish historian are interesting as an indication that the questions of modern anthropology in relation to religion could arise even in a mind of the first Christian century.

Further examples: 144,000 (or 12,000 for each tribe) are sealed as the 'servants of our God' (7$^{4ff.}$ 14^{1}). The number 12, with multiples and fractions, is used exclusively in the delineation of the Celestial City: 12 gates, angels; a cube of 12,000 furlongs; 12 foundations, precious stones, pearls (21$^{12ff.}$).

5. Ten.—A natural importance attaches to this number. It is the number of fingers (5 + 5) on the two hands—the natural means of reckoning between two traders who speak different languages. It closes the series of units and is the dominating number of the most natural system of reckoning. It is the number naturally chosen to designate a considerable number of persons or a short but not inconsiderable period of time: *e.g.*, 10 days' tribulation for the faithful Church of Smyrna (2^{10}); 10,000 × 10,000 and 1,000 × 1,000 are the number of the angels round about the throne (5^{11}). Men without the seal of God are tormented by locusts for 5 months (9^{5}). The dragon has 10 horns, the Beast rising out of the sea has 10 horns and 10 crowns (12^{3} 13^{1}). Similarly the woman on the scarlet Beast has '10 horns' (17$^{3.\,7}$), which are explained to be '10 kings' (17^{12}). The devil is bound for 1,000 years, while the martyrs of Jesus reign on the earth (20$^{2.\,4}$). On the 1,000 years see art. APOCALYPSE, p. 78, note. The fraction $\frac{1}{10}$ occurs only in 11^{13}. Its use in this passage suggests the negative side of the significance of the tithe-offering—viz. the part representing the whole. The 10th part of the city—7 out of 70 thousand inhabitants—perish, but the remnant 'were affrighted and gave glory to God.'[*]

6. Six.—Apart from the notorious three 6's of the Beast in 13^{18}, 6 occurs only once in the Apocalypse. In 4^{8} the 4 Beasts, copied doubtless from Ezk 1$^{6ff.}$, have 6 wings like the seraphim in Is 6^{2}, and not 4 only as in Ezekiel. In connexion with 13^{18}, the suggestion has been made (see art. APOCALYPSE) that to a Jewish symbolist 6, as $= 7 - 1$, might very well have the significance of that which resembles the Divine perfection but fails just when it seemed likely to succeed. The Beast, to which the Dragon gives its throne (13^{2}), and which therefore represents the rival of the Supreme God, has 7 heads, like the 7 spirits of God, which belong to Jesus Christ (3^{1}), but on the heads are 'names of blasphemy.' The Beast has the trappings of divinity; only the reality fails.

7. The number of the Beast.—The passage, Rev 13^{18}, is a Scripture instance of what is known in later Rabbinism as *Gemaṭria*, or the mystic art of attaching values to names according to the numbers represented by the letters composing them. As both in Hebrew and Greek the letters of the alphabet were used to indicate numbers, the art could be pursued both by Hellenic and Palestinian or Babylonian Jews. For the various views regarding the name (Greek or Hebrew) corresponding to 666, see art. APOCALYPSE. For a fuller account see G. A. Barton's art. 'Number' in *EBi* iii. 3434 ff.

The calculation which gives the name 'Nero Cæsar,' נרון קסר (Neron Ḳesar), is as follows: נ=50; ר=200; ו=6; נ=50; ק=100; ס=60; ר=200—total, 666. In regard to the Hebrew notation it may be mentioned that the letters א to ט = the units; י to צ = the tens; ק to ת = the first four hundreds. ת compounded = other hundreds. Thus ת״ק=500; ת״ר=600; ת״ש=700; ת״ת=800; תת״ק=900. The thousands are expressed by the letters for the units with two points placed above: א̈=1,000; ט̈=9,000; י̈=10,000.[*]

8. Four.—This number is naturally associated with the 4 directions of space. The 4 living creatures (ζῷα) 'round about the throne' in 4^{6} are adopted from Ezk 1$^{5ff.}$. The principal difference is that the 4 faces (man, lion, calf,[†] eagle) are distributed among the 4 ζῷα, instead of, as in Ezekiel, belonging to each. The reason seems to be that to the apocalyptist the main attribute of these ministers of the Divine presence is not, as with Ezekiel, their ubiquitousness, but rather their omniscience. Their place is round about a stationary throne, but they are 'full of eyes before and behind.'

It may fairly be doubted whether the apocalyptist attached any significance to the number 4 in this reference or to the variety of faces. Perhaps as in other places (see art. APOCALYPSE) he borrowed more than he used. The other instances of 4 in the Apocalypse are: 4 angels standing at the 4 corners of the earth holding 4 winds (7^{1}; cf. 29^{8}), '4 horns of the golden altar which is before God' (9^{13}), 4 'angels bound on the river Euphrates,' corresponding to 4 terms of destructive operation (hour, day, month, year) (9$^{14f.}$), 'the city lieth τετράγωνος' (21^{16}). It is perhaps only in the last instance that we are warranted in supposing that the apocalyptist attached any significance of faith to the numeral 4. It seems to be associated in his mind, if it does not actually express it, with the inconceivable magnitude, yet perfect symmetry, of the City of the Redeemed.

9. Eight.—The significance of this number in the Apocalypse does not arise from its being a multiple of 4. It occurs twice in the ordinal form (17^{11} 21^{20}). The former passage—'the 8th' that is 'of the 7'—is interesting. Adopting the view that the person intended is Domitian, we see that the author or the final editor is governed by the idea that 7—the number of the 'heads' of the woman on the scarlet Beast (17^{3})—ought to represent the number of genuine Roman Emperors,[‡] who are allowed to maintain for a time a blasphemous rivalry to the King of kings. The 8th is a difficulty. The apocalyptist gets over the difficulty by thinking of him as *Nero Redivivus.* He is the 8th, yet still of the appointed 7, and he 'goeth to destruction.' This elongation of 7 so as to absorb 8 is not unnatural in a Jewish writer. One may compare the

---

[*] It is curious that the multiple 40, so common in the number-schematism of Scripture to denote a period of disciplinary affliction or penitential exercise (*e.g.* Ps 95^{10}, Ezk 4^{6} 29$^{11\text{-}13}$, 1 S 17^{16}, Jon 3^{4}, Ex 24^{18}), does not occur independently in the Apocalypse. The nearest approach to a reference is the '42 months' (instead of 3½ years) of 11^{2} and 13^{5}.

[*] On this and the very similar system of Greek notation see especially art. 'Zahlen' and kindred articles in E. C. A. Riehm's *Handwörterbuch des biblischen Altertums*, 1884.

[†] Ezk 1^{10} LXX gives *μόσχος* as in Rev 4^{7}. The translators use *μόσχος* for no fewer than four Hebrew words: פַּר = 'a bull,' בָּקָר = 'cattle,' שׁוֹר = 'an ox *or* cow' (the word in Ezk 1^{10}), עֵגֶל = 'a calf' (see Grimm-Thayer, *s.v.*).

[‡] Galba, Otho, and Vitellius are excluded, and the 10 horns are not Emperors but kings, or kinglets, who receive power for one hour along with the Beast (17^{12}).

8th day of the Feast of Tabernacles, which had come in practice to be the most important day, and is recognized even in the rubrics which make it clear that the legal Feast ended on the 7th day (Lv 23$^{34.36}$).

10. Two and one.—Apart from association with other numbers (as in 9^{16} and 11^{2}) and from the '2 woes more' (9^{12}), 2 occurs only in 11$^{3.4.10}$, each time in connexion with the '2 witnesses,' the unnamed Moses and Elijah (11^{6}) of chapter 11. The witnesses are, therefore, Law and Prophecy. The author seems to use the numeral to convey the idea that, though God's witnesses may be the least possible number (Nu 35^{30}), their testimony will yet prevail to secure the destruction of blasphemers and murderers of the servants of God.

The numeral 1 occurs in a significant sense chiefly in the '1 hour,' signifying a very short time, which occurs five times (17^{12} 18$^{8.10.17.19}$).

Result.—Our survey of the Apocalypse would seem to show that, except in the cases of 7, 3½, and 12, no consciousness of their being specially sacred underlies the usage of the writers in regard to numbers. The usage in reference to these numbers is, however, sufficient to show that the men of the Apostolic Age found nothing alien to their new faith in the mystic symbolism of numbers which they inherited from their Jewish ancestors and especially from the apocalyptic writers. From the fact, however, that this symbolism appears with definite intent only in one book of the NT, and even there but sparingly, we may fairly infer that no great currency was given to it in the Apostolic Church, and the apocalyptic books, other than the Apocalypse of John, which contain it, while undoubtedly much read (see art. APOCALYPSE), were not considered of supreme worth or authority. The authoritative writers might take over the symbolism to a certain extent, but they did so almost unconsciously. Those who went further and made much of it might be then, as in subsequent ages of the Church down to our own day, interesting and edifying writers, but they did not rank with the authorities.

This state of the case may best be illustrated by a survey of the practice, in this reference, of the other NT writers.

II. *NUMBERS IN THE OTHER NT BOOKS.*—The examples given below are intended to represent cases in which the *selection* of the particular number or the *mention* of the particular number, presumably in accordance with fact, may reasonably be supposed to rest on ancient symbolical usage.

i. THE GOSPELS.—**1. Seven.**—The genealogies in Mt 1$^{1ff.}$, Lk 3$^{23ff.}$ are a clear instance of symmetrical arrangement on the basis of the number 7. To St. Matthew it seems important that the genealogy of Jesus from Abraham includes 3 × 14 generations (1^{17}). In the part of St. Luke's genealogy which is comparable with St. Matthew's neither names nor numbers agree; but the list from Adam to Abraham gives, inclusive of Abraham, 21 names. The total, inclusive of the *termini* (God and Jesus) is 77. The phrases '7 other spirits worse than himself' (Mt 12$^{45ff.}$ ‖), the '7 demons' that 'came out' of Mary Magdalene (Lk 8$^{2f.}$ ‖), the '7 times' and '70 × 7 times' of Mt 18$^{21ff.}$ show that the use of 7 to express a totality of good or evil (even though it might be, as in Mt 18$^{21ff.}$, immeasurable) was not confined to the symbolists of the first Christian age.* There is no likelihood that either our Lord or the Evangelists thought of the planet-divinities of Babylon, or of the 7 Amshaspands of good spirits of Persia, opposed to 7 spirits of evil, yet the number comes to lip and pen involuntarily through a usage that may have its basis or confirmation there.* Again, in considering the accounts of the two miraculous feedings in Mark, chs. 6 and 7 ‖, it is difficult to exclude the idea that the numbers employed, especially 7, 5 + 2, and 12,† may have to the writers a certain sacred and sacramental significance. The sacramental association—apart from the numbers—is obvious in the narrative of the Fourth Evangelist (Jn 6), but is it not suggested even in the Synoptic account? The Divine supply is perfect (5 + 2 or 7). What is left of it may be as great as or even greater than what is taken (7 to 7, or 12 to 7). And where the company is largest most may be left. See especially the commentary on the double incident in Mk 7$^{14-21}$ (cf. Mt 16$^{5-12}$). Ac 1$^{23ff.}$ (filling of the vacancy in the apostolate), and 1 Co 15^{5},‡ where 'the 12' is used of the company that was only 11, seem to imply that to the mind both of our Lord and the apostles the number 12 signified His intention and ability to recover completely what was lost (Lk 19^{10}; cf. with Mt 15^{24}. See also Jn 10$^{28f.}$ 17^{12}, Ac 26^{7} ['our 12 tribes']).

2. Three.—The chief instance of this numeral in a suggestion of sense other than strictly literal is that of the resurrection of our Lord on the 3rd day (Mk 10^{34}, etc.‖; cf. Ac 10^{40}, 1 Co 15^{4}). There is no reason to doubt either the definite prophecy or the definite fulfilment. It is not so easy to state precisely the reason of the choice of the number. It has been customary to refer, for a proximate reason, to the influence of Hos 6^{2},§ and, for one more remote, to the ancient idea that the spirit hovered beside the body it had inhabited for 3 days, departing on the 3rd day because in the decaying flesh it no longer recognized its own likeness. Perhaps only the former of these associations is worth more than mention. It may fairly be argued that St. Luke, St. John, and St. Paul thought of Hos 6^{2} when they referred to the Resurrection on the 3rd day as taking place *according to the Scriptures* (Lk 24^{46}, Ac 10^{40}, Jn 2^{22}, 1 Co 15^{4}), as this is the only passage discoverable where the collocation of 'revival from the dead' and 'the 3rd day' occurs.‖ It is another thing, however, to ascribe such definiteness of emphasis upon the 3rd day to our Lord. Even if He thought of the passage in Hosea, He may have regarded the numbers 2 and 3 simply as the natural equivalent for a very short time that was yet a real interval. If one reckons in days, there can hardly be a shorter interval than one day. It is not surprising that after the event of the Resurrection the more definite emphasis upon the numeral 3 or 3rd became common.¶ Other instances in the

---

* Instances in which, apart from mention of the numeral, a preference for it may be fairly considered implicit are the 7 petitions in the Lord's Prayer (Mt 6$^{9ff.}$), the 7 parables of Mt 13, the 7+1 woes of Mt 23$^{13ff.}$.

* Proof that the sacredness of 7 was a subject of speculation among Jews of the 1st cent. may be found in *Slav. En.* xxx. 3. See also Josephus, *Ant.* III. vi. 7, along with the parallel passage in *BJ* v. v. 5, cited above under I. 4, note.

† Other instances of 12, worth mentioning, are 'the 12 legions of angels' (Mt 26^{53}), and the age of the child Jesus when He was found in the Temple (Lk 2^{42}). In regard to the latter, Josephus (*Ant.* v. x. 4) gives Samuel the same age when the Lord called him (1 S 3$^{8ff.}$), and pseudo-Ignatius (*ad Magn.* 3) makes Solomon 12 when he delivered the famous judgment (1 K 3$^{16ff.}$).

‡ W. Taylor Smith notices that 'the 12' occurs twenty-two times in the Gospels (art. 'Numbers' in *DCG*).

§ Taken as an expression of real faith, not of delusive hope (see the Commentaries). The prophet's faith for the holy nation, the Servant of God, decided, it might be supposed, the terms of our Lord's faith for Himself as One 'torn' and 'smitten' for their sins.

‖ See E. A. Abbot's *Message of the Son of Man*, London, 1909, ch. ix. There is also a reference in his *The Son of Man*, Cambridge, 1910, p. 200 (Addendum on 'The Third Day').

¶ The strongest argument, perhaps, in favour of distinguishing, in reference to the '3rd day,' between Jesus and His reporters, is that supplied by Mt 12^{40}. This verse is an obvious gloss on the part of the Evangelist, who thinks that the 'sign' referred to is the death and resurrection of Jesus, and naturally finds the point of comparison between Him and Jonah in the '3 days.' He is not disturbed by the fact that in Jonah's case there are '3 nights' as well (Jon 1^{17}). The sign intended by our Lord is that explained in v.^{41}.

Gospels in which some kind of symbolical meaning may lurk in the fact or mention of the number 3 are: '3 measures of meal' (Mt 13^{33}), 'these 3' (Lk 10^{36}), 'these 3 years' (13^{7}), '3 temptations' (Mt $4^{1\text{ff.}}$), 3 agonized prayers ($26^{37\text{ff.}\ 42.\ 44}$ ‖; cf. 2 Co 12^{8}), 3 denials and charges of Simon Peter (Mt $26^{69\text{ff.}}$ ‖ Jn $21^{15\text{ff.}}$). Of these perhaps the most relevant are the 3 temptations of Jesus and the 3 years of patience with the barren fig-tree. In both instances the number may be suggested by 3½ as the common apocalyptic number for a period of trial or probation. In regard to the 153 of Jn 21^{11} Calvin has perhaps said the last word: 'Quantum ad piscium numerum spectat non est sublime aliquid in eo quærendum mysterium' (*Com. ad loc.*). 'Peter never landed a haul of fish without counting them' (M. Dods, in *EGT*, London, 1897, *ad loc.*).

3. **Three and a half** appears instructively in Lk 4^{25} (cf. Ja 5^{17}). The addition of the ½ to the 3 of 1 K 18^{1} is evidently due to apocalyptic tradition.

ii. The Acts of the Apostles.—Apart from the instances already referred to, the most relevant seem to be: 7 deacons (6^{3}), 7 'sons of one Sceva a Jew,' using the name of Jesus (19^{14}), the 3 forties in the history of Moses and the Israelites ($7^{23.\ 30.\ 36}$), 3 days without sight and food (9^{9}), '4 corners of the earth' (10^{11}).

iii. The Pauline Epistles. — 1. **Oratorical rhythm.**—It occurred to the present writer[*] to study the rhetorical sentences of St. Paul with the view of discovering whether any sort of preference was given to particular numbers in lists of words, phrases, or sentences. The investigation seems to show that if a preference, instinctive or conscious, is given to any number above another, it is rather to 5, 3, or even 6, than to 7. Thus in Ro $8^{29\text{f.}}$ there are 5 steps (including the *terminus a quo*) from 'foreknowledge' to 'glory,' in Ro $10^{12\text{-}15}$ the number from 'call' to 'sent' is 5. St. Paul would rather speak '5 words with understanding than 10,000 in a tongue' (1 Co 14^{19}). The grace in which the Corinthians abound and the things they are to put up with are 5 (2 Co 8^{7} 11^{20}). There are 5 things to be mortified (Col 3^{5}), 5 things to be put off, and 5 to be put on (with love as 6th) (Col $3^{8.\ 12}$), 5 good works of a widow (1 Ti 5^{10}).

Instances of 3, single or multiple, are 'faith, hope, love, these 3' (1 Co 13^{13}), the 9 fruits of the spirit in Gal $5^{22\text{f.}}$. The rhetorical questions at $6^{15\text{f.}}$ are 3. In the remarkable passage 2 Co $6^{4\text{ff.}}$ the phrases beginning with ἐν are 18, those beginning with διά are 3, while the adversative phrases beginning with ὡς are 7.

In the passage in Romans already alluded to ($8^{28\text{ff.}}$) the number from 'tribulation' to 'sword' (v.^{35}) is 7, and at 2 Co 7^{11} there are 7 exhibitions of sorrow. But, on the other hand, the number is absent where we might most expect it. Thus the weapons of the spiritual warfare in Eph $6^{13\text{ff.}}$ are 6, and the things to be thought on in Ph 4^{8} are also 6 (cf. 1 Ti 4^{12} 6^{11}).

Rhetorical examples of 4 are: Eph 6^{12} (4 powers to be resisted), Ph 3^{19} (4-fold description of the enemies of the Cross), 2 Ti 3^{16} (the profit of Scripture in 4 particulars), $2^{11\text{-}13}$ (a faithful saying in 4 conditional clauses), 2^{22} (4 things to follow after).

2. **Symbolical suggestion.**—Apart from rhetorical connexions it would appear that the numbers 3 and 4 occur most frequently, if also in part unconsciously, in a sacred connexion. In 2 Co 13^{14} we have the trinitarian benediction, and in the descriptions of God and the company in heaven a preference seems to be given to the number 3 (1 Ti 1^{17} 5^{21}). Along with the 3 graces (1 Co 13^{13}) may be placed the 3 gifts (2 Ti 1^{7}). On the other hand, in the usual form of greeting there is no reference to the Holy Spirit, but only to 'God our Father' and the 'Lord Jesus Christ' (Ro 1^{7} and all the Epistles to Churches except Galatians). In all but the three Pastoral Epistles the ingredients of the blessing are 2 (grace and peace), in the Pastorals they are 3 (grace, mercy, and peace). The better text, however, in Tit 1^{4} omits ἔλεος. The apocalyptic suggestions in the '3rd heaven' of 2 Co 12^{2}, and in the 4 dimensions of the immeasurable in Eph 3^{18}, should be noticed.

iv. The Epistle to the Hebrews.—The oratorical style of this book, where the clauses and phrases are more carefully balanced than in St. Paul's writings, would lead us to expect a preference for the perfect number 7. But here, as in the Pauline Epistles, other numbers (*e.g.* 5 and 6) are just as frequent. Thus in 11^{32} there are 7 from 'Gideon' to 'the prophets'; in 12^{18}, 7 things to which 'ye have not come.' But, on the other hand, in 7^{3} we have a 5-fold description of the King of Peace; in 7^{26}, 5 adjectives describe the High Priest, Christ; in $6^{1\text{f.}}$ we have the 'foundations' of Christian faith in 6 particulars; in 12^{22}, there are 8 or, reckoning 'Mount Zion' and the 'city of the living God' separately, 9 things to which 'ye have come.' This is the more remarkable that the author seems, pretty clearly, to associate a mystical significance with the number 7 (4^{4}).

v. The Epistle of James.—In 3^{17} there are 7 attributes of the wisdom that is from above; in 5^{17} we have, as in Lk 4^{25}, 3½ for the 3 of 1 K 17^{1}.

vi. The Second Epistle of Peter.—In $1^{5\text{ff.}}$, 7 virtues are evolved from faith; in 2^{5}, we have 'Noah the 8th person' (AV). According to Gn 5, however, Noah is the 9th or, according to the reckoning followed in Jude ^{14}, the 10th from Adam. The supposition may be hazarded that 7 generations had come to be regarded as the measure of the world before the Flood. The '8th person' begins the new world. In 3^{8}, 1 day is mentioned as the shortest period and 1,000 years as the longest (cf. Ps 90^{4}).

vii. The First Epistle of John. — In the Johannine style the sentence of 3 clauses prevails: *e.g.* $1^{6.\ 8}$ *et passim*. For examples of words and short phrases cf. 2^{10} 3^{18}, and especially 5^{8} (the '3 that bear witness on earth').

viii. The Epistle of Jude.—In v.^{14} we have 'the 7th from Adam.' The number is obtained by reckoning Adam one of the 7 (cf. Gn $5^{3\text{-}18}$).

Literature.—Artt. in *HDB*, *DCG*, and *EBi*. Of similar work in German, E. C. A. Riehm's art. 'Zahlen' in *Handwörterbuch des biblischen Altertums*, 1884, and O. Zöckler's art. 'Siebenzahl, heilige,' in *PRE*³ xviii. [1906] 310 ff., will be found specially helpful. See the latter especially on the bibliography of the subject. Of monographs may be mentioned H. Gunkel, *Zum relig.-geschichtl. Verständnis des NT*, Göttingen, 1903 (*e.g.* on the number 4, p. 43 f., and p. 81); T. K. Cheyne, *Bible Problems and the New Material for their Solution*, London, 1904; but especially A. Jeremias, *Babylonisches im NT*, Leipzig, 1905 (a sequel to *Das AT im Lichte des alten Orients*, do., 1904). Regarding this work Zöckler remarks that it is a good antidote to the extravagant Babylonism of Gunkel and Cheyne. Note, in Zöckler's bibliography, especially the references to the works of F. von Andrian ('Die Siebenzahl im Geistesleben der Völker,' in *Mitteil. der Anthropol. Gesellschaft in Wien*, vol. xxxi. [1901] pp. 225–274) and W. H. Roscher ('Die Bedeutung der Siebenzahl im Kultus und Mythus der Griechen,' in *Philologus*, 1900, pp. 260–373). On the development of number-symbolism in the Church in connexion with its ethical teaching see Zöckler, *Die Tugendlehre des Christentums geschichtlich dargestellt mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Zahlensymbolische Einkleidung ihrer Lehrformen*, Gütersloh, 1904.

L. A. Muirhead.

NURTURE.—See Chastisement.

NYMPHA, NYMPHAS.—In Col 4^{15} (AV) we read, 'Salute the brethren which are in Laodicea and Nymphas and the church in *his* house.' The proper name is found in the accusative case Νυμφαν, and may be masculine (Νυμφᾶν) or feminine

---

[*] Unaware at the time that Zöckler had carried out the same idea in his art. 'Siebenzahl' in *PRE*³ xviii. 310 ff.

(Νύμφαν). The feminine form Νύμφαν is Doric for Νύμφην, and Lightfoot (*Colossians*, p. 242) thinks it 'in the highest degree improbable' that such a Doric form should occur here; but similar forms occur in Jn 11^{5} and Ac 9^{38}, while the contracted masc. accus. Νυμφᾶν for Νύμφαδα is very rare. The question is complicated by a variety of readings in the following clause. There is strong evidence for the reading 'her' house (αὐτῆς), which is adopted by WH, RVm, Tr mg., and Ln; while T, Tr, L, and RV read 'their' house (αὐτῶν). If the correct form be 'her house,' then the name is *Nympha*, and the bearer a woman of Laodicea in whose house a number of Christians met for worship. If this be the true solution, then Nympha was a woman of the same type as Prisca at Rome (Ro 16^{3}), or Lydia at Philippi (Ac 16^{14}). The reading '*his* house' (αὐτοῦ) is found in several good MSS—DFGKL; and if this be accepted, the name is *Nymphas*, which would probably be a contracted form of Nymphodorus, as Artemas for Artemidorus, Zenas for Zenodorus, and Theudas for Theodorus. The form Nymphodorus is found by no means infrequently, while Nymphas on the other hand occurs seldom. Other names of which Nymphas might be a contraction are suggested by Lightfoot, viz. Nymphius, Nymphicus, Nymphidius, Nymphodotus, the first and last being most common. The reading 'their house' leaves the form of the name uncertain and is probably due to a change made by a scribe who included 'brethren' in the reference, while a scribe might alter the fem. αὐτῆς to αὐτοῦ under the assumption that a woman could not be referred to in this way. The more difficult reading (αὐτῆς) is probably the correct one in this case, and if so, a woman, *Nympha*, is meant by the Apostle.

LITERATURE.—J. B. Lightfoot, *Colossians and Philemon*^{2}, London, 1876, p. 242; A. S. Peake, in *EGT*, 'Colossians,' do., 1903, p. 547. Artt. in *HDB* and *EBi*, *s.v.*

W. F. BOYD.

O

OATH.—An oath may be defined as an assertion that a statement is true (Germ. *assertorischer Eid*) or shall be true (*promissorischer Eid*), or a promise of loyalty and fidelity, made binding by invocation of the Deity, or of some person or thing revered or dreaded. The motive for telling the truth may be regard for what is thus invoked (*e.g.* the honour of God) or the fear of avenging punishment. It is generally held that the latter thought is dominant and determinative, even when only implicit. In an adjuration one person states the terms of the oath and another accepts it, thus owning the solemn sanction invoked by the first party as the ground and guardian of the truth he vows to tell. The other use of the ambiguous words 'oath,' 'swear,' viz. for meaningless profanity of speech, does not immediately concern us, in spite of Mk 14^{71} (EV) (see *EBi* iii., art. 'Oath'). An oath in the primary sense guarantees truth-telling under necessity, and, like the 'necessary' lie (*Notlüge*), belongs at best to the higher, and too frequently to the lower, casuistry. A NT example of the latter, which Jesus vigorously denounced, occurs in Mt 23^{16-22}. On such casuistry, irreverence is a close attendant. To the present writer it appears that the customary views on this subject need considerable revision if they are to be harmonized with the Gospels, with justice to certain 'sects' (Quakers, Mennonites, etc.), with practical experience of the law-courts, and with the possibility that even of a thing which is 'woven into the common law' it may be necessary to say, in Milton's words (*Of Reformation touching Church Discipline*, 1641, p. 78): 'Let it weave out again.'

The chief NT passages concerned are Mt 5^{33-37}, where Jesus gives the command, 'Swear not at all,' and the parallels in 23^{16-22} and Ja 5^{12}. It is maintained by Zahn and others, with much probability, that St. James has here preserved the original words of Jesus in a purer form than St. Matthew (T. Zahn, 'Matt.,' in *Kommentar zum NT*, 1903 ff., p. 244). The chief grounds for this view are:—(1) that certain ancient writers quote the first part of Mt 5^{33-37} as it now stands, but substitute Ja 5^{12} for St. Matthew's ending; (2) that some of these writers appear not to have known this Epistle, and therefore they and St. James will have derived these words from a common source, older and better than Mt 5^{37}; (3) that Ja 5^{12} is free from an apparent inconsistency which attaches to Mt 5^{37}, for Jesus has been urging that His followers should keep to the simplest possible form of affirmation, and 'yea, yea' is not strictly that; the second 'yea' seems almost a vain repetition. On the other hand, Ja 5^{12} may possibly be secondary; for instead of 'Let your "yea" be (a reliable and unadorned) "yea" and your "nay," "nay,"' it may be rendered: 'Let yours be the "yea, yea," "nay, nay" (enjoined in Mt.).' Further, while St. Matthew's double 'yea' can scarcely be defended (but see H. H. Wendt, *The Teaching of Jesus*, Eng. tr., 1892, i. 269) as securing clearness—for what illumination does the repetition convey?—yet the emphasis added by the second word is by no means extreme, and Jesus may therefore have used it; it falls short of the 'verily' which He used so often. However this may be, the two passages yield the common and unmistakable general principle of a characteristic Christian simplicity and moderation of speech. This is further enforced by the words, 'Swear not at all' (μὴ ὅλως). Any exceptions to this strongly exclusive phrase must bear the burden of proof, and to apply it strictly in the meantime is the only natural course, and the precise reverse of 'hair-splitting' (T. Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, Eng. tr., iii. [1877] 314). This strictness is made still more binding by the parallel in St. James: 'nor by any other oath.' The forbidden oaths specified in Mt 5^{34-36} are illustrations only—selected, not exhaustive. The ground of the prohibition is the link with God which in the thoughts of our Lord's hearers (ch. 5) and also in the teaching of the Pharisees (ch. 23) had been snapped; this He replaces with reiterated emphasis. These evasive or frivolous oaths are condemned expressly because, in principle, the name of God is involved in them. The main appeal in both chapters is, as J. Köstlin (in *PRE*^{3} v. 239 f.) has already maintained, an appeal to reverence, though this is indissociably combined with the demand for veracity. All false swearing amounts indirectly to profane swearing. For it must be irreverent either because God's presence is invoked in order to make a lie more credible, or else because men adopt a formula (as in Mt 5 and 23) which seeks to exclude Him while the lie is told. The 'evil' which is the source of 'whatsoever is more than' a simple affirmation consists of casuistry and irreverence alike.

That Jesus is not attacking untruthfulness alone is further shown by this, that He offers His teaching as a conscious correction of that which had been given to the ancients, viz. that vows or oaths by God must be kept (cf. W. C. Allen, *ICC*, 'St. Matthew,'^{3} 1912, p. 53). If Jesus meant that the oath by God should be left standing (so Keim, *op. cit.* p. 311 f.) in the interests of veracity, He only confirmed the OT. Moreover, if that were His only object, then instead of 'Swear not at all' (for one cannot evade the reference to God), He would have needed to say, 'Never let any matter of importance be settled without an oath, and that directly by the name of God.'

Wendt (*op. cit.* p. 269 f.) and others hold that the oath is 'of the evil' because it implies that the truth need not be told on *other* occasions. But that seems to imply that the oath itself is not 'of the evil,' but a highly commendable act of exceptional virtue. It is true that oaths on special occasions encourage a double standard of truthfulness. This is, indeed, denied in a vigorous article by W. C. Magee (*CR* xlix. [1886] 1 ff.), in which it is maintained that oaths are only a forcible reminder of a duty which applies equally at other times; but the oath actually uttered by witnesses always concerns itself quite specially with the particular case under trial. Yet this limitation of the veracity due outside the oath cannot be the chief evil *in* the oath. That chief evil, so far as it is lying at all, must be lying which is committed in and under the oath; and this is not merely nor chiefly unveracity; by it a despite is done to God which seems to have been, in the judgment of Jesus, an additional and greater sin. Now the admissions of writers of all views show that a very large proportion of those who have strong motives for untruth will not be deterred by any oath that can be devised (cf. Magee, *op. cit.* p. 3). In any case, their testimony will be false, and thus a certain irreverence will be implied in it, but only remotely; the requirement of an oath will simply make it far more pointed and direct; for it is known beforehand that a large number, if they take an oath at all, will commit perjury; moreover, few of these perjuries will be investigated, and the number punished will be negligible. At the other end of the scale are those who would tell the truth under any circumstances—the earnest Christians whom the oath only forces into a certain lowering of tone, and the high-minded unbelievers who, when the case is over, will have been truthful in everything except in the oath by which their truthfulness is 'ensured.' And with both of these undesirable results the name of God will be concerned in a way which is at least indelicate.

The ideal of Jesus is clear. A man is to be so truthful that his possible untruthfulness need not be reckoned with, and therefore he will take no oath, nor be asked to take one. But if men will not always trust him, owing to the general lack of trustworthiness, is he or is he not to submit to this indignity (cf. Clem. Alex. *Stromata*, vii. 8, and Kant's epithet 'State blackmail' or 'civil extortion' [*bürgerliches Erpressungsmittel*] in *Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft*, 1793, p. 226; Eng. tr., 1838), in which he will feel that God is implicated? It may be said that this surrounding 'evil' of the world would make only the demanding of the oath to be wrong, not the taking of it. But any submission to or compromise with the 'evil' can be regarded as an unworthy surrender, and as itself evil. Another vital point is the shrinking attitude towards God which is taken in the oath by the explicit or implicit invocation of His powers of punishment. The question arises whether that is a Christian or a sub-Christian conception of Him; whether the Christian does not tell the truth, in the ordinary course, from far higher motives; and whether, by suddenly accepting an official injunction to 'believe and shudder' before Him whom he is usually permitted to love, he does not do an injustice to God and to himself. Magee admits that the oath has lost its power increasingly with the decline of superstitious dread (*op. cit.* p. 13 f.), and Köstlin admits that the non-swearing sects have been influenced largely by a reverence and delicacy which lie upon the unspoiled Christian spirit like bloom.

In face of all this, can the oath be re-instated by the actual practice of Jesus or of St. Paul? In the case of the latter, 'the disciple is not above his master' (see Barclay, quoted by A. Tholuck, *Sermon on the Mount*, Eng. tr., 1860, p. 261); and apart from that, the actual examples of asseveration in his Epistles are not very convincing (see H. Weinel, *St. Paul*, Eng. tr., 1906, p. 358, and C. H. Watkins, *St. Paul's Fight for Galatia*, 1914, pp. 108, 159 f.). This is especially evident at 1 Co 1^{14-16}, which, in view of the 'I thank God,' reveals a strange lack of clarity; and, where the witness is himself uncertain, strong expressions of affirmation and invocation can but add to the difficulties.

As to Jesus, it is curious that Mt 26^{63-65} should be thought so conclusive. There are two important variations in the Synoptic accounts, thus:

Mt $26^{63\text{ff.}}$	Mk $14^{61\text{f.}}$	Lk $22^{67\text{f.}}$
I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ.	Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?	Art thou the Christ? Tell us.
Thou hast said.	I am.	If I tell you, ye will not believe.

For the adjuration, we have the authority of St. Matthew alone; and an adjuration would not in any case be an ordinary oath. If one who is 'adjured' does not, by one explicit word, say that he makes the adjuration his own, it remains the utterance of the other party only, and no one can prove that he answers, or answers truly, because of it (see *HDB*, art. 'Adjure'). The Jewish use of 'Amen' in acceptance of an adjuration is often appealed to as if it occurred here (see Tholuck, *op. cit.* p. 254), but Jesus said no such word. He makes reference only to the question asked Him, not to the adjuration in itself. And is that reply explicit? According to St. Mark, He answers, 'I am (the Messiah)'; but probably St. Mark is secondary here, for Messianic utterances are usually the more confident the later they are.* Moreover, 'I am' can be understood as St. Mark's interpretation of 'Thou hast said,' but not *vice versa*. J. Weiss has argued with much force that Jesus *could* not, to any purpose, answer either 'yes' or 'no' (*Schriften des NT*^{2}, i. [1906] 393 f., 516 f.; cf. W. C. Allen on Mt 26^{63} [*op. cit.* p. 283 f.] and Swete on Mk 14^{62} [*St. Mark*^{2}, 1902]). In St. Luke this evasiveness, or indefiniteness, is patent, but in St. Matthew also the emphatic pronoun ('*Thou* hast said'—not I; cf. Lk 22^{70}) suggests that a definite answer was refused. That the high priest treated the answer (or perhaps the following prophecy) as a plain self-condemnation proves nothing except that he wished to do so (cf. Swete on Mk 14^{61} and art. CONSPIRACY). The tone of Jesus' reply is at any rate lofty, and not in the least submissive. Essentially the same reply is given by Jesus to Pilate (who has no interest in making it more definite than it is), and it is not regarded as closing the case (Mk 15^{2}, Mt 27^{11}, Lk 23^{3}).

---

* St. Mark's confidence and emphasis show how far he is from the thought of an unwilling confession extorted solely by an adjuration. He mentions no adjuration, and on his showing the question might have been answered earlier if it had been asked.

On this evidence it cannot be held, with any confidence, that Jesus accepted the adjuration, and His example does not, therefore, justify oaths in law, as distinguished from private conversation. In Mt 5 He is not dealing directly with law-courts, but we do not know that He would have exempted them from His prohibition, if questioned.

The expression *εἰ δοθήσεται σημεῖον* (literally 'if a sign shall be given') in Mk 8^{12}, if an abbreviated oath-formula, goes far to decide the practice of Jesus. In opposition, however, to Piscator's *Straf-mich-Gott-Bibel* (Herborn, 1606), and to various commentaries, it must be questioned whether the invocation of God's punishment, undoubtedly absent from His words, was present to His mind. Nothing could be more foreign to His usual attitude to the Father. Much more prominence has been assigned to His habitual expression 'Verily' (='Amen'), which He used in an unprecedented way (G. Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, Eng. tr., 1902, pp. 226–229). It lends some support to the double and thus emphatic 'yea' and 'nay' in Mt 5^{37}, though the view can scarcely be accepted (see, *e.g.*, E. Klostermann, and cf. H. J. Holtzmann, *in loc.*) that this doubling constituted not only an emphasis but an oath, for then the whole context makes v.^{37} impossible, and Ja 5^{12} must be substituted. Dalman speaks as if Jesus, feeling the need of asseveration, and embarrassed by the recollection that He had said 'Swear not at all,' fixed upon 'Amen' as an evasive but virtual oath (cf. Achelis on early 'Christian' oaths [*Christentum*, 1912, Excursus 62]). But it is only fair to suppose that Jesus regarded 'verily' as differing from the oath in principle; for by it a man neither cringes before God's punishments, nor presumptuously offers to suffer them on certain conditions of his own.

Regarding He $6^{13f.}$ $7^{20f.}$ and Rev $10^{5f.}$, from which the conclusion is often drawn that Jesus cannot have forbidden all oaths, since oath-taking is here ascribed to God and His angels, and commended when practised by men, it may be said: (1) that not all the genuine teachings of Jesus were everywhere known, understood, and practised in the churches of the 1st cent.; (2) that the Divine example, especially in the handling of something dangerous, is not always enjoined upon man. The *lex talionis* is forbidden to men that it may be left entirely to God (Mt 5^{44-45}, Ro 12^{19}, 2 Ti 4^{14}). There are also the objections that the ascription of oath-taking to God may be simply anthropomorphic—which is the very opposite of following a Divine example; and that His swearing 'by Himself' is irreconcilable with the ordinary definition of an oath (see above), for it avowedly does not include an appeal to a higher power (He 6^{13}), still less the invocation of a penalty.

Exegetically, the best conclusion is perhaps Augustine's: that to swear falsely is perdition, to swear truly is perilous, and that the only safe course is to leave the oath alone. Practical experience tends in the same direction. Defender after defender admits that perjury is committed constantly, increasingly, and with impunity. This has the most deadening effect on morality and religion alike, and there is a very general desire to limit oaths to a few matters on which truthfulness is specially vital, or to abolish preparatory oaths altogether and accept sworn testimony only to evidence already given. The latter suggestion, however, would have positively bad effects unless witnesses were solemnly reminded beforehand that they would have to take an oath afterwards; otherwise, if they had once uttered falsehood, they would almost certainly not go back on it. On the Continent there is a strong movement within the legal profession to substitute declarations for oaths (cf. F. Paulsen, *System der Ethik*$^{7.\,8}$, 1906, ii. 208–209); in certain Swiss cantons, where the experiment has been tried, false evidence has not increased. In any case, the best deterrent would be more frequent prosecutions and severer sentences for untrue witness. It would probably be best to lay upon the magistrate the duty of impressing on witnesses the seriousness of their position, but to leave him free to do this when and how he thought best. A set form becomes almost inevitably a formality. Finally, it is necessary to realize that much of the argumentation on this whole subject is double-edged. If, for instance, as the advocates of the oath say, the word 'verily' is practically the equivalent of an oath, could they not be satisfied with this equivalent? They could then, perhaps, settle the controversy by accepting as adequate some such words as these: 'Recognizing the solemn duty of truthfulness, I verily promise that the evidence which I shall give in this case shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.'

LITERATURE.—Besides the works mentioned in the art., see artt. 'Oath' in *HDB* (G. Ferries), 'Oaths' in *DCG* (G. Wauchope Stewart), and 'Eid (Ethisch)' in *RGG* (O. Scheel), with the recent literature there quoted. Reference may also be made to the Commentaries on *Matthew*, by B. Weiss^{10} (in Meyer's *Kommentar*, 1910), T. Zahn^{3} (*Kommentar zum NT*, 1910), E. Klostermann and H. Gressmann (in Lietzmann's *Handbuch zum NT*, 1909), H. J. Holtzmann^{3} (*Handkommentar zum NT*, 1901), W. C. Allen^{3} (*ICC*, 1912), A. B. Bruce (*EGT*, 1897), A. Plummer (1909); on *Mark*, by B. Weiss^{8} (in Meyer, 1892), G. Wohlenberg$^{1.\,2}$ (in Zahn, 1910), E. Klostermann and H. Gressmann (in Lietzmann, 1907), H. J. Holtzmann^{3} (*Handkom.*, 1901), E. P. Gould (*ICC*, 1896), A. B. Bruce (*EGT*, 1897), H. B. Swete (1902); on *Hebrews*, by B. Weiss^{6} (in Meyer, 1897), E. Riggenbach (in Zahn, 1913), H. Windisch (in Lietzmann, 1913), M. Dods (*EGT*, 1910); on *James*, by W. Beyschlag (in Meyer, 1897), W. O. E. Oesterley (*EGT*, 1910), R. J. Knowling (1904), J. B. Mayor (^{3}1910). See also the text-books on *Ethics* by I. A. Dorner (Eng. tr., 1887), C. E. Luthardt (Eng. tr., 1889), H. Martensen (Eng. tr., 1881–85), G. C. A. v. Harless (Eng. tr.^{6}, 1868), R. Rothe (^{2}1867–71), F. H. R. Frank (1884–87), K. Köstlin (1887), L. Lemme (1905). Nearly all the German work is marked by a strong emphasis on loyal citizenship; see especially Lemme and Frank.

C. H. WATKINS.

OBEDIENCE.—The principal word which calls for notice under this head in the apostolic writings is the noun *ὑπακοή*, with the corresponding verb, *ὑπακούω*, and adjective, *ὑπήκοος*. *ὑπακοή* is unknown in classical Greek. It occurs once in the LXX—2 S 22^{36}; in the NT it is common. Its general meaning is 'obedience' (Ro 6^{16}; cf. the verb in Eph $6^{1.\,5}$, Col $3^{20.\,22}$, 1 P 3^{6}, and Ro $6^{12.\,16}$); but it has also the special sense of submission to the Divine will, and is thus found of the obedience of Christ (Ro 5^{19}, He 5^{8}; cf. Ph 2^{8}, *ὑπήκοος*). In regard to Christians it comes to have the still more special sense of subjection to the saving will of God, as revealed in Christ, and is thus brought into close connexion with the idea of faith (cf. 1 P 1^{22}, *ὑπακοὴ τῆς ἀληθείας*; Ro 1^{5} 16^{26}, *ὑπακοὴ πίστεως*; 2 Co 10^{5}, *ὑπακοὴ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*. Cf., in the same sense, the usage of *ὑπακούω* in Ac 6^{7}, 2 Th 1^{8} 3^{14}). Finally we find *ὑπακοή* standing alone, as a mode of manifestation of Christian faith (Ro 15^{18} 16^{19}, 2 Co 7^{15} 10^{6}, Philem ^{21}, 1 P $1^{2.\,14}$; cf. the verb, Ph 2^{12}, 2 Co 7^{15}, and the adjective, 2 Co 2^{9}).

The other words signifying 'obedience' in the NT are the noun *ὑποταγή*, properly 'subjection,' and the verb *ὑποτάσσεσθαι*. These are sometimes used as synonyms for *ὑπακοή*, etc. (cf., for the noun, 2 Co 9^{13}, Gal 2^{5}, 1 Ti 2^{11} 3^{4}; and for the verb, Ro 10^{3}, Ja 4^{7}, 1 P 2^{13} 5^{5}, He 12^{9}).

In the sub-apostolic writings both series of words are found in much the same senses as in the NT. The particular circumstances of 1 Clem., an Epistle written to deal with a state of disorder in Corinth occasioned by the insurrection of some of the younger men of the Church against the elders, bring it about that the virtue of obedience and subjection is particularly commended in this Epistle (cf. ix. 3, x. 2, 7, xix. 1, lxiii. 1, etc.). The keynote of the whole Epistle is struck in xiv. 1, when it is said: 'It is just and right, brethren, that we should rather become obedient unto God than follow those who in vainglory and sedition have become the leaders of a detestable emulation' (cf. also Ign. *Eph.* ii. 2, where subjection [ὑποταγῇ] to Christ is the same thing as subjection to the bishop and the presbytery).

In conclusion, reference may be made to a passage in which Thomas Aquinas endeavours to define the special virtue of obedience (*Summa Theologiæ*, II. ii. quæst. 104, art. 2).

> 'To all good works, which have a special ground of praiseworthiness, a special virtue is assigned. For this is what properly belongs to a virtue, that it renders a good work. But to obey one's superior is a debt we owe in accordance with the Divine order immanent in things; and as a consequence is good. . . . The act we are considering has, however, a special ground of praiseworthiness on account of its special object. For while inferiors have many duties towards their superiors, amongst the rest there is one duty in particular, that they are required to obey their commandments. Wherefore obedience is a special virtue, and its special object is the commandment, whether implicit or explicit. For the will of the superior however made known is in a way an implicit command: and obedience appears so much the more ready, in proportion as it anticipates an explicit command by obeying, when the will of the superior is perceived.'

It is this obedience not merely to the express commands of God, but to whatever is understood to be His will, which constitutes true Christian obedience, which is an obedience from the heart (Ro 6^{17}), an obedience even of the thoughts (2 Co 10^{5}).

LITERATURE.—H. Cremer, *Bibl.-Theol. Lexicon of NT Greek*^{3}, 1880; H. E. Manning, *Sermons*, 1844, pp. 117, 129, 287; R. Whately, *The Use and Abuse of Party Feeling in Matters of Religion*, 1859, pp. 167, 196; J. H. Newman, *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, 1868, i. 228, viii. 201; F. W. Robertson, *Sermons*, 2nd ser., 1875, p. 94; J. Martineau, *Hours of Thought*, 1879, ii. 79; P. Brooks, *The Light of the World*, 1891, p. 340; W. R. Inge, *All Saints' Sermons*, 1907, p. 172; B. P. Browne, *The Essence of Religion*, 1911, p. 209; A. B. D. Alexander, *Christianity and Ethics*, 1914, p. 164.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

OCCUPATION.—See LABOUR, WORK.

ODES OF SOLOMON.—It was in 1909 that Rendel Harris, whose researches in the domain of Christian antiquities have been so fruitful, enriched the learned world by the discovery of a collection of forty-two old Syriac hymns known as 'The Odes of Solomon.' Since their publication many useful essays by eminent scholars have been written to elucidate the difficult questions attaching to a composition which reflects the state of mind of communities belonging to so early a period as the first centuries of the Christian era. The result of these discussions has unfortunately not been such as to lead to unanimity of judgment. We shall try to analyze the principal theories, and examine which of them seems to be most in accordance with the original text and with the general course of ecclesiastical history.

1. Manuscripts and principal editions of the Odes.—The MS * from which Rendel Harris published his first and second editions is not very ancient. It cannot be older than the 15th cent.; but apart from occasional passages which point to a corruption of some words by careless copyists, it exhibits generally a text which can be relied upon for critical purposes. It is written in Syro-Occidental letters, and its editor tells us that it came from the valley of the Tigris, in Northern Mesopotamia. It is truncated at the beginning and at the end. Odes i. and ii. and some lines of Ode iii. are missing; these stood, with the title of the book, on the three leaves which are lost at the beginning.

In 1911 Harris published a second edition, revised and enlarged, of the text, with a facsimile of Odes xxvi. 13–14, xxvii. 1–4. In the same year H. Grimme edited the Syriac text at Heidelberg, and translated it into Hebrew, with the intention of showing that the Syriac version was dependent on a Hebrew original. In 1914 Kittel published, at the close of a discussion of the Odes, a glossary of the words used in the text.*

At the moment of writing we are informed that a third edition is being published at Oxford for the Rylands Library, with a complete reproduction in facsimile of all the pages of the MS. We expect that this publication will answer a legitimate *desideratum* felt everywhere for a critical *editio princeps*, which, so far as the text and its literal translation are concerned, will be a safe guide to all students of Christian antiquities and a solid basis for subsequent researches.

Besides the Syriac text, five Odes are preserved in Coptic in a fantastic book entitled *Pistis Sophia*. These are Odes i., v., vi., xxii., and xxv., which are not only quoted and given a Gnostic interpretation in that book, but cited as Solomon's and commented on *in extenso* as if they were canonical portions of the Bible. The sentence which introduces them is *προεφήτευσε per Salomonem*, the subject being *vis luminis*.

In April, 1912, F. C. Burkitt published in the *JThSt* some variants, from a MS of the Nitrian collection in the British Museum, previously described by the skilled hand of W. Wright (Cod. Mus. Brit. Add. 14, 538). This new MS, dating probably from the 10th to the 13th cent., is very important, but it frequently exhibits a truncated text, as many words are quite illegible, and it begins only at Ode xvii. 7. Being more ancient than Cod. H, it occasionally exhibits readings which, for critical reasons, have commended themselves to scholars.

As to the modern versions made upon these texts, besides the works that we have mentioned concomitantly with the editions of the original, the following publications appear to be the most important. (1) 'Ein jüdisch-christlich Psalmbuch aus dem ersten Jahrhundert,' in *TU*, new ser., v. 4 [1910]. The translation is by J. Flemming, and the critical study by A. Harnack. (2) G. Diettrich, 'Eine jüdisch-christliche Liedersammlung aus dem apostolischen Zeitalter,' in *Die Reformation*, ix. [1910]. (3) *Les odes de Salomon*: separate edition of articles printed in *RB* vii. [1910] 483 ff., viii. [1911] 5 ff., 161 ff. The translation is due to J. Labourt, and the critical study to P. Batiffol. (4) F. Schulthess, 'Textkritische Bemerkungen zu den syrischen Oden Salomos,' in *ZNTW* xi. [1910]. This study contains some valuable remarks, its author being a good Semitic scholar. (5) A. Ungnad and W. Stärk, 'Die Oden Salomos,' in *Kleine Texte für theol. und phil. Vorlesungen und Übungen*, lxiv. [1910]. (6) J. H. Bernard, 'The Odes of Solomon,' in *TS* viii. 3 [1912].

In addition, hundreds of useful articles are to be found in theological magazines of Germany, Great Britain, and France; and all of them testify to the importance of these beautiful Odes for Christian dogma. No book, not even the *Teaching of the Apostles*, has excited so keen an interest among Christian students; and its discovery is to be placed, from a theological point of view, among the events of which the 20th cent. may justly be proud. So far as the text is concerned, few amendments worth noticing have been suggested, and the very few linguistic difficulties that the original offers will remain for a long time insoluble, owing to the scarcity of MSS and the lack of exact Patristic quotations.

---

* This MS has been recently acquired by the Governors of the John Rylands Library of Manchester, and is at present found there as Cod. Syriac, 9.

* G. Kittel, *Die Oden Salomos*, Leipzig, 1914.

2. Character of the Odes.—Three principal theories as to the nature of the Odes have been launched by scholars since their publication. (*a*) The first theory, put forward by Harnack, and fully endorsed by Grimme, considers them a Jewish composition, interpolated towards the end of the 1st cent. by a Christian hand. (*b*) The second theory regards them as entirely Christian hymns, and Bernard, a well-known holder of this view, goes so far as to believe them to be hymns recited by new proselytes, for baptismal purposes.

‘The conclusion which seems to the present writer to emerge most clearly from an examination of the Odes is, . . . that they are baptismal hymns intended for use in public worship, either for catechumens or for those who have recently been baptized. . . . A few parallelisms here and there might be set down to chance, but when we find that this scheme of interpretation, applied to every Ode, provides a consistent explanation of their phraseology in every case, and in some cases illuminates obscure phrases for which no other explanation has been suggested, we are entitled to claim for it serious consideration’ (*op. cit.* p. 42). ‘The *Odes* do not differ in this respect from Ephraim’s baptismal hymns’ (*ib.* p. vi).

(*c*) The third theory, upheld by Harris, who put it forward at the very beginning, considers the Odes (or most of them) to be the work of a Jewish-Christian, but rejects entirely the idea of an Ebionite source.

Before we try to form a judgment as to which of these three principal theories is likely to receive most support, it is useful to know how the Odist introduces his subject, what person he uses in speaking, and what kind of man he believes himself to be.

In Ode xx. the author speaks as a priest of the Most High: ‘I am a priest of the Lord, and to Him I do priestly service: and to Him I offer the sacrifice of His thought.’ In the following Ode the writer believes himself to be a bondman that God has released by His grace: ‘My arms I lifted up on high, even to the grace of the Lord: because He had cast off my bonds from me.’ In Ode xlii. we read the following lines: ‘I stretched out my hands and approached my Lord: for the stretching of my hands is His sign: my expansion is the outspread wood which was set up on the way of the Righteous One. And I became of no account to those who know me, for I shall not reveal myself to those who did not take hold of me; and I shall be with those who love me. All my persecutors are dead; and they have sought me who announced me,* because I live, and I rose and am with them; and I will speak by their mouths. . . . And I was not rejected, though I was reckoned to be so. . . . Death cast me up, and many along with me. I was gall and bitterness to him.’ Few will read these passages without immediately thinking of Christ as the speaker.

In many other passages the Christ is spoken of in the third person. Ode xxiv.: ‘The Dove fluttered over the Christ, because He was her head; and she sang over Him, and her voice was heard.’

In some passages the tone of the Odist is homiletic and didactic, referring, as in some prophetical books, neither directly nor indirectly to Christ. Ode xxiii.: ‘Joy is of the saints! and who shall put it on, but they alone? Grace is of the elect! and who shall receive it, except those who trust in it from the beginning? Love is of the elect! and who shall put it on, except those who have possessed it from the beginning? Walk ye in the knowledge of the Most High, and you shall know the grace of the Lord without grudging.’ This change of tone may have been one of the reasons which gave birth to the theory of interpolation referred to above. But, as Syriac hymnology constantly exhibits this characteristic of an interchange of speakers, no serious conclusion can be drawn from it in favour either of diversity of authorship or of the theory of interpolation. On the contrary, the main idea which may be gathered from a group of three or four Odes remains the same throughout, and the author lays stress continually on the same theme. The features which principally strike a reader of the Odes, besides some general counsels of piety, may be summarized as follows.

(1) *Love.*—iii. 2–4: ‘And my members are with him. And on them do I hang, and He loves me: for I should not have known how to love the Lord, if He had not loved me. For who is able to distinguish love, except the one that is loved?’ vi. 2: ‘So speaks in my members the Spirit of the Lord, and I speak by His love.’ See, further, viii. 2, 14, 23; xi. 2; xii. 11; xvi. 4; xviii. 1; xxiii. 3; x. 7.

(2) *Knowledge.*—vi. 5: ‘The Lord has multiplied the knowledge of Himself, and is zealous that these things should be known, which by His grace have been given to us.’ vii. 24: ‘For ignorance hath been destroyed, because the knowledge of the Lord hath arrived.’ See, further, vii. 4; viii. 13; xi. 4; xii. 3; xv. 5; xxiii. 4.

(3) *Faith.*—viii. 11: ‘Keep my secret, ye who are kept by it.’ iv. 5: ‘Thou hast given thy heart, O Lord, to thy believers: never wilt thou fail, nor be without fruits: for one hour of thy Faith is more precious than all days and years.’ See, further, xvi. 5; xxviii. 4; xxix. 6; xxxix. 11; xli. 1; xlii. 12.

(4) *Truth.*—viii. 9: ‘Hear the word of truth, and receive the knowledge of the Most High.’ xxxviii. 1–7: ‘I went up to the light of truth as if into a chariot: and the Truth took me and led me. . . . And it went with me and made me rest, and suffered me not to wander, because it was the Truth. . . . And I did not make an error in anything because I obeyed the Truth; for Error flees away from it, and meets it not: but the Truth proceeds in the right path.’ See, further, ix. 8; xi. 3, 4; xii. 1, 11, 12; xvii. 5, 7; xxv. 10; xxxii. 2; xxxiii. 8.

(5) *Rest.*—iii. 6: ‘And where His rest is, there also am I.’ xi. 10: ‘And the Lord renewed me in His raiment, and possessed me by His light, and from above He gave me rest in incorruption.’ See, further, xx. 8; xxvi. 13; xxviii. 4; xxx. 2; xxxvi. 1; xxxvii. 4; xxxviii. 4.

(6) *Grace.*—v. 2–3: ‘O most High, thou wilt not forsake me, for thou art my hope: freely I have received thy grace, I shall live thereby.’ iv. 7: ‘For who is there that shall put on thy grace, and be hurt?’ See, further, vii. 12, 25; ix. 5; xi. 1; xv. 8; xx. 7; xxi. 1; xxiii. 2; xxv. 4; xxxiii. 1; xxxiv. 6.

Many allusions are made to *crowns* or *garlands* (see i. 1; v. 10; ix. 8; xvii. 1; xx. 7); several passages are found also in which the Christian is compared to a *harp* on which the Spirit seeks to play (see vi. 1; xiv. 8; xxvi. 3). The idea of God being a *helper* of man is also expressed in many verses (see vii. 3; viii. 7; xxi. 1; xxv. 2). For the *transfiguration of the face of the believer*, see xvii.; xxi.; xl.; xli. For the *offering to God of the fruit of the lips* (He 13^{15}) see viii.; xii.; xiv.; xvi. For the figure of *milk from the breasts of God*, see viii.; xiv.; xix.; xxxv.; iv. For the *joy felt by good people*, see xxxii.; vii.; xxxiii. On the *rescue from bonds* effected by Christ, see below. For the *peace* in which true believers shall live, see viii.; ix.; xxxv. 2; x. 2. On the good *fruits* to be offered to the Lord, see xiv.; xi.; viii. 3; xxxviii. 18. On the *light* of the Lord, see vii.; viii.; xii. 3; xxv. 7; xl. 6; x. 7. For the *putting on of Christ*, see vii.; xii.; xi. 10; xxxiii. 10. On the *hope* of the believer, see xxix.; v. 2, etc.

These are the ordinary themes that the Odist emphasizes chiefly, and it is difficult to find an Ode in which the above scheme is not explicitly developed. They constitute a kind of spiritual mysticism, of which the Johannine writings and some Pauline doctrines convey a vague but true idea. We cannot find in them any clear implication of sacramentalism, or any special interest in legal observances, either Judaic or Christian; but, as the reader has already surmised, all the forty-two Odes are closely joined together in a series whose keynote is the Johannine theology and experience.

---

* Or ‘set their hope on me.’

The ideal of holiness, of which the Odist is the champion, is so marked in all the Odes that it appears very difficult not to ascribe the whole collection to a single man. It seems, therefore, that the theory of interpolation launched by Harnack has little to commend it. On the contrary, a study of the Syriac text makes it highly probable that all the verses which have been bracketed as Christian interpolations of a Jewish composition are in spirit, thought, and vocabulary so intimately related to the genuine passages that nothing short of identity of authorship can satisfactorily account for them (cf. R. H. Connolly in *JThSt* xiii. [1912] 298 ff.).

Harnack's hypothesis postulates many things that even *a priori* are not to be easily admitted. We have seen that the thread of the narrative is unmistakably one throughout the book; to suppose that a second writer changed some verses that savoured of Judaism and gave them a Christian tone, or to believe that he interpolated existing passages with sentences altogether opposed in spirit to those he wished to modify, would imply that this second writer was a consummate artist. He had to conform his thoughts and his phraseology, and sometimes to assimilate even his personality, to that of the Jewish Odist; both writers must have been deeply influenced by the same Johannine atmosphere; and the Christian interpolator must have lived in a *milieu* not far removed from that of the original Jewish writer. All these are suppositions for which stronger evidence is demanded.

The passages which Harnack considers as Christian interpolations are the following: iii. 9; vii. 4–8, 14, 15, 18; viii. 23–26; ix. 2; x. 4–6, 8; xvii. 10–14, 15; xix.; xxiii. 16, 19; xxiv. 1; xxvii.; xxix. 6–7, 8; xxxi. 3–11; xxxvi. 3; xxxix. 10; xli. 1–7, 11–17; xlii. 1–3, 17–25. We shall examine the last passage (xlii. 17–25), which, according to Harnack, exhibits the most distinct traces of interpolation:

> 'Sheol saw me and was made miserable: Death cast me up and many along with me; I was gall and bitterness to him, and I went down with him to the utmost of his depths: and the feet and the head he let go, for they were not able to endure my face: and I made a congregation of living men amongst his dead men, and I spake with them by living lips: in order that my word might not be void: and those who had died ran towards me: and they cried and said, Son of God, have pity on us and do with us according to thy kindness, and bring us out from the bonds of darkness: and open to us the door by which we shall come out to thee. For we see that our death has not touched thee. Let us also be redeemed with thee: for thou art our Redeemer.'

Before we compare this passage with other verses of the Odes which exhibit the same idea, it is useful to notice that the *Descensus ad inferos* which is so clearly represented in these verses is one of the commonest themes of the Syrian writers when speaking of the death of Christ. The breviaries of the two branches of the Syrian Church are full of such ideas, and the Syrian Fathers deal with them in more than one homily. Two citations will suffice for our purpose: 'He bought us and saved us by His precious blood, and He went down to Sheol, and loosed the bonds of death' (*Missale juxta Ritum Ecclesiæ Syrorum Orientalium*, Mosul, 1901, p. 76); 'O Living One who went down to the dwelling of the dead, and who proclaimed good hope to the souls which were bound in Sheol . . . and who by His death rent asunder the tombs and quickened the dead' (*Breviarium Chaldaicum*, Paris, 1887, vol. ii. p. 370). Then follows on the same page a long hymn in which all the good men of the OT are summoned to rise and look at their Saviour. See, further, the following passages of Syrian authors which would be too long to quote here: *Acts of Judas Thomas*, ed. W. Wright, London, 1871, pp. 155, 288; *S. Ephræmi Syri Hymni et Sermones*, ed. T. J. Lamy, Malines, 1882–1902, vol. i. p. 145, etc. For Aphrahat, see *Patrologia Syriaca*, ed. R. Graffin, Paris, 1894, vol. i. col. 524, etc.

Many other verses of the Odes contain indubitable allusions to the idea of Christ loosing bonds and descending into Hades, and, if we try to detach these from their context, the whole structure of the passage breaks down. For instance, Ode xvii.: 'And from thence He gave me the way of His footsteps and I opened the doors that were closed, and brake in pieces the bars of iron; but my iron melted and dissolved before me; nothing appeared closed to me: because I was the door of everything. And I went over all my bondmen to loose them; that I might not leave any man bound or binding: . . . and they were gathered to me and were saved; because they were to me as my own members and I was their Head.' Ode xxii.: 'He who scattered my enemies and my adversaries: He who gave me authority over bonds that I might loose them . . . and thy hand has levelled the way for those who believe in thee: and thou didst choose them from the graves and didst separate them from the dead. Thou didst take dead bones and didst cover them with bodies; they were motionless, and thou didst give (them) energy for life.' See, further, Odes xv., xxv., xxi., x.

The numerous verses of the Odes which contain allusions to the remaining eighteen topics mentioned above exhibit the whole collection as so coherent in its unity that any critic who should seriously try to break it up into different pieces would find himself face to face with strong and sometimes unanswerable objections.

On the other hand, Bernard's theory, while recognizing the perfect unity of the Odes and their Christian character, assigns to them too narrow a scope in restricting them to exclusively baptismal purposes. The nineteen features already mentioned, which, generally speaking, form the essence of the Odes, are cast into a baptismal mould, by means of some coincidences of speech found in the style of Christian Fathers or in the phraseology of baptismal rituals. An example will show the nature of this process. In the first verses of the first Syriac Ode (iii.) we find the following passage: 'I love the Beloved, and my soul loves Him.' To prove that this verse alludes to baptism, a sentence is cited from the book entitled *Exposition of Baptism* by the Syrian writer Moses Bar Kéfa (9th cent.): 'The betrothals of Rebecca, Rachel, and Zipporah were beside water. So also are the betrothals of the Holy Church beside the waters of Baptism.' Several other alleged coincidences are much nearer the point. For instance, as parallels to the following sentence of the same Ode, 'for he that is joined to Him that is immortal, will also himself become immortal,' a quotation from Clement and another from Ephrem are cited which run thus: 'Being baptized, we are illuminated; illuminated, we become sons; being made sons, we are made perfect; being made perfect, we are made immortal' (*Pæd.* i. 6); 'Go down to the fountain of Christ, and receive life in your members, as armour against death' (*Epiphany Hymns*, vii. 17). For many other verses there are even stronger Patristic quotations, but in the opinion of the present writer none of them can be regarded as decisive. On theoretical grounds this hypothesis has to face the following objections.

(1) It is scientifically inexplicable that a book written for baptismal purposes should not so much as name baptism, or even allude with any clearness to immersion, aspersion, or affusion, essential ceremonies of this sacrament. Bernard answers this objection by falling back on the so-called *disciplina arcani.* But such an argument is a *dernier ressort.* Why should we extend the 'secret discipline' to the simple practice of washing with water represented in Israelite circles by various ablutions with which the commonest pagan was familiar? How then could Tertullian have written his treatise *de Baptismo*? The field that this theory gives to the *disciplina arcani* is probably too extensive to be taken seriously into consideration.

> 'There is no trace of this "reserve" or *disciplina arcani* in the writers of the New Testament, who never shun to declare unto us the whole counsel of God. We do not find it either in the subapostolic Fathers; and Justin has no hesitation in fully describing the observance of the Lord's Supper in writing to the heathen emperor. Yet he tells us that Baptism was already called φωτισμός (illumination)—the technical term for initiation in the mysteries. Clement speaks of Christianity as a mystery, and uses freely the language of the mysteries in the invitation to the heathen which is the peroration of his *Protrepticus*' (H. M. Gwatkin, *Early Church History*, 2 vols., London, 1909, i. 272 f.).

(2) We are also unable to subscribe to the possibility of a constant relation between the Odes and the Baptismal Hymns of St. Ephrem. The hymns of this Father, written exclusively for baptism, contain always in their tone allusions which unmistakably refer to this sacrament, while the Odes are devoid of anything that would turn the thought of a reader in this direction.

There are two verses which might seem to point to baptismal practices. Ode xxiv. 1: 'The Dove fluttered over the Christ, because He was her head; and she sang over Him, and her voice was heard.' Ode vi. 17: 'And in water they lived an eternal life.' But it is obvious that the first quotation refers to the baptism of Christ in the same manner as other Odes refer to the mysteries of the Incarnation or of redemption; and we are not entitled to infer from it that either this Ode or the whole collection has any special interest in the ritual of baptism. As to the second quotation, it is possible that it alludes to the grace of God, and by extension, to Christian doctrine, the word 'water' being frequently used in Syriac literature to express this idea. St. Ephrem, speaking of Judas, says: 'He drank living water' (*Breviarium Chaldaicum*, ii. 380). At all events, even if the word 'water' be taken in its material sense, it affords no support for the notion that the forty-two Odes as a whole were written for baptismal purposes.

With regard to the third theory, the only passage that might suggest the work of a Jewish, or, more probably, a Jewish-Christian writer, is the following (Ode iv.): 'No man, O my God, changeth thy holy place; and it is not [possible] that he should change it and put it in another place: because he hath no power over it: for thy sanctuary Thou hast designed before Thou didst make places: that which is the elder shall not be altered by those that are younger than itself.' These sentences seem to allude to the Temple of Solomon, the principal place of worship for Judaism. No other verse points with any clearness to a Judaizing writer; but the above statement is precise, and we cannot wholly ignore it. On the other hand, allusions to Christian mysteries and Christian doctrine in general are, as we shall see, numerous and undoubted, and compel us not to exclude from our mind a Christian author. Our Odes are separate hymns, extolling sometimes special articles of faith, but exhibiting always a high ideal of mysticism. By their outward form they are not linked closely together, and we could invert the order in the MS without doing the slightest injury to the sense. In this respect they resemble their prototype, the canonical Psalms of the prophet king, and there is no internal evidence to prevent us from holding that they are simply an attempt to imitate, in Christian circles, the Davidic Psalms.

3. The original language of the Odes.—The question of the original language of the Odes is very important, because it may furnish a good starting-point for the solution of many problems dealing with the country, the age, and the aim of the whole collection. Critics here again have adopted three different views. The majority (but we ought to say at once that some of them are not good Semitic scholars) hold to a Greek original. A second opinion, represented by Grimme, favours Hebrew, this theory being essential to the establishing of a Jewish authorship. The present writer has ventured to suggest that Aramaic may have been the language in which they were originally written.[*]

Before we discuss this tangled question, a preliminary remark will not be out of place. After the invasion of Palestine, Syria, and neighbouring countries by the Hellenic troops, under the leadership of Alexander, the Greek language acquired a firm footing in these countries, and from the time of the Seleucids onwards it began to supersede, in great centres, the Canaanitish and Aramaic dialects which were doomed to disappear. Thousands of Greek words were introduced into Aramaic, which had come to be the vernacular of all the Semitic tribes, inclusive of the remnants of the once prosperous people of Jahweh. The ordinary population spoke Aramaic, and the sacred national documents were written also in Aramaic, but the official decrees and the general regulations of the State were worded, at least at the beginning of the Christian era, in Greek. This fact is not surprising; Hellenic culture had, with the glorious arms of the Macedonian hegemony, conquered the old civilized world, and in Rome itself it was considered an honour to speak the language of Homer. The Aramæans were far more influenced by this current than any other Semitic people, and distinct traces of Hellenism are frequent in books originally written in Aramaic, or directly translated from the Hebrew. The OT Peshiṭta is an irrefragable testimony to this assertion, and the literary compositions of Aphrahaṭ and Ephrem, in which Greek words and Greek expressions are counted by hundreds, would not tend to weaken it. The instance of these two writers, who could not even understand Greek, may easily be extended to scores of poems and historical lucubrations, of which Edessa and the neighbouring countries are justly proud. But in this matter there is a difference between the style of a writer who knew Greek and that of one who did not. How deep, for instance, is the gap between the stylistic method adopted by Ephrem in his hymns, and that used by Narsai in his homilies. As concerns the style of the Odes, we may assume that it is not moulded on that of Ephrem, but it would be precarious to assert that it is completely foreign to that of Narsai, or of Bardesanes. The only conclusion that we can safely draw from the arguments of some critics for a Greek original of the Odes, is that their problematic author was a man of good Hellenic culture; and, as a matter of fact, in Syria and in Palestine, from the 1st to the 8th cent., the writers were few who were without any Hellenic culture.

We may open our discussion with an examination of Grimme's theory of a Hebrew original. In spite of the excellence of his Hebrew translation of the Syriac text, we are unable to discern any strong philological foundations for his view. His argument is two-fold. He tries, first of all, to find in the Odes an acrostic arrangement of their reconstructed text, which should suggest a dependence of the Syriac upon the supposed Hebrew.

---

[*] 'Quelques mots sur les odes de Salomon,' in *ZNTW* xiv. [1914] 234 ff.

Here is the order of this complicated acrostic system : Ode i. begins with א ; Ode ii. and the beginning of Ode iii. are missing. Odes iv. and v. have again א ; Odes vi. and vii. have a ב ; Odes viii., ix. ג ; Odes x., xi., xii., xiii., xiv. a ה ; Odes xv., xvi., xvii. a ג ; Ode xviii. a ה ; Odes xix., xx., xxi. a כ ; Odes xxii., xxiii. a ס ; Odes xxiv., xxv., xxvi. a ג ; Ode xxvii. a פ ; Ode xxviii. a כ ; Ode xxix. a שׂ ; Odes xxx., xxxi., xxxii., xxxiii. a שׂ ; Ode xxxiv. an א ; Ode xxxv. a ר ; Ode xxxvi. a ג ; Ode xxxvii. a פ ; Ode xxxviii. a ע ; Ode xxxix. a ג ; Ode xl. a כ ; Ode xli. a י ; Ode xlii. a פ.

The reader will readily observe that, despite the good will of the editor, this alphabetical arrangement is very defective, and we cannot rely upon it for critical purposes. If in the future other scholars should undertake, with better success, a Hebrew translation which would exhibit this acrostic system in a more constant manner, then the same method might be applied to the Aramaic language generally. Moreover, this acrostic arrangement is much in use in Syriac literature ; several hymns of Ephrem, all the poems called *soghiathas*, and innumerable other literary compositions, exhibit such an acrostic system (cf. *Brev. Chald.* vols. i., ii., iii. pp. 35, 185, 195 f. ; A. Mingana, *Narsai Homiliæ et Carmina*, Mosul, 1905, vol. ii. *ad fin.*); the idea might have been suggested to Aramæan writers from some poems of the OT which exhibit this strophic arrangement, but the work of these Aramæans is independent of a Hebrew text, and does not involve a Hebrew original.

Grimme's second argument is more scientific. He brings forward a number of morphological and syntactical features which, according to him, point to an original Hebrew text. It would take too long to examine in detail every word that he quotes to corroborate his opinion, but we may be allowed to say that none of the 35 instances that he gives carries conviction. He emphasizes, and very justly, the fact of the double meanings of some Hebrew words, in order to deduce from them the explanation of some grammatical and lexicological difficulties of the Syriac text, but we shall wait until more convincing proofs are given to Syriac scholars. But, although Grimme's theory is certainly not in all points invulnerable, it has opened the way for further investigation in the domain of the general Semitic stock.

Those in favour of a Syriac original support their view by the following proofs.

(1) There is a constant relation between the style of the Odes and Syriac hymnology in general. Syrian and Arab writers are fond of repeating the same word several times in one sentence, to make it and the principal idea expressed by it more emphatic. Confining ourselves to Syriac literature, we may see, for instance, how the word meaning 'star' is repeated seven times by Ephrem in two lines of a hymn which is preserved in *Brev. Chald.* (vol. i. p. 338) ; the word meaning 'man' and the verb meaning 'to eat' are repeated four and three times respectively in one line of a homily of Narsai (the present writer's edition, vol. i. p. 21). When we examine the Odes, we find that this characteristic note occurs more than once in the text. Ode xxxviii. repeats the word meaning 'to corrupt' five times in one short verse ; the verb meaning 'to impede' is repeated three times in another verse of Ode vi., etc.

(2) There is a constant use by the writer of the *mimmed infinitive*, or of the *noun of action* derived from the verb immediately following this verb, to give energy to the sentence, *e.g.*, 'the error erred' (Ode xxxi.), 'the truth flowed as a flow of water' (Ode xii.). There are in all 24 verses in which this linguistic phenomenon is represented, and if some of them may be explained by the too pronounced freedom of the translator, as is sometimes the case in books translated from the Greek, it is highly uncritical to suppose that all of them are a play of words invented by the translator.

(3) There are some words which seem to point in an indubitable manner to an Aramæo-Syriac original. Ode xix. contains the following remarkable passage : 'She did not require a midwife, because Himself facilitated her pains.' The word 'midwife' (in Syriac, 'the living,' the 'giver of life') is derived from the verb which comes just after it : 'He facilitated her pains' (in Syriac, 'He gave life'). This curious derivation would have been impossible in any other language than Aramaic. This sentence, in the absence of any adequate objection, is decisive.

The supporters of a Greek original point to certain incidences of speech of which the following are the most striking.

(1) There are some Syriac words which, in their present context, do not explain or amplify the idea that the Odist had in mind. Three principal instances are given in proof of this assertion. In Ode vii. the expression 'by His simplicity' would be used to translate the phrase *ἐν τῇ ἁπλότητι αὐτοῦ*. In Ode xxxiv. the sentence 'No way is hard where there is a simple heart, nor is there any wound in right thoughts' would contain the Greek words *ἁπλοῦς* for 'simple' and *ἔκπληξις* for 'wound'; the expression 'in the midst' in Ode xxx., 'and until it (the spring of water) was given in the midst, (they did not recognize it),' would be also a translation of a Greek *εἰς τὸ μέσον τιθέναι*, because such an expression, it is said, is not Semitic.

(2) Great stress is laid on the use of the privative *alpha*. It is suggested that almost all the words beginning in Syriac with the negative particle are a translation from the Greek. The Syriac expression meaning 'without grudging,' 'abundantly,' which is employed several times in the Odes (cf. Ode xi.), would be the Greek *ἀφθόνως* ; the word 'indescribable' in the sentence 'the swiftness of the Word is indescribable' would be a translation of *ἀνεκδιήγητος*. We must remark, however, that the first expression is found twice in the *Book of the Laws of Countries* of Bardesanes, which is surely a genuine Syriac composition.

We do not wish to dwell on some other Hellenic features discovered in the book of the Odes, such as the concept of 'taking refuge,' which is the real meaning in the first verse of Ode xxv., while the Syriac verb suggests only the idea of 'fleeing'; likewise the argument taken from the employment of the possessive particle, which is used eight times only in all the Odes, does not seem to be convincing. Cf. on this question the article of Connolly in *JThSt* xiv. [1913] 530, and that of D. Willey, *ib.* p. 293 ff. ; and cf. it with our study referred to above.

Finally, on account of the remarkable variants which sometimes differentiate the Syriac and the Coptic versions from one another, the supporters of a Greek original need also to resort to the hypothesis of two different Greek texts, one underlying the Coptic version preserved in *Pistis Sophia*, and another underlying the Syriac version of our MSS. This is a fact worthy of study ; and, so far as we are aware, no sufficient explanation of it has been given. On the other hand, as Harris has rightly pointed out, a sacred book entitled *Ψαλμοὶ καὶ Ὠδαὶ Σολομῶντος* is mentioned by pseudo-

Athanasius, and in the *Stichometry* of Nicephorus (9th cent.). On the hypothesis that this title refers to our Syriac Odes, it is almost certain that a Greek version was in circulation several centuries before the time of these ecclesiastical writers.

4. Their relation to the Bible. — Though the main ideas that the Odist expresses are drawn from figures used in the Old and New Testaments, no direct quotation from a sacred book can be clearly pointed out; it would almost seem that the author had made up his mind not to use quotations. A list of the principal semi-quotations, or, as Wellhausen calls them, 'Biblisms,' will be found below.

The title itself, 'Odes of Solomon,' brings the whole collection, at least in the mind of the copyists and of some ecclesiastical writers, such as Lactantius, into relation with the Bible. The last-named writer seems to have believed the Odes to be as canonical and authoritative for Christian doctrine as the Davidic Psalter. No sufficient explanation has yet been given of their attribution to Solomon, in preference to all other sacred writers. The question is not in itself very important; but, if it were cleared up, the problem might prove not to be devoid of interest with regard to many obscure points arising from this precious discovery.

Critics have generally fallen back, in this matter, on the statement of 1 K 4^{32}, in which we are informed that Solomon wrote 1005 odes. Solomon was known to have written odes, and our actual Odes, by a natural course of events, readily assumed his name. This assumed Solomonic authorship would account, as F. C. Burkitt (*JThSt* xiii.) has pointed out, for the obstinate silence that the anonymous writer maintains with regard to some elementary Christian practices and his avoidance of any clear prophetical or evangelical quotations.

All this is pure speculation; the important point is that no proper biblical name and no direct biblical quotations are to be noticed in the Odes, though their nucleus mainly consists of biblical elements. On this subject the most striking semi-quotations are the following:

Ode v. 8: 'For they have devised a counsel, and it did not succeed' (cf. Ps 21^{11}).

Ode xxvi. 11: 'Who is able to interpret the wonders of the Lord?' (cf. Ps 106^{2}).

Ode xxix. 10: 'Like the stubble which the wind carries away' (cf. Ps 1^{4}).

Ode xxix. 1: 'The Lord is my hope: in Him I shall not be confounded' (cf. Ps 71^{1}).

Ode xiv. 1: 'As the eyes of a son to his father, so are my eyes, O Lord, at all times towards thee' (cf. Ps 123^{2}).

Ode xvii. 8: 'I opened the doors that were closed, and brake in pieces the bars of iron' (cf. Is 45^{2}, Ps 107^{16}).

Ode xxii. 9: 'Thou didst take dead bones and didst cover them with bodies; they were motionless, and thou didst give them (energy) for life' (cf. Ezk 37^{1-11}).

Ode xxii. 12: 'That the foundation for everything might be thy Rock: and on it thou didst build thy Kingdom' (cf. Mt 16^{18}).

Ode xxix. 8: 'That I might subdue the imaginations of the peoples; and the power of the men of might to bring them low' (cf. Lk $1^{51.52}$).

Ode iii. 3: 'I should not have known how to love the Lord, if He had not loved me' (cf. 1 Jn 4^{19}).

Ode xvi. 20: 'The worlds were made by His word' (cf. Jn 1^{3}).

See, further, Ode xli. 16, and cf. 1 P 1^{20}; Ode xii. 5, and cf. He 4^{12}; Ode xxiii. 17, and cf. He 1^{2}; Ode iv. 12, and cf. Ro 11^{29}; Ode xxxi. 4, 5, and cf. Jn $17^{6.11}$; Ode xxi. 1, and cf. Lk 1^{69-73}; Ode vi. 7, and cf. Ezk 47^{1}; Ode xxviii. 11, and cf. Ps 22^{16}; Ode xlii. 10, and Mt 11^{29}, etc.

5. Probable date of their composition.—It is very difficult to fix a precise date for the composition of the Odes. The absence from them of definite historical data gives critics some 130 years within which to exercise their historical and geographical skill. The Odes are merely devotional hymns, and safe criteria found in hymns of this kind for the fixing and delimitation of a definite period of time are naturally scanty, and those that are available do not generally justify a categorical conclusion. If we exclude Harnack's theory of interpolation, and assume that the Odes are either wholly Christian or else Judæo-Christian, they would fall within the period A.D. 80–210. The point of divergence amongst critics is how near to the earlier or to the later date they seem likely to belong.

Lactantius (*Div. Inst.* iv. 12) has the following clear quotation from Ode xix.: 'Salomon [in ode undevicesima] ita dicit: Infirmatus est uterus virginis et accepit fetum et gravata est, et facta est in multa miseratione mater virgo.' This important quotation, noted by Harris, shows that before 310 (see H. J. Lawlor, 'Notes on Lactantius,' in *Hermathena*, xxix. [1903] 459) not only was the existence of the Odes known to Lactantius, but at his time, at least in the district of Nicomedia, they even had the same order as that exhibited by our MSS. The citation does not appear to be due to hearsay, but to be drawn from a book before the writer. From it we cannot positively prove that a Latin version of the Odes was current in Western Churches, but we are not at liberty to assume the contrary.

Between 250 and 295 larger quotations from the Odes are found in the Gnostic book called *Pistis Sophia*, which contains five complete Odes of the collection, as we have stated above. It is, on the whole, difficult to ascertain the inter-connexion between the Coptic and the Syriac texts; but the present writer thinks that, apart from a short verse that seems to be lost in Syriac, there is a certain literary ascendancy which establishes the superiority of this last version over the Coptic. The words which have disappeared from the Syriac text come in the middle of v.^{8} of Ode v.: 'And they are overcome, although they are powerful.' The lack of some words due to the carelessness of copyists cannot *a priori* point to the dependence of one composition upon another. On the contrary, the Coptic is generally inferior to the Syriac, and seems to be a translation of it; *e.g.* Ode vi. 9 says: 'And the restrainments of men could not restrain it, nor the arts of those who restrain water.' The repetition of the verb is, as we have seen, in accordance with the usage of Syriac and Arabic poetry; the Coptic substituted 'loca ædificata' for the word 'restrainments.' This curious variant could not have occurred if the Coptic translator was not translating from a language in which these words resemble each other in writing; and this language is Syriac.

The existence of these five Odes in the Gnostic book involves their priority to it by several years; and consequently it becomes almost certain that they cannot be ascribed to a period later than the first quarter of the 3rd century. We may, therefore, assume as highly probable that the extreme limits of our whole collection are, as stated above, A.D. 80–210. Of these 130 years, it is historically impossible, in the present state of our knowledge, to fix upon a definite date, and no probable hypothesis has so far been put forward. We shall set forth briefly the reasons which suggest a date nearer to 80, and those which appear to postulate one not far from the end of the 2nd or the beginning of the 3rd century.

We have already quoted the sentence of Ode iv. which declares that the sanctuary of God cannot be changed. If this sentence is to be taken literally, it may perhaps suggest by its vividness that the author wrote at a time not far removed from the destruction of the Temple.

We have elsewhere (in our study referred to above) pointed to two incidents which would perhaps require a date earlier than the end of the 2nd century. There are, we have said, nine semi-quotations from the canonical Psalter, whose wording differs from that used in the Odes. The author, or, in the case of a Greek original, the translator, ought reasonably to have employed the same words as those found in a previous sacred book known, read, and generally learnt by heart by every Eastern Christian. If this argument may claim a certain plausibility, it can also be used in favour of an Aramaic original of the Odes. We cannot, indeed, discover any good reason why this Syrian writer or translator did not employ the words used in the OT Peshiṭta, if he knew them, and we cannot reasonably suppose that he did not know them if he was writing long after the end of the 2nd century.

We have also noticed that the Johannine concept of the 'word' is rendered five times by the term *petghâma*, which means 'word' *in concreto*, instead of *melltha*, which is used in all the Syriac versions of the NT, and which means 'word' *in abstracto*. A good acquaintance on the part of the Odist with Johannine Syriac writings would have prevented his using frequently such an inadequate word.

Mrs. M. D. Gibson has called our attention (*Athenæum*, April, 1914, p. 530) to the fact that several Church historians, notably Theodore of Mopsuestia, report that in the Apostolic Age there were people who wrote 'Odes' and 'Psalms' like the 'blessed David.'

Some supporters of the hypothesis of the later date (*i.e.* A.D. 210) would attribute the whole collection of the Odes to the famous Bardesanes of Edessa (154–222), who played so important a rôle in the history of the Church. The grounds of this hypothesis may be summarized as follows. On the one hand, it is historically established that Bardesanes wrote 150 psalms in imitation of those contained in the canonical Psalter; on the other hand, the presence of these odes in the *Pistis Sophia* would suggest that their author was, at least in the mind of the Gnostic writer of this last book, imbued with Gnostic ideas, otherwise he would not have had sufficient reason to quote them; and, since Bardesanes is represented by some Fathers of the Church as inclining towards Gnosticism, he might very easily have been their first writer. The existence of a Greek savour in the style of the Odes would easily be explained by the good Hellenic culture that this Mesopotamian writer had received.

There are some linguistic features which tend to corroborate Bardesanes' authorship. The expression which means 'without grudging,' very seldom used by other Aramæan writers but found twice in the *Book of the Laws of Countries*, would lend a certain amount of plausibility to this hypothesis; and the frequent occurrence in the Odes of the Semitic phenomenon of a noun of action or a *mimmed* infinitive placed immediately before or after its respective verb, is also a favourite stylistic method of the semi-Gnostic Christian writer, whose orthodoxy is very doubtful.

Finally, if, as Bernard remarks (*op. cit.* p. 42), the allusions which abound in the Odes are always to beliefs and practices current in the East, and if they have little affinity with Western doctrine or Western ceremonial, their attribution to an Eastern writer would indeed account for many difficulties otherwise insoluble. So the present writer has tried elsewhere (*op. cit. supra*) to show that the puzzling Ode xxiii., which deals with a mysterious letter descending from heaven, contains in its phraseology a clear reference to the mystery of the Incarnation, which, according to the ecclesiastical books of the Syrian Church, was accomplished by means of a letter confided to the archangel Gabriel.

6. Their Christian doctrine and orthodoxy.—The doctrine of the Trinity is clearly expressed in the Odes. Ode xix. 2: 'The Son is the cup, and He who was milked is the Father: and the Holy Spirit milked Him' (see also Ode xxiii. 20).

The belief in God the *Father* as *Creator* is also emphasized. Ode iv. 14: 'Thou, O God, hast made all things'; vii. 28: 'He hath given a mouth to His creation'; ix. 4: 'Be enriched in God the Father.'

The Odist's doctrine of the *Son* is as follows. xli. 14, 29: 'The Son of the Most High appeared in the perfection of His Father; and light dawned from the Word that was beforetime in Him; the Christ is truly one; and He was known before the foundation of the world.' He is 'the Lord Messiah' (xvii. 14), 'our Lord Christ' (xxxix. 10), 'the Lord's Christ' (xxix. 6). 'We live in the Lord' (xli. 3). He was born of a virgin (xix. 6). 'He became like me, in order that I might receive Him' (vii. 5). The Crucifixion is perhaps alluded to in xlii. 3: 'The outspread wood which was set up on the way of the Righteous One' (see also xxvii. 3). The gall and vinegar of the Passion are mentioned in xlii. 17: 'I was gall and bitterness to him.' The purpose of the humiliation of the Son was 'that I might redeem my people' (xxxi. 11).

The Holy Spirit frequently underlies the thoughts of the writer (xi. 2): 'for the Most High circumcised me by His Holy Spirit and revealed my reins towards Him' (see also xiv. 8, xxviii. 2, xxxvi. 1).

The believer has immortality in his soul (iii. 10): 'for he that is joined to Him that is immortal, will also himself become immortal' (see also ix. 3).

On the other hand, there are many Christian topics about which the Odist maintains a deep and astonishing silence. There is no mention of sin, repentance, forgiveness, or the resurrection of the body. Sacramentalism is generally absent; it is only by forcing the context that one verse may be referred to the Eucharist; but the notion of priesthood and sacrifices is expressed in some verses already quoted.

Strictly speaking, Gnosticism has no strong support in the Odes. Ode xii., singled out as containing some Gnostic technicalities, savours probably but little of such aberrations. On the other hand, there are sentences which seem to betray slight tendencies towards Docetism. Ode xxviii. 14 f.: 'And I did not perish, for I was not their brother nor was my birth like theirs, and they sought for my death and did not find it'; vii. 6: 'He was reckoned like myself in order that I might put Him on'; xix. 8: 'She brought forth, as it were a man, by the will [of God].'

LITERATURE.—This is indicated in the course of the article.

A. MINGANA.

OFFENCE.—The English word 'offence' is derived from the Lat. *offendere*, 'to strike against' or 'to injure' (O.Fr. *offens*, Fr. *offense*), and is employed to translate various Heb. and Gr. nouns, in the sense of an injury, a trespass or a fall, or as an occasion of unbelief, doubt, or apostasy. The chief Heb. words in the OT are the verb אָשַׁם, which has the meaning of 'to trespass' or 'to be guilty,' and the noun מִכְשׁוֹל, in the well-known passages Is 8^{14} and 57^{14}, translated as 'a stone of stumbling,' 'a stumbling-block.' The other terms are generally synonyms of error and sin.

The most important NT words are *παράπτωμα* and *σκάνδαλον*. The former is used with respect to a moral fall, 'a falling beside,' and thus completes the conception of sin (*ἁμαρτία*, 'missing the mark') by that of falling short or falling aside. The one is a loss of aim, the other the perversion of aim or culpable error. As transgression, it is found in Ro 4^{25} $5^{15\ bis.\ 16.\ 17.\ 18.\ 20}$, where 'offence' in the AV is rendered ‘trespass’ in the RV. *πρόσκομμα* is found only in Ro 14^{20}, signifying ‘something to strike against’: a man runs, as it were, against an obstacle, and does wrong when he eats contrary to the dictates of his conscience. In 2 Co 6^{3} *προσκοπή* is that which causes stumbling, and the Christians are enjoined to place no stumbling-block in the way of others. As an adjective, *ἀπρόσκοπος* is used in Ac 24^{16} with respect to the conscience, also in 1 Co 10^{32} and in Ph 1^{10} as giving no occasion of stumbling.

The word *σκάνδαλον* (verb, *σκανδαλίζω*) is frequently brought into use especially in Matthew. It signifies a bait or stick in a trap and generally anything which causes a person to be entrapped or to fall. It is a modified form of the classic *σκανδάληθρον*. Sometimes it is used in reference to persons, who may become stumbling-blocks to others. When Christ called St. Peter a stumbling-block, He evidently recognized in His disciple's remonstrance the agency of the arch-enemy (*Σατανᾶς*) who was tempting Him to do what was contrary to the will of God (Mt 16^{23}). Isaiah's description of ‘the stone of stumbling’ and ‘the rock of offence’ (Is 8^{14}) is applied by St. Paul to Christ (Ro 9^{33}) because the lowliness of His origin and of His earthly surroundings as well as the deeply spiritual character of His ministry offended the religious leaders of His day (Mt 13^{57}). The rejection of His claims by the Pharisees was attended by some irritation and the spirit of opposition (15^{12}): thus they were offended or caused to stumble. This was later accentuated by the ‘scandal of the Cross,’ which, when not accepted in faith as the symbol of the Divine redemption, became a stumbling-block. Its disgrace and ignominy made it difficult for the Jews to accept Christ as their Messiah, and it also roused their animosity to the preachers of the gospel (Gal 5^{11}). They expected a Messiah who should restore their political freedom and re-establish the kingdom in material success and splendour, and our Lord's ministry being essentially spiritual made Him to be a stumbling-block to them. The fault was in their lack of faith and spiritual insight; but, on the other hand, Christ's followers are to be on their guard against giving occasion to others to stumble through their own selfishness or folly. Thus the term *σκάνδαλον* is employed in reference to actions or habits which might prove to be a stumbling-block to those who are weak or inexperienced. To cause Christ's little ones to stumble or to fall is severely condemned (Mt 18^{6}). The casuistry concerning meats offered to idols should involve the consideration of the hyper-sensitive consciences of the weaker brethren, who are not to be offended or made to stumble by those who are less scrupulous (Ro 14. 15^{1-3}). In all such cases the exhilarating and newly-found consciousness of liberty is to be controlled by love.

Clement of Rome uses the word *παραπτῶσις* in combination with danger, in the sense of a fault incurred through disobedience to the counsels of the Fathers (*Cor.* 59). Ignatius, whilst not employing the word ‘offence,’ warns the believers against the snares of the devil and against giving occasion to the heathen to triumph, and thus bringing discredit upon the whole body of believers through the folly of the few (*Ep. ad Trall.* 8). If love be the ruling principle of Christian morals, there is no *σκάνδαλον*, for love removes rather than creates difficulties.

LITERATURE.—Artt. ‘Offence’ in *HDB* and in *DCG*; Sanday-Headlam, *ICC*, ‘Romans,’ ^{5} 1902, p. 390; F. J. A. Hort, *The First Epistle of St. Peter, I. 1-II. 17*, 1898, p. 121; F. W. Robertson, *Sermons*, new ed., 1876, 3rd ser., xvi.; J. Moffatt, ‘Jesus upon “Stumbling-blocks,”’ in *ExpT* xxvi. [1914–15] 407 ff.

J. G. JAMES.

OFFERING.—See SACRIFICE.

OFFICER.—In the only passages in which this word occurs in the apostolic writings (Ac $5^{22. 26}$), it stands for the Gr. *ὑπηρέτης*, and denotes an official of the Sanhedrin sent to bring the apostles before the Court. These officials appear to have been under the command of the captain of the Temple (v.^{26}).

G. WAUCHOPE STEWART.

OIL (*ἔλαιον*, from *ἐλαία*, ‘olive-tree’).—As the Greek name implies, the common oil of Scripture is olive oil. It is obtained from the ripe olive berries by crushing and pressure, aided sometimes by the use of hot water, and is used for food, light, soap-making, and for anointing the hair and the skin. In Rev 6^{6} ‘the oil and the wine’ refer to the growing crops of olives and grapes. In 18^{13} oil appears in the list of the merchandise of the apocalyptic Babylon.

The remaining references to oil in the apostolic writings illustrate two special purposes for which it was employed.

1. Ceremonial.—The olive oil used in the consecration of priests and kings by anointing was compounded with various perfumed ingredients (Ex 30^{23-25}). In this use of oil we have the basis of a number of figurative passages.

(*a*) In He 1^{9} (=Ps 45^{7}) ‘the oil of gladness’ suggests the honour that has been bestowed on the Exalted Christ. Elsewhere there is more distinct reference to His royal position as the Messiah or Anointed One, and to the Holy Spirit as the means of His consecration to this office (Ac 10^{38}; cf. 4^{27}).

(*b*) The Holy Spirit given to Christians is represented as an anointing oil. The context shows that this is the meaning of 2 Co 1^{21}. The same is true of the ‘anointing’ of 1 Jn 2^{20} (AV ‘unction’)·^{27}.

2. Medicinal.—With this must be connected in some sense the much-discussed passage (Ja 5^{14}) where the elders of the Church are directed to pray over the sick brother, ‘anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord.’ The general use of oil in ancient times as a remedy for disease and injury is illustrated in Is 1^{6}, Lk 10^{34}. The treatment applied to Herod the Great during his last illness (Jos. *Ant.* XVII. vi. 5, *BJ* I. xxxiii. 5) is a well-known case in point. That the practice was associated from early times with a belief in magic is shown by S. Daiches (*Babylonian Oil Magic in the Talmud and in the later Jewish Literature*, 1913). The exact bearing of such facts on Ja 5^{14} must remain obscure, but it is interesting to observe that the procedure here enjoined was anticipated by the Twelve (Mk 6^{13}), though without any express injunction from Jesus. One thing is clear, viz. that in James the healing of the sick is ascribed directly to ‘the prayer of faith’ (v.^{15}) and not to the anointing. The latter must be regarded as quite subsidiary, originating probably in compliance with custom, yet dissociated from superstition, since it is done ‘in the name of the Lord,’ and serving perhaps as a kind of sacramental help to faith. ‘It is easier to believe when visible means are used than when nothing is visible, and it is still easier to believe when the visible means appear to be likely to contribute to the desired effect’ (Plummer, *St. James and St. Jude*, p. 327).

There are few traces of observance of such a rite in the early Church, though the Emperor Septimius Severus believed himself to have been cured by oil administered by a Christian (Tertullian, *ad Scap.* 4). But from the 6th cent. onwards the practice was regularly established, and had different developments in the East and in the West. In the latter it was finally transformed into the sacrament of Extreme Unction, of which it need only be said that it is administered when recovery is supposed to be hopeless, whereas in James the anointing is expected to be followed by a cure. After the

Reformation we find that the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. (1549) provides for the NT ceremony, ‘if the sicke person desyre to be annoynted.’ In the Prayer Book of 1552 this provision disappears. There has been a revival of the practice in certain Anglican circles in recent times (see F. W. Puller, *The Anointing of the Sick in Scripture and Tradition*, 1904).

LITERATURE.—On the medicinal use see the Commentaries on James of A. Plummer (*Expositor's Bible*, 1891), R. J. Knowling (*Westminster Comm.*, 1904), and J. B. Mayor (^{3}1910).

JAMES PATRICK.

OINTMENT (*μύρον*). — Perfumes for the toilet were extensively used in ancient as well as in modern times. The modern methods of extraction and preparation, however, were unknown, and the principal form of these luxuries was that of perfumed oils and pomades. The basis of the former was olive oil or some similar vegetable oil (*e.g.* oil of nuts or almonds), to which were added the fragrant volatile oils obtained from various flowers and plants. Of the scented ingredients the finest and most expensive came from the East, and the *oleum nardinum*, made from the flowers of Indian or Arabian nard-grass, was especially prized among the Romans. Unguents of this type were liquid or semi-liquid, rather than of the consistency suggested by the modern use of the word ‘ointment,’ and were kept in bottles of precious metal or stone. The *alabastron* was of the latter material, and was a small cylindrical vessel narrowing at the neck in order that the contents might drip out gradually. The pomades, on the other hand, had fine fat for their basis. These various ointments were used for anointing the body, especially after bathing, for dressing the hair and beard, for perfuming the dress, and even for scenting the water of the bath. In the public baths at Rome there were special apartments (*unctoria*) where the unguents were applied. Pliny (*HN* xiii. 1 ff.) comments on the prevalence of this form of luxury in the society of his time. Cicero (*in Cat.* ii. 3) says that the effeminate companions of Catiline ‘shine with ointments’ (‘nitent unguentis’).

In Rev 18^{13} ‘ointment’ (so RV; AV ‘ointments’) appears in the list of the luxurious merchandise of ‘Babylon’ (*i.e.* Rome), and the foregoing particulars illustrate the aptness of the reference.

The ‘eyesalve’ of 3^{18}, though used in conjunction with the verb *ἐγχρίειν* (‘anoint’) does not belong to the class of ordinary unguents. The Gr. word is *κολλούριον* or *κολλύριον* (dim. from *κολλύρα*). The *collyra* was a sort of elongated bun, and the *collyrium* was a medicated preparation of similar shape, used for rubbing on tender eyelids or other affected parts (Celsus, V. xxviii. 12; Horace, *Sat.* I. v. 30; Pliny, *HN* xxxv. 53).

LITERATURE.—W. A. Becker, *Gallus*^{9}, 1888, p. 378; E. Guhl-W. Koner, *Das Leben der Griechen und Römer*^{3}, 1873, Eng. tr., 1889, pp. 150, 398, 492, 508.

JAMES PATRICK.

OLD TESTAMENT.—1. The Old Testament in the primitive Church.—By the opening of the Christian era the limits of the OT Canon had been practically fixed, and a high doctrine of its inspiration developed within the Jewish Church. The real Author of the books embraced within the Canon was God Himself; and, charged as they were with His Spirit, they were holy as He was, and ‘defiled the hands’ of those who touched them. The OT Scriptures were thus the final norm of faith and conduct, and an appeal to their authority was decisive (see art. SCRIPTURE). The early generation of Christians inherited this tradition. As children of the household of Israel, they grew up in the atmosphere of the OT revelation; and, even when they passed to the fuller life in Christ, they carried with them their reverence for the ancient Scriptures. No need for a distinctively Christian literature was yet felt. The books of the OT were the ‘oracles of God,’ which enshrined the Divine rule of life, not for the Fathers only, but for those also who had been called and redeemed in Christ. Being read mainly in the Greek or Aramaic versions, and interpreted, with the freedom characteristic of the age, as a collection of independent ‘prophecies’ or *predictions* of things to come, they were easily made to cover the great facts associated with Christ's teaching, personality, and work. In this light they were regarded also as a sufficient guide to Christian conduct.

The clearest reflexion of this simple attitude towards the OT is found in the apostolic preaching in Acts. The theme of all the utterances found there is the salvation won through Christ's death and resurrection. But the burden of proof rests on the authority of the Scriptures, as represented by the LXX. Christ Himself is the Prophet whose coming was heralded by Moses (3^{22} 7^{37}), and His death is the ‘fulfilling’ of ‘the things which God foreshewed by the mouth of all the prophets’ (3^{18}). To Him the mysterious prophecy of the Suffering Servant of Is 53 is directly applied ($8^{32f.}$). His resurrection, likewise, is that which was ‘foreseen’ by David in his protest against God's ‘Holy One’ seeing corruption ($2^{25ff.}$), and points forward to the final restoration of all things ‘whereof God spake by the mouth of his holy prophets which have been since the world began’ (3^{21}). The outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost is equally the fulfilment of Joel's glorious vision of the latter days ($2^{16ff.}$), while the persecution that followed the first triumphs of the gospel marks the rage of kings and nations against the Lord and His Anointed, as foretold ‘by the Holy Ghost, by the mouth of our father David thy servant’ ($4^{25f.}$). Even the tragedy of Judas' end is the immediate working out of the curse denounced in Ps 69^{25} against the enemies of the righteous (1^{20}).

2. The Old Testament and the conflict for spiritual freedom.—So long as the preaching of the gospel was confined to Jews, the new wine was easily kept within the old bottles. But a conflict was inevitable when the wine began to ferment, and the freedom of the faith to assert itself against Jewish limitations. This conflict is already foreshadowed in St. Stephen's preaching; but it became acute only with the conversion and world-wide ministry of St. Paul.

The Apostle to the Gentiles was a Pharisee ‘of the straitest sect,’ brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, and thus imbued not merely with a deep reverence and love for the Scriptures, but also with the Rabbinic method of expounding them, in entire independence of their historical setting and significance, as a store-house of separate ‘oracles,’ the manifold sense of which (literal, allegorical, rational, and mystical) was to be deduced by the interpreter's own insight, logical acumen, or fancy, according to the rules laid down by representative Rabbis. His love for the ‘sacred writings’ St. Paul naturally brought with him into the service of Christ. His sermons and Epistles are steeped in the language of the OT, and proof-texts are abundantly used to point the edge of an argument, or to emphasize his counsels for Christian life (see art. QUOTATIONS). Like his Jewish teachers, the Apostle continued to read the Scriptures as a body of independent ‘words,’ each charged with a life and force of its own. He is usually indifferent to the exact exegesis of his texts, following the LXX even when its rendering is faulty, though occasionally he does appear to cite from the original Hebrew. In other directions he claims a wide freedom in his reproduction and application of texts. Nor has he shaken himself quite clear of Rabbinic subtleties. Thus the narrowing of Abraham's 'seed' to Christ (Gal 3^{16}) is a thoroughly characteristic example of the verbal exegesis of the Rabbis. The allegory of Sarah and Hagar, the freewoman and the handmaid (Gal $4^{21\text{ff.}}$), and the extracting of a hidden personal principle from the humane law of the unmuzzled ox (1 Co $9^{9\text{f.}}$, 1 Ti 5^{18}), illustrate the 'manifold sense' read into the letter of Scripture; while the bold way in which he transfers to Gentile Christians the promises made to Israel (Ro $9^{8\text{ff.}}$), and finds in the Deuteronomist's great thought of the nearness of the Law suggestions of Christ's descent to earth and His rising from the dead (Ro $10^{6\text{ff.}}$), or in the 'strange tongues' of Is $28^{11\text{ff.}}$ a forecast of Christian 'tongues' (1 Co 14^{21}), betrays the unrestrained liberty of interpretation exercised by the Jewish exegete. It is remarkable, however, that the Apostle is so little influenced by Rabbinic methods. Apart from these few survivals from a dead past, which touch only the periphery of his thought, there is nothing in his Epistles that reminds us of the arbitrary and highly extravagant exegetical results of his Jewish contemporaries. So deeply has he entered into the spirit of his Master that his whole treatment of the OT is marked by a sanity and sobriety of mind, enriched with a breadth, sympathy, and penetrating insight surpassed only by Christ.

In his preaching to the Jews St. Paul follows the practice of the earlier apostles, though with a new fullness and range. 'He reasoned with them from the scriptures, opening and alleging, that it behoved the Christ to suffer, and to rise again from the dead' (Ac $17^{2\text{f.}}$; cf. $28^{23\text{ff.}}$). Thus in his speech at Antioch he sets forth Jesus as the Saviour of David's seed brought unto Israel 'according to the promise,' whose condemnation and death at the hands of the people and rulers of Jerusalem were the fulfilment of the words of the prophets 'which are read every sabbath,' and His resurrection the bringing to pass of 'the holy and sure blessings of David,' as promised in Psalms 2 and 8 (Ac $13^{23\text{ff.}}$). In his Epistles, too, he cites OT texts as direct predictions of the gospel. The new faith of which he was called to be an Apostle is 'the gospel of God, which he promised afore by his prophets in the holy scriptures' (Ro $1^{1\text{f.}}$; cf. 3^{21}). Christ both died and rose again 'according to the scriptures' (1 Co $15^{3\text{f.}}$), while proof-texts are adduced for the promise of the Spirit (Gal 3^{14}), the destruction of human wisdom through the foolishness of preaching (1 Co 1^{19}), the universal range of the preaching of salvation (Ro 10^{18}), the vital principle of righteousness by faith (1^{17} 3^{21}, Gal 3^{11}), the fatal unbelief of the Jews (Ro $10^{16\text{ff.}}$) and the calling of the Gentiles ($9^{25\text{ff.}}$ $10^{19\text{f.}}$ $15^{9\text{ff.}}$), the final salvation of Israel ($11^{26\text{f.}}$), Christ's victory over all His enemies (1 Co $15^{24\text{ff.}}$), and the swallowing up of death and sin in the immortality won through Him (v.$^{54\text{f.}}$).

So far, then, the OT is treated as a Jewish book, pointing to the fulfilment of the 'promise' in Christ. But the extension of the gospel to the Gentiles, which was an essential part of this promise (cf. above), of necessity involved a change in the Apostle's attitude to the Scriptures. As a Jewish book, the OT made no direct appeal to other nations. They had their own modes of thought and expression, and the most cultivated of them possessed a literature of surpassing beauty and power. On occasion the Apostle might approach their conscience by this path (cf. especially his speech to the Athenians); but his mind was so saturated with OT ideas, and the book itself was so manifestly the Word of God which made men 'wise unto salvation' (2 Ti 3^{15}), that he could not withhold it from any nation. Irrespective, then, of the Jewish origin and cast of the whole, he deliberately transformed it into a Christian book, in which Christ was openly identified with the God of the Jews (cf. Ro $10^{13\text{f.}}$ $11^{26\text{f.}}$, Eph 4^{8} 5^{14}, etc.), and the history of Israel was read typically (*τυπικῶς*, 'by way of pattern' or 'figure'), as a series of illustrative moral examples, 'written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the ages are come' (1 Co 10^{11}). Thus the promise to Abraham is extended to all who walk in the steps of his faith, whether in circumcision or in uncircumcision (Ro 4^{12}), while 'it was not written for his sake alone, that it (his faith) was reckoned unto him (for righteousness), but for our sake also, unto whom it shall be reckoned, who believe on him that raised Jesus our Lord from the dead, who was delivered up for our trespasses, and was raised for our justification' (Ro $4^{23\text{ff.}}$). The true Israel unto whom the Word was given is no more Abraham's seed according to the flesh, but 'the children of the promise,' whether Jew or Gentile (Ro $9^{6\text{ff.}}$, Gal 3^{28}). Thus 'whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that through patience and through comfort of the scriptures we might have hope' (Ro 15^{4}).

This transformation of the OT into a distinctively Christian book was the more easily effected as the conflict for freedom turned decisively around the Law. For orthodox Judaism the Law was the heart of the Scriptures, the very 'holy of holies.' Like the other apostles, St. Paul was a child of the Law, who excelled them all in his zeal for its honour. Even as a Christian he remained under its influence, and was ready in the interests of the gospel, if need were, to circumcise and to carry through the statutory vows for himself and his converts (cf. his procedure in Ac 16^{3} 18^{18} $21^{23\text{ff.}}$). But to impose the Law on Gentile Christians as a necessary condition of their salvation would inevitably reduce Christianity to a mere Jewish sect. The Apostle knew, moreover, from personal experience, as well as from observation of life, that there was no saving power in the Law. As coming from the holy God, the Law was holy, and its commandment 'righteous and good.' But so weak and sinful was human flesh that the very constraint of the Law not only awoke the consciousness of sin, but roused an inward opposition, and thus actually provoked sin. Hence the paradox of moral life, that the 'law of sin' in man's members 'worked death through that which is itself good—that through the commandment sin might become exceedingly sinful.' And the only real virtue of the Law was to drive men in despair to Christ (Ro $7^{7\text{ff.}}$).

On this profound psychological analysis the Apostle based his new reading of OT history. For him the Law was no longer the heart and spirit of the older revelation, but a mere parenthesis or side-issue. Sin was a great fact which directly entered the world (*εἰσῆλθεν*) in Adam. To circumvent its fatal effects, grace likewise entered (Ro $5^{12\text{ff.}}$). The Law came in sideways (*παρεισῆλθεν*), and therefore in a subordinate and non-essential capacity (Ro 5^{20}). Its purpose was not to save men, but to hold them in ward or prison until the true faith should be revealed (Gal 3^{23}). At best, it was but the slave-boy (*παιδαγωγός*), who kept them under a certain moral restraint until Christ came (*εἰς Χριστόν*, *i.e.* 'up to the time of Christ'), when they might be 'justified by faith' (Gal 3^{24}). Thus the gospel had its spiritual affinities, not with the Law, but with that faith of Abraham which was the beginning of the promise (Gal $3^{15\text{ff.}}$). In a real sense, indeed, the gospel was already inherent in the covenant between God and Abraham, confirmed 430 years before the giving of the Law, and remaining valid in spite of its interposition. If it be rightly read, therefore, the OT is a revelation of the same grace as is made manifest in Christ. Only the Jews have obscured its true character by the fatal emphasis they have placed on the Law. The veil with which Moses covered his face when he spoke to the people is a symbol of that still darker veil lying heavily upon the heart of Israel 'at the reading of the old covenant,' which will never be removed until they turn to Christ. In Him the veil has been 'done away.' And all who have found liberty through Him, 'with unveiled face beholding as in a mirror [RVm] the glory of the Lord,' are able to trace that glory shining through the ancient Scriptures, and are likewise 'transformed into the same image from glory to glory' (2 Co $3^{12ff.}$).

3. The Old Testament as the foreshadowing of the gospel.—In the Epistle to the Hebrews the problem is attacked from a different point of view. The underlying assumptions are, no doubt, the same. The OT is treated throughout as the very Word of God, and quotations are introduced with the formula, 'he saith' (λέγει), used of God Himself (He $1^{5ff.}$ $5^{5f.}$), or the Holy Spirit ($3^{7ff.}$ $10^{15ff.}$), or God speaking through the Spirit ($4^{3ff.}$ $8^{8ff.}$), or even the Messiah ($2^{12f.}$ $10^{5ff.}$), irrespective of their human authorship. But the widest freedom of interpretation is claimed. The author cites invariably from the LXX, being evidently ignorant of the original Hebrew. He is quite unfettered, too, by the historical application of texts. Thus not merely are Messianic Psalms like Ps 2 and Ps 110 referred directly to Christ (He $1^{5.13f.}$), but the highly dubious אֱלֹהִים, 'O God,' of Ps $45(46)^{6}$ and the 'son of man' in Ps 8^{4} are both identified with Him (He $1^{8f.}$ $2^{6ff.}$), while even Isaiah's description of himself and his children as 'signs and portents in Israel' (Is 8^{18}) is cited as a proof of Jesus' oneness with His people and His participation in the same flesh and blood as theirs, 'that through death he might bring to nought him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and might deliver all them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage' (He $2^{13ff.}$). But, as a Jew of the school of Alexandria, he is much more influenced by the allegorical spirit than St. Paul. To him, indeed, the OT is a system of signs and symbols, foreshadowings and anticipations of something better, which is to be found only in Christ and the 'new covenant' of grace.

The opening paragraph lays down the famous contrast between the multiform and fragmentary character of the older revelation and the fullness of the light that came through Christ. 'God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers through the prophets in many parts and in many modes, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in a Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, through whom also he made the worlds, who being the effulgence (*ἀπαύγασμα*) of his glory, and the very impress of his essence (*χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ*), and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had made purification of sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high' ($1^{1ff.}$). The history of revelation is here set forth under the categories of Platonic idealism. As this world is but a dim and flickering shadow of the eternal realities, thrown upon the screen of the passing present, the OT is a broken and changing expression of God's mind, given through many different media, and sharing the imperfection bound up in all of them, while the revelation in Christ is the full 'shining forth' of the Divine glory through the perfect image or embodiment of the eternal Majesty. The real value of the OT Scriptures, therefore, is to point forward to the Light, and then to pass away as the shadow before the sunshine.

The author applies the same categories to the Law, by which, however, he means not the moral command that pressed so hard on the conscience of St. Paul, but the system of Levitical ordinances, as carried through in the service of the Temple. This also was a 'copy and shadow (*ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά*) of the heavenly things,' an earthly adumbration of the worship carried through in the eternal temple above (8^{5}). As such, every part of the ritual had its significance (cf. esp. $9^{1ff.}$). But the Law itself was quite powerless to save. 'It is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins' (10^{4}). It was equally impossible that high priests subject to the infirmities and mortality of human nature should by their daily and yearly sacrifices, offered continually and without change, 'make perfect them that draw near' ($7^{23ff.}$ $9^{9ff.}$ $10^{1f.}$). In these sacrifices remembrance was made of sins, and the worshipper's thoughts were thereby directed towards the perfect Sacrifice yet to be offered (10^{3}). The 'very image' (*αὐτὴ ἡ εἰκών*), the clear, full expression of the 'good things' of which the Law was but a dim, uncertain 'shadow,' was found only in Christ, by the offering of whose body sin was expiated once for all, and a 'new and living way' opened through the veil, 'that is to say, his flesh,' into the holy place where God is ($10^{5ff.}$). The Aaronic priesthood was thus as imperfect a channel of the mediation of grace as the prophets had been of the revelation of God's mind. Both were but foreshadowings of the 'new covenant' ($8^{7ff.}$), 'a parable for the time now present' (9^{9}). The truest OT type of Christ was Melchizedek, coming, as He did, from the heavenly sphere, 'without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life,' to bear immediate witness to the Divine ($7^{1ff.}$).

4. Practical use of the Old Testament.—Christian interest in the OT is by no means exhausted by such discussions as to its relation to the gospel. The main test of its 'inspiration' is rather the practical one of helpfulness 'for teaching, for judgment, for correction, for discipline in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work' (2 Ti $3^{16f.}$). Thus St. Paul not merely checks his own fiery outburst against the high priest by calling to mind the injunction not to speak evil of a ruler (Ac 23^{5}), but cites the Decalogue and other moral precepts of the OT as still binding upon his readers (cf. Ro $12^{19f.}$, 1 Co 9^{9}, 2 Co $6^{17f.}$ 9^{9}, Eph 6^{2}, 1 Ti 5^{18}, 2 Ti 2^{19}), and with equal freedom adduces OT heroes as examples or warnings (*e.g.* Adam in Ro $5^{12f.}$; Eve in 2 Co 11^{3}, 1 Ti 2^{14}; Abraham in Ro $4^{1ff.}$, Gal $3^{6ff.}$; Moses and the children of Israel in 1 Co $10^{1ff.}$). The fate of the rebellious Israelites is likewise held forth as a warning to Christian believers in He $3^{12ff.}$; but the noblest instance of this practical use of the OT in the Epistle is found in the great roll-call of faith (ch. 11). In the remaining books the speculative interest has almost vanished, and the OT is cited mainly for its ethical value. Of the six quotations in James, five are unmistakably ethical; and even the text from Gn 15^{6}, which St. Paul made the basis of his doctrine of justification by faith, is adduced as a proof of justification by works (as the necessary fruit of faith). In the same way the Apostle refers to Rahab, Job, and Elijah as notable examples of works, patience, and prayer respectively (2^{25} $5^{11.\ 17f.}$). Even in 1 Peter, where the primitive conception of the OT as a body of predictions fulfilled in Christ finds clear expression ($1^{10f.}$ $2^{6ff.}$), the actual use of the Scriptures is predominantly practical (cf. 1^{16} 3$^{6.10ff.}$ 5^{5}). The few suggestions of the OT traceable in 2 Peter (*e.g.* 2$^{5ff.16f.22}$) and 1 John (3^{12}) are of the same character; while the numerous reminiscences in Revelation, if not distinctively ethical, are yet concrete and imaginative, the clothing of the writer's own dreams in the majestic symbolism of the OT poets and prophets (see art. QUOTATIONS).

LITERATURE.—**A. Tholuck**, *Das AT im NT*^{6}, Gotha, 1868; **L. Diestel**, *Gesch. des AT in der christl. Kirche*, Jena, 1868, p. 6 ff.; **B. Jowett**, *St. Paul's Epp. to Thess., Gal. and Rom.*, vol. i.: 'Essays and Dissertations,' London, 1894; **C. Clemen**, *Der Gebrauch des AT in den neutest. Schriften*, Gütersloh, 1895; **G. H. Gilbert**, *Interpretation of the Bible*, New York, 1908; **A. Harnack**, *Dogmengeschichte*^{3}, Freiburg, 1898, i. 41 ff.; **H. St. J. Thackeray**, *The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*, London, 1900; the New Testament Theologies of **B. Weiss** (Eng. tr., Edinburgh, 1882–83), **W. Beyschlag** (Eng. tr., do., 1895), **H. J. Holtzmann** (^{2}Tübingen, 1911), etc.; **Sanday-Headlam**, *ICC*, 'Romans,'^{5} Edinburgh, 1902; **B. F. Westcott**, *Hebrews*, London, 1889, p. 469 ff.; **A. B. Bruce**, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Edinburgh, 1899.

A. R. GORDON.

OLIVE (*ἐλαία, ἀγριέλαιος, καλλιέλαιος*).—The only passages in which the olive is referred to in the NT are Ro 11$^{17.24}$, Ja 3^{12}, Rev 11^{4}. (For Ro 11$^{17.24}$ see art. GRAFTING.) For the proverb in Ja 3^{12}—'Can the fig-tree, my brethren, bear olive berries?'—cf. Seneca, *Ep.* 87, 'non nascitur ex malo bonum non magis quam ficus ex olea'; see also Epict. *Diss.* ii. 20 and Plut. *Mor.* p. 472. A like simile is found in Mt 7^{16} 12^{33}. The reference to the two olive-trees in Rev 11^{4} is after Zec 4$^{2f.}$. In the latter passage the *λυχνία* is Israel, and the two olive-trees which feed it are probably the monarchy and the priesthood as represented by Zerubbabel and Joshua. The writer of Rev 11^{4} has adapted the imagery of Zec 4$^{2f.}$. In Rev 1$^{12.20}$ he has likened the seven churches to seven golden *λυχνίαι*. These *λυχνίαι* are kept burning by the oil of the Spirit with which the true members of the Church are imbued (cf. Mt 25^{4}, Ro 11^{17}). These stand before the God of the earth (Rev 11^{4}). In Ja 5^{14} reference is made to the early Christian custom of anointing the sick with oil (*ἔλαιον*).

Of recent years olive-trees have been largely destroyed, chiefly with a view to avoiding taxation, but also in part for the supply of fire-wood. The extent to which the olive was cultivated in Palestine in ancient times may be gauged by the large number of olive-presses that are to be seen all over the country. Many of these presses were cut in the rock before houses were built upon it. They are often found in immediate association with Troglodyte caves, while a press was actually found inside one cave. In the earliest times the presses were of a simple character and generally consisted of a single circular or rectangular vat with one or two cup-holes in the floor. These appear both on the hill-sides and also on the rock-surface. The olive-presses of a later time show greater elaboration, and in Roman times or after, the receiving-vats were sometimes lined with Mosaic tesseræ. The fruit was apparently crushed on the surface of the press with stones, rollers, or pestles, the juice being subsequently expressed by boards placed over the fruit and weighed down with weights. The juice thus extracted was collected in a receiving-vat of greater depth than the press itself. The receiving-vat was sometimes sunk in the press, while sometimes it lay outside, and communicated with it by a channel. The pressing-surface is nearly always square or rectangular, and never more than from 1 to 1½ ft. deep; the receiving-vat is generally square but occasionally circular. There were often several receiving-vats to a single press. In the larger presses, the fruit was not crushed by the aid of movable hand-stones, but by a large, massive stone wheel rotated round a central staple by an ox or horse. One of these wheels that has been recovered has a diameter of 4 ft. 8 in. The rock in the press-surface was usually left bare, but the receiving-vat was often cemented.

But olive-presses of an entirely different character were also in use in all the Semitic periods. They consisted of movable slabs or boulders of stone. They are generally circular in shape and have a diameter of from 4 ft. 9 in. to 6 ft. 6 in. The rim within which the fruit was crushed is raised, the juice being collected in a cup hollowed out within the rim. Apart from the natural use of the olive as a fruit, it supplies the place of butter and is used for cooking. The oil is used for lamps as well as for anointing the body, while the soap of the country is made exclusively from it. The wood is used for cabinet-work. See also art. GRAFTING.

LITERATURE.—**J. B. Mayor**, *The Epistle of St. James*^{3}, 1913, pp. 125, 170 ff.; **Sanday-Headlam**, *ICC*, 'Romans,'^{5} 1902, p. 326 ff.; **H. B. Swete**, *The Apocalypse of St. John*^{2}, 1907, p. 135; **W. M. Thomson**, *The Land and the Book*, 3 vols., ed. 1881–86, *passim*; ed. 1910, pp. 31–36; **J. C. Geikie**, *The Holy Land and the Bible*, 1903, pp. 50–52, 74; **H. B. Tristram**, *The Natural History of the Bible*^{10}, 1911, pp. 373, 377; *SDB*, p. 667; *EBi* iii. 3495–3496; *HDB* iii. 616; and especially **R. A. S. Macalister**, *The Excavation of Gezer*, 1912, ii. 48–67.

P. S. P. HANDCOCK.

OLIVET (*ὁ ἐλαιών*, Ac 1^{12}; found only here and in Jos. *Ant.* VII. ix. 2, *διὰ τοῦ ἐλαιῶνος ὄρους*; *τὸ ἐλαιών* in Mk 11^{1} is confined to B; Lat. *olivetum*).—Olivet, called in the Gospels 'the Mount of Olives,' is the range of hills facing Jerusalem on the E., beyond the ravine of the Kidron valley. It has three summits, which are now commonly known as 'Scopus' (a misnomer, however, the real Scopus being further west), which is about a mile N.E. of the Temple site, 'the Ascension,' three-quarters of a mile E. of the same, and 'the Mount of Offence,' three-quarters of one mile S.E. of Ophel. The Risen Lord led His disciples not 'as far as to Bethany' (AV), but 'until they were over against Bethany' (RV), *ἕως πρὸς* (better supported than *εἰς*) *Βηθανίαν*, and there, a Sabbath day's journey—about six furlongs—from the Holy City, His ascension is recorded to have taken place. Bethany itself was fifteen furlongs—more than twice a Sabbath day's journey—from Jerusalem (Jn 11^{18}), and it is unlikely that He wished the solemn parting to take place in the village. Not far from the scene of His agony and betrayal, 'he was taken up' (Ac 1^{9}). It was not from Bethany, therefore, but 'from the mount called Olivet,' that the disciples returned to Jerusalem (v.^{12}). From early times the traditional spot from which the Lord ascended has been the central summit of the range, on which now stands the Church of the Ascension, built on the ruins of a crusading church of the 12th cent., which itself took the place of a basilica of the time of Constantine. More important than the identification of sites and scenes is the fact that

> '. . . faith has still its Olivet,
> And love its Galilee'
> (Whittier, *Our Master*, l. 51 f.).

LITERATURE.—See **Josephus**, *Ant.* xx. viii. 6, *BJ* v. ii. 3; **E. Robinson**, *Biblical Researches in Palestine*^{2}, 1856, vol. i. pp. 274 f., 604 f.; **A. P. Stanley**, *Sinai and Palestine*, new ed., 1877, pp. 185–195; *PEFSt*, 1889, pp. 174–184; **W. M. Thomson**, *The Land and the Book*, new ed., 1910, pp. 709–711; artt. in *HDB* and *EBi*.

JAMES STRAHAN.

OLYMPAS (*Ὀλυμπᾶς*, a Greek name, contracted from Olympiodorus).—Olympas is the fifth of a group of five persons, 'and all the saints that are with them,' saluted by St. Paul in Ro 16^{15}, probably as forming an *ἐκκλησία* or household or district church in Rome or Ephesus. If the first two persons in the group, Philologus and Julia (*qq.v.*), were husband and wife, it is possible that 'Nereus and his sister and Olympas' were their family. But there is nothing further known of any one of them.

T. B. ALLWORTHY.

OMEGA.—See ALPHA AND OMEGA.

ONESIMUS (Ὀνήσιμος). —Onesimus was a Colossian (Col 4^{9}), the slave of Philemon (Philem ^{16}). The name, signifying 'useful,' 'profitable,' 'helpful,' was frequently and appropriately borne by slaves (see J. B. Lightfoot, *Colossians and Philemon*^{3}, 1879, p. 310, who quotes numerous examples, chiefly from Muratori's Collection of Inscriptions). C. v. Weizsäcker (*Apostolic Age*, Eng. tr., 1894–1895, ii. 245) regards the Epistle to Philemon as allegorical owing to the play on the name Onesimus in v.^{11}; but on similar grounds much well-authenticated history might be rejected. Onesimus, for a time, belied his name; he absconded from his master's house, after either robbing him or otherwise doing him 'injury.' In order, probably, to avoid detection and at the same time to seek his fortune, Onesimus came to Rome. (For the argument against Cæsarea as his place of refuge, see PHILEMON, EPISTLE TO.) There he came into relation with the apostle Paul, the spiritual father of Philemon. At this time St. Paul had not yet visited Colossæ (Col 2^{1}); but Onesimus may have seen and heard the Apostle at Ephesus during the latter's three years' abode in that city, which was only 100 miles distant from Colossæ. In any case, he must have heard much of St. Paul in Philemon's house; and he may thus have been drawn to the Apostle's Roman lodging by the desire to obtain help in need or to listen to teaching from one who had taken a special interest in slaves (1 Co $7^{21.\,22}$, Eph $6^{7\text{-}9}$, Ac 16^{18}). Epaphras of Colossæ, the Apostle's fellow-worker in Rome (Col 4^{12}), may have been the medium of introduction. Under St. Paul's instruction and influence Onesimus became a Christian (Philem ^{10}, 'whom I have begotten in my bonds'). There must have been something very lovable about the fugitive slave, notwithstanding his blemished record; for the Apostle not only testifies to his faithfulness and helpfulness, but calls him a 'beloved brother' (Col 4^{9}), his other self (Philem ^{17}), 'my very heart' (lit. 'my own bowels,' *τὰ ἐμὰ σπλάγχνα*, Philem ^{12}). As a Christian, Onesimus would realize more keenly his misdemeanour in absconding and perhaps stealing from Philemon; hence he appears to have readily acquiesced in St. Paul's determination not to retain him, however 'profitable,' but to restore him to his lawful master. Onesimus, accordingly, returns to Colossæ along with St. Paul's colleague in the ministry, Tychicus (Col $4^{8.\,9}$), who, as a native of the province of Asia, would probably be known to Philemon, and would be an appropriate personal intercessor for Onesimus with Philemon on the Apostle's behalf. To render certain, however, the friendly reception of Onesimus, St. Paul sends with the slave a letter to Philemon commending him as one to be received and permanently possessed (*αἰώνιον ἀπέχῃς*) 'no longer as a slave, but above a slave, a brother beloved.'

We have no reliable account of Onesimus' subsequent history; but we may accept as in itself highly credible the tradition (*Apost. Canons*, 82) that Philemon not only forgave but emancipated his slave. More doubtful and also discordant are the records which represent Onesimus as attaining to the position of 'bishop' or presiding presbyter, in Berœa, according to the *Apost. Const.* (vii. 46); in Ephesus, according to another tradition which identifies him with Onesimus, 'bishop' of Ephesus in the time of Ignatius (Ign. *Eph.* 1; *AS*, under 16th Feb.). A tradition (also embodied in the *AS*) represents him as journeying to Spain; and the apocryphal *Acts* of the Spanish Xanthippe and Polyxena are written in his name (see *TS* ii. 3 [1893]). Nicephorus (9th cent.) transmits (*HE* iii. 11) a tradition that he was martyred at Rome; while another authority (Galesinius) describes that martyrdom as taking place at Puteoli (*AS*, *loc. cit.*). The commonness of the name deprives these accounts of any historical reliability. F. W. Farrar, in *Darkness and Dawn*, ed. 1892, p. 79 ff., and the author of *Philochristos* (E. A. Abbott) in his *Onesimus*, 1882, give interesting fictitious accounts of what might have been the life-story of this slave.

LITERATURE.—See under PHILEMON, EPISTLE TO.

HENRY COWAN.

ONESIPHORUS (Ὀνεσίφορος, 'profit-bringer').—This is the name of a Christian convert belonging to Ephesus who had visited Rome during the apostle Paul's imprisonment and had sought out the prisoner and ministered to his wants: 'He oft refreshed me, and was not ashamed of my chain' (2 Ti 1^{16}). He had also performed outstanding services for the Church at Ephesus, to which the Apostle refers, mentioning that Timothy, to whom he writes, knew better (*βέλτιον*) about them than he did himself (v.^{18}). The word used here and translated 'ministered' (Gr. *διακονέω*) has been supposed to indicate that Onesiphorus acted as a deacon of the Church in Ephesus, but this is by no means certain. When in Rome during his second imprisonment the Apostle sends greetings to the household of Onesiphorus (4^{19}); and in 1^{16} he expresses the desire that the Lord may give mercy to the 'house of Onesiphorus.' St. Paul mentions that Onesiphorus had treated him very kindly when in Rome, and contrasts his action with that of other members of the Church of Asia, who had turned away from him and refused to help him in his need, particularly referring to Phygellus and Hermogenes.

Several questions arise here. Why does St. Paul speak of the household of Onesiphorus? Why does he not send greetings to Onesiphorus himself, as he does, *e.g.*, in 4^{19} to Prisca and Aquila? Was Onesiphorus dead when the Epistle was written? Most students conclude that Onesiphorus had already died. If this view be correct, an interesting point arises with regard to the prayer in 1^{18}—'the Lord grant unto him that he may find mercy of the Lord in that day.' Is this a prayer for one who was already dead? Several who advocate the practice of prayer for the departed have quoted this passage in support of their position (*e.g.*, Archibald Campbell, *The Intermediate or Middle State of Departed Souls*, London, 1713, p. 72; E. H. Plumptre, *The Spirits in Prison*; do., 1884, pp. 128, 266; H. M. Luckock, *After Death*^{3}, do., 1881, p. 77, *The Intermediate State*^{2}, do., 1896, p. 211). N. J. D. White, in *EGT*, '1 and 2 Timothy and Titus,' London, 1910, p. 159, refers to 2 Mac 12^{44} in support of the contention that an orthodox Jew of the time of Christ could have prayed for the dead. It seems, however, to be an undue pressing of the text to regard the sentence in 1^{18} as more than a pious wish on the part of the Apostle for one of whom he had very kindly memories (cf. G. S. Barrett, *The Intermediate State*, London, 1896, p. 113). In any case, we have no foundation whatever for the Roman Catholic system of prayers for the deliverance of souls from the pains of purgatory.

See, further, artt. in *HDB* and *EBi*.

W. F. BOYD.

ONLY-BEGOTTEN (*μονογενής*, יָחִיד).—**1. Use of the phrase.**—It occurs in a literal sense four times in the NT: in Lk 7^{12} (the widow's son at Nain), 8^{42} (Jairus' daughter), 9^{38} (the child in the scene after the Transfiguration), He 11^{17} (Isaac); not at all in the other Synoptists. As referring to our Lord, it is Johannine only; and outside the Fourth Gospel it is found once only—in 1 Jn 4^{9}. It is used of Christ absolutely, 'the Only-begotten,' in Jn 1^{14}; and with 'Son of God' or 'his Son' in Jn $3^{16.\ 18}$, 1 Jn 4^{9}. The reading in Jn 1^{18} is disputed; the best-attested reading is *μονογενὴς θεός* (without the article), 'God only begotten' (ℵ*BC*L Pesh. Boh. Æth., etc.); but AX with Old Lat., Vulg., Syr-cu, Arm., secondary uncials and almost all cursives, have *ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός*, 'the only begotten Son.' The *Diatessaron* seems to have got out of the difficulty by reading 'the Only-begotten' simply; Syr-sin is wanting here, but Burkitt (*Evang. da-Meph.*, 1904, ii. 307 f.) thinks that it had *μονογενὴς θεός*, and that the unrevised Syr-cu had 'the Only-begotten' as the *Diatessaron*. This is to some extent confirmed by the Ignatian interpolator (*Philipp.* 2 [late 4th cent.]), who also reads 'the Only-begotten' (Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*: 'Ignatius'^{2}, iii. [1889] 190; see also i. 254). The Fathers are divided; the old Roman Creed (as given by Swete, *Apostles' Creed*, p. 16) has 'unicum filium,' which evidently presupposes the second reading (the derived 'Apostles' Creed' has 'filium eius unicum dominum nostrum'; see below).

Another Greek rendering of יָחִיד is *ἀγαπητός*, and this is found in the LXX of Gn 22^{2}, whence the same word has found its way into 2 P 1^{17} and into Mt 17^{5}, Mk 9^{7} ('my beloved Son'); in ‖ Lk 9^{35} the best MSS have *ἐκλελεγμένος*, 'chosen.' But the LXX has *μονογενής* in Jg 11^{34} (Jephthah's daughter) and To 3^{15} (Sarah, daughter of Raguel), and Aquila seems to have used it in Gn 22^{2} (Hort, *Two Dissertations*, p. 49). The Latin renderings are *unicus* and *unigenitus*; the former seems to be the older of the two (*DCG* ii. 281).

2. Meaning as applied to our Lord.—It appears to the present writer to be clear that in Jn. *μονογενής* refers to the pre-existent Sonship of our Lord: 'God hath sent his only begotten Son into the world' (1 Jn 4^{9}). Our Lord is Son in a unique sense; we by adoption, He by nature (see ADOPTION). 'The Divine essence was so peculiarly communicated to the Word that there never was any other person naturally begotten of the Father, and in that respect Christ is the only begotten Son of God' (Pearson; cf. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat.* x. 4: 'He is called Son, not as advanced by adoption, but as naturally begotten'). The emphasis on the first part of the word is the same as that on *ἑαυτοῦ* and *ἰδίου* in Ro $8^{3.\ 32}$ ('God sending his own Son . . . spared not his own Son'); in these phrases St. Paul has an equivalent to *μονογενής*.

The above is the universal interpretation of the title by the Fathers from at least the time of Nicæa onwards, though other views were held in certain heretical circles. But was it the earliest interpretation? It is certainly the fact that *μονογενής* was not much used by the writers of the first three quarters of the 2nd cent., as far as we can judge by their very scanty remains; but Justin uses it occasionally (*e.g. Dial.* 105: 'He was the only-begotten of the Father of all things, being begotten in a peculiar manner Word and Power by Him, and having *afterwards* become man through the Virgin'), and it is found in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* (§ 20). The Valentinians in the 2nd cent. used it for their æon Nous; they certainly treated the Only-begotten of Jn. as a pre-existent Being, but they took the particle 'as' (*ὡς*) in Jn 1^{14} as excluding the complete identification with Jesus (see Swete, *op. cit.* p. 26). The title took its place (probably *c.* A.D. 150) in the old Roman Creed—in the Greek form of the Creed as *μονογενής*, in the Latin form as *unicus*—perhaps as a protest against the misuse of it by the Valentinians. In some Western forms of the Creed, however, it is absent. F. Kattenbusch (*Das apost. Symbol*, 1894–1900, and *DCG* ii. 281) holds that 'unicum' was originally meant to go with 'Dominum,' but in view of the Johannine use this seems improbable. Later in the 2nd cent. *μονογενής* is constantly used by Irenæus.

Harnack asserts (*Das apostol. Glaubensbekenntniss*, ed. 1892) that in the Roman Creed the title refers only to the Incarnate Life, not to the Pre-existent Sonship. This is certainly not the case with Justin (see above); and Aristides affirms the pre-existence of the Son of God ('He is named the Son of God most High; and it is said that God came down from heaven, and . . . clad Himself with flesh, and in a daughter of man there dwelt the Son of God,' *Apol.* § 2, ed. Harris [*TS* i. 1 (1891) 36]). The earlier Fathers taught that before the Incarnation our Lord was Son of God (*e.g.* Ignatius, *Magn.* 6, 7; *Smyrn.* 1), and did not, like some contemporary heretics, limit the Sonship to the human life. But they did not at first adopt the technical word 'generation' for the communication of the Divine essence to the Son. Here we have an excellent example of the change in the use of technical theological words, of which *hypostasis* furnishes another and a later example. Ignatius says (*Eph.* 7) that our Lord was 'generate and ingenerate' (*γεννητὸς καὶ ἀγέννητος*)—generate, that is, in His humanity, and ingenerate in His Divinity; 'generation' as used by Ignatius has an earthly sense, whereas by the time of Justin and Tatian it had acquired a heavenly one (cf. Swete, p. 28). What Ignatius means is that our Lord's humanity is created, His Divinity is uncreated; and, as Lightfoot shows (excursus in *Apostolic Fathers*: 'Ignatius'^{2}, ii. [1889] 90 ff.), he substantially held the same views as the Nicene Fathers as to the Person of Christ. In the later writers Christ is said to be *ἀγένητος* in His Godhead—there never was a time before He came into existence; but He was not *ἀγέννητος*. In His Godhead he was *γεννητός*, 'begotten'; the Father alone was *ἀγέννητος*, 'unbegotten.' But this distinction was unknown to Ignatius. It is also an example of the fluid state of theological terminology that some 2nd cent. writers speak of the pre-existent Christ as Spirit (pseudo-Clement, *2 Cor.* § 9: 'Christ . . . being first Spirit, then became flesh'; cf. Hermas, *Sim.* v. 6, ix. 1, and Lightfoot's note in *Apostolic Fathers*: 'Clement,' ii. [1890] 230); and that even in the 3rd cent. Hippolytus speaks of the Incarnation being necessary for the perfect Sonship of our Lord, although, when unincarnate, being perfect Word, he was Only-begotten (*c. Noet.* 15).

Other interpretations of 'Only-begotten' make it equivalent to 'begotten by one alone,' as Eunomius asserted (Basil, *c. Eunom.* ii. 20: *μόνος παρὰ μόνου . . . γεννηθείς*), or to *ἀγαπητός*, 'beloved,' as is affirmed by the Racovian Catechism (Socinian).

The word *μονογενής* is found in the Nicene and 'Constantinopolitan' Creeds, in the early Creed of Jerusalem (gathered out of Cyril's *Catechetical Lectures*), in the Creed of Marcellus (Epiphanius, *Hær.* lxxii. 3), in *Apost. Const.* vii. 41, and apparently in all Greek forms of the Apostles' Creed.

See also art. FIRST-BORN, FIRST-BEGOTTEN.

LITERATURE.—B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel acc. to St. John*, 1908, *The Epistles of St. John*, 1883; J. Pearson, *On the Creed*, new ed., 1899, art. ii., esp. notes 52, 53; H. B. Swete, *The Apostles' Creed*^{3}, 1899; F. J. A. Hort, *Two Dissertations*, 1876; F. Kattenbusch, art. 'Only-begotten' in *DCG* ii. (takes a different view from that of this article); W. Sanday, art. 'Son of God' in *HDB* iv.

A. J. MACLEAN.

ORACLE.—In the literature of the Apostolic Church the word 'oracle' has lost its technical pagan meaning. *λόγιον* occurs four times in the NT (Ac 7^{38}, Ro 3^{2}, He 5^{12}, 1 P 4^{11}). In the first three of these passages it means the Canonical Scriptures of the OT. That is probably also its meaning in 1 Peter: 'If any man speaketh, speaking as it were oracles of God,' *i.e.* treating his words as seriously as if they were inspired Scripture. Clement of Rome uses the word three times (*ad Cor.* xix., liii., lxii.), always in the sense of authoritative Scripture, *i.e.* the OT. Eusebius (*HE* III. xxxix. 16) quotes Papias as saying that 'Matthew composed the oracles (*sc.* of the Lord) in Hebrew, and each one interpreted them as he could.' E. C. Selwyn holds that these were the Messianic prophecies of the OT which Matthew collected (*The Oracles in the New Testament*, London, 1912, p. 396 ff.). The adjective λόγιος (RV 'learned') is applied to Apollos (Ac 18^{24}).

R. H. MALDEN.

ORATION.—The word occurs in the NT only in connexion with Herod Agrippa, who, at Cæsarea, 'made an oration' (δημηγορέω) from the throne (or judgment-seat [RVm]) to the embassy from Tyre and Sidon (Ac 12^{21}). It refers to set speeches made in public assemblies, but sometimes it is employed in a derogatory sense for speeches of the demagogic order. There is a curious use of the word in the LXX, Pr 30^{31} (24^{66})—βασιλεὺς δημηγορῶν ἐν ἔθνει. It was not an unusual thing for kings and princes to make orations in public assembly.

JOHN REID.

ORATOR.—See TERTULLUS.

ORDINANCE.—The word 'ordinance' is used in the RV to translate four different Greek substantives: (1) δικαίωμα (Ro 1^{32} 2^{26} 8^{4}, He 9$^{1.\ 10}$); (2) διαταγή (Ac 7^{53}, Ro 13^{2}); (3) δόγμα (Eph 2^{15}, Col 2^{14}); (4) κτίσις (1 P 2^{13}). The Latin Vulgate in these passages renders δόγμα by *decretum*, κτίσις by *creatura*, δικαίωμα by *iustificatio* or *iustitia*, διαταγή by *dispositio* and *ordinatio*. δικαίωμα is also used to signify a righteous act (Ro 5$^{16.\ 18}$, Rev 15^{4} 19^{8}), δόγμα is translated 'decree' in Ac 16^{4} 17^{7} and 'commandment' in He 11^{23}. The only Evangelist who uses either word is St. Luke (1^{6} 2^{1}). The verb δογματίζεσθε ('submit yourselves to ordinances' [RV], *decernitis* [Vulg.]) is found in Col 2^{20}. Clement uses δικαίωμα three times (*ad Cor.* ii., xxxv., lviii.). In the first and third of these passages it is coupled with πρόσταγμα; in the second he is quoting the Greek (LXX) version of Ps 50^{16}. He has three other words which might be translated 'ordinance': (1) νόμιμα (*ad Cor.* i.); (2) διάταξις (*ib.* xxxiii.); (3) δεδογματισμένα (*ib.* xx.; cf. Col 2^{20}). The verb διέταξε, 'he ordained,' occurs once (*ib.* xx.). 'The δόγμα of the Gospel' as a practical rule of conduct occurs in the *Didache*, xi. Ignatius speaks of being 'established in the δόγματα of the Lord' (*Magn.* xiii.) and has the verb διατάσσομαι, 'I ordain,' three times (*Eph.* iii., *Trall.* iii., *Rom.* iv.). The substantive derived from it (διάταγμα) occurs in *Trall.* vii.

The conception of an ordinance seems to be primarily something which is recognized as obtaining in practice. The authority upon which it rests may be Divine, as when it is applied by Clement to the laws of nature, which earth, sea, sky, and all living creatures must obey; or it may be primarily human, albeit ultimately Divine, as in 1 P 2^{13}. The usage is not absolutely uniform, but as a rule the Divine sanction of an ordinance seems to be less direct than the immediate command of God Himself. Thus the Law is spoken of as being the ordinance of angels (Ac 7^{53}). An ordinance is generally a human deduction from a Divinely-revealed premise rather than the actual premise itself. When Ignatius says 'I ordain,' it is with reference to his personal authority, which is not irrefragable (cf. the distinction drawn by St. Paul in 1 Co 7^{25}).

R. H. MALDEN.

ORDINATION.—**1. Scope of the inquiry.**—It is proposed to examine the somewhat scanty evidence of the 1st cent. as to the manner in which Christian ministers were admitted to office. In the investigation the following passages, which have, or may be thought to have, a bearing on the subject, will be specially considered: Ac 1^{24} (appointment of Matthias) 6^{6} (appointment of the Seven) 13^{3} (mission of Barnabas and Saul) 14^{23} (appointment of presbyters); 1 Ti 4^{14}, 2 Ti 1^{6} (Timothy's ordination); 1 Ti 5^{22} (?), Tit 1^{5} (ordinations by Timothy and Titus). But, before examining these passages, we may make two preliminary remarks. (*a*) There is no technical word used in the NT to express admission to ministerial office, for though χειροτονεῖν is found (Ac 14^{23}), there is no indication that it is there used in a technical sense (see below, **3**). This is the case also in the *Didache* (§ 15, *c.* A.D. 130?), where we read: 'Appoint (χειροτονήσατε) therefore for yourselves bishops and deacons.' At a later date this word and χειροθετεῖν and others (for which see *ERE*, art. 'Ordination') acquired a technical sense; but this is not the case in the NT. (*b*) As we have for this subject to depend largely on the narrative in Acts, it will be well to bear in mind a characteristic of St. Luke. With the wealth of material at his disposal, it was impossible for him to repeat the same or similar details over and over again; he therefore omits a detailed description in cases where a like account has already been given. We notice this both in the Third Gospel and in Acts. St. Luke gives the salient facts, especially of the events that happened at critical periods of the history; but, having once given them, he does not repeat the details next time he has to narrate a similar event. This will be borne in mind when we are considering narratives about admission to the ministry. We shall not expect that on each occasion the whole procedure will be described; but from the analogy of one such ordination, *e.g.* that of the Seven in Ac 6, we shall conclude, unless anything is said to the contrary, that the same procedure was followed on other occasions.

2. Choice of ordinands.—The normal method of choosing men for the Christian ministry in the Apostolic Age, as certainly in those which succeeded it, was election by those to whom the ordained was to minister. This was undoubtedly the case with the Seven in Ac 6. Whatever their exact office was—and it is not likely, in view of the solemn procedure adopted, to have been *only* an office of serving tables, a supposition which seems also to be contrary to the evidence of evangelistic activity by Stephen, Philip, and the rest—the people ('the whole multitude') elected (ἐξελέξαντο, 'chose for themselves,' 6^{5}) the Seven and presented them to the apostles (v.^{6}), who after election 'appointed' them (v.^{3}, καταστήσομεν) and prayed and laid their hands on them (v.^{6}). The difference between the 'appointing' and the 'electing' would seem to be that while the people had a free choice, the apostles reserved the right of veto if they thought the choice in a particular case unsuitable. And the same veto apparently rested with 'apostolic men' like Timothy and Titus. Thus Titus *appoints* (Tit 1^{5}, καταστήσῃς, the same word as in Ac 6^{6}) presbyters in every city. This must involve at least the same power of veto as in Ac 6.

We do not read of election in some cases; notably it is not mentioned when the presbyters are appointed in Ac 14^{23}, and some have taken the pronoun in the phrase 'appointed *for them*' as indicating that Paul and Barnabas acted without consulting the people. Yet, as has been said above (1), we ought probably to presume election to have taken place unless there is evidence to the contrary. The details are given in ch. 6; they are not repeated in ch. 14. It is also probable that election existed at Ephesus and in Crete, though we nowhere read of it in the Pastoral Epistles. This method (not without a certain veto attached) continued for many centuries, and to a large extent, with geographical and local variations, exists to this day (see art. 'Laity,' *ERE* vii. 768 f.).

An exception to this method of choosing men for the ministry would be when the Divine will was directly intimated. The Twelve were chosen by our Lord Himself (note especially Jn 15^{16}), without ecclesiastical intervention. So also was St. Paul (Gal 1^{1}; see below, **8**). In the appointment of Matthias to the apostolate, the people did indeed choose two (Joseph Barsabbas, surnamed Justus, and Matthias) from among the personal witnesses of our Lord's life and resurrection, but took the lot which (after prayer had been offered) was cast between these two as an indication of the purpose of God (Ac 1^{15-26}). The prayer is noteworthy both as being the first recorded act of public worship of the disciples after the Ascension, and as containing words which are characteristic of later ordinations: 'thou which knowest the hearts of all men' (καρδιογνῶστα πάντων, v.^{24}; cf. 15^{8}), though it is uncertain whether the prayer in Acts is addressed to the Father or to the Son. In the later ordinations it is addressed to the Father. In the case of St. Matthias there was apparently no further 'ordination' to the apostolate. The Divine choice is announced by the lot, and so he 'was numbered with the eleven apostles' (v.^{26}).

Other cases of Divine intervention are mentioned, and in such cases it would seem that there was no election. Whatever was the significance of the ceremony in Ac 13^{1-3} (see below, **8**), the *choice* of Barnabas and Saul was made by the Holy Ghost—no doubt through the utterance of a Christian prophet. And Timothy, as St. Paul tells us (1 Ti 4^{14}), was ordained through (διά) prophecy. This is taken by Liddon (*Com. in loc.*) as indicating an apostolic utterance or prayer—*i.e.* the ordination prayer. But this interpretation does not suit 1^{18}: 'the prophecies which went before on thee' (or better, as RVm, 'which led the way to thee'); and a much more likely view is that the 'prophecy' is the indication of the Divine purpose by a Christian prophet, showing that Timothy was a suitable person. Here a regular ordination did follow. It is possible, though perhaps not probable, that the words in Ac 20^{28} (see below, **6**) mean that the Holy Ghost had by a prophet pointed out the presbyters at Ephesus as being worthy of ordination.

3. The outward sign of ordination.—We are not told that our Lord gave directions to the apostles as to the method by which they were to appoint officials for the Church. Indeed, it is not a little remarkable that what Western theologians of a later day called the 'matter' and 'form' of ordination could neither of them have been taken from the incidents recorded in the gospel narratives which have come down to us. For in Jn $20^{22f.}$ (we need not stop to inquire whether these words were addressed to the Ten or to a larger number of disciples) our Lord is said to have 'breathed' on those present, whereas the apostles and those who came after them used, without any known exception, laying on of hands as an outward sign, and to have pronounced a declaratory and imperative formula, whereas the disciples always (till the Middle Ages) used by way of 'form' a prayer only.

The use of an outward sign for the admission of men to the ministry follows many analogies. Our Lord had made use of outward signs in instituting the two great sacraments of the gospel, baptism and the Eucharist. In the OT an outward sign was used in setting apart for office, and it was to be expected that a similar custom should be found in the Christian Church. As a matter of fact, the only outward sign found for many centuries in the case of Christian ordination is imposition of hands. This symbol was used in the OT in acts of blessing, of appointment to office, and of dedication to God. Moses laid his hands on Joshua when he set him apart as his successor (Nu 27^{23}, Dt 34^{9}). Jacob blessed his grandchildren by laying his hands on their heads (Gn $48^{14.17}$). Imposition of hands was used in dedicating sacrifices (Lv 1^{4}), and in setting apart Levites (Nu 8^{10}). Similarly our Lord blessed by laying on of hands (Mk $10^{13.16}$ and ‖ Mt. Lk.), and used the same symbolic act in healing (Mk 5^{23}—which shows that it was a well-known practice, as Jesus is *asked* to lay on hands, Lk 4^{40} 13^{13} etc.). The disciples also used laying on of hands in healing ('Mk' 16^{18}; Ac $9^{12.17}$, referring probably to the restoration of Saul's sight: see below, **8**; Ac 28^{8}). We see, then, that the symbol had more than one signification. The apostles used it when praying for the gift of the Holy Ghost for the baptized (Ac 8^{17} 19^{6}), and also when setting men apart for the ministry. The 'laying on of hands' in He 6^{2} perhaps refers to all the occasions when the symbol was used; or else to 'confirmation' only, as F. H. Chase maintains (*Confirmation in the Apostolic Age*, London, 1909, p. 45).

Laying on of hands is explicitly mentioned in Ac 6^{6} (the Seven) 13^{3} (mission of Barnabas and Saul; see **8**), 1 Ti 4^{14} and 2 Ti 1^{6} (ordination of Timothy), and in 1 Ti 5^{22}, if that refers to ordination (see below). No other outward sign is mentioned in the first three centuries. None at all is mentioned in the appointment of presbyters in Ac 14^{23}. Here the verb χειροτονεῖν is used, which in later days often meant 'to ordain.' But it does not necessarily imply laying on of hands; it may mean election, properly through a show of hands, or at any rate by an assembly, as in 2 Co 8^{19}; or it may even mean an appointment by God (Ac 10^{41}) or by man (14^{23}). Thus we cannot affirm from the last-named passage that Paul and Barnabas laid on hands* when they appointed presbyters in every church† which they visited on their first missionary journey. Yet it is exceedingly unlikely that they used any other outward sign, or that they refrained from using any outward sign. Here the characteristic of St. Luke already mentioned should be borne in mind. Laying on of hands was the sign universally used in the early Church for ordination; a supposed exception in the case of the ordination of a bishop in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (*c.* A.D. 375) is conclusively shown by the newly-discovered Church Orders to be only apparent.

In the 4th cent. another outward sign was introduced, apparently in cases where it was not at first deemed suitable to use imposition of hands—namely, at the admission of men (and women) to minor orders. In this case the 'porrectio instrumentorum' was substituted; a reader, for example, was given a book. In the Middle Ages, in the West, this kind of outward sign almost overshadowed the imposition of hands, especially in the case of the chalice and paten given to one ordained to the presbyterate. See on this subject *ERE*, art. 'Ordination.'

Laying on of hands is mentioned in 1 Ti 5^{22}. Timothy is to 'lay hands hastily on no man.' But does this refer to ordination? If so, it gives us confirmation of the fact, which in any case we can scarcely doubt, that the local ministry were ordained with imposition of hands. It is taken in this sense by Chrysostom and the Greek commentators, and in modern times by Alford, Liddon, and (apparently with a slight hesitation) by H. B. Swete (*HDB* iii. 85). On the other hand, this passage is interpreted by several moderns (Hort,

---

* The word χειροθεσία ('laying on of hands') is not found in the NT (as it is so often found later on), but ἐπίθεσις χειρῶν. In some works, *e.g.* the *Apost. Const.*, χειροτονία is used ordinarily for 'ordination,' but χειροθεσία when 'laying on of hands' is emphasized; the latter is used in *Apost. Const.* for other impositions of hands (A. J. Maclean, *Ancient Church Orders*, Cambridge, 1910, p. 154 f.).

† This word might have been translated 'in church': cf. Ac 2^{46}, 'at home'; but Tit 1^{5} is conclusive for the other translation.

Hammond, Ellicott, Chase, etc.), as referring to the reception of penitents with laying on of hands. This interpretation suits the context perhaps better than the other; both before and after this verse St. Paul is speaking of sinners, and the words, 'Neither be partaker of other men's sins, keep thyself pure,' are held to be less suitable to ordination. The custom of receiving penitents or persons who had been in schism or heresy, with laying on of hands, is attested in the 3rd cent. by Cyprian (*Ep.* lxxiv. [lxxiii.], 'ad Pompeium,' 1, *de Laps.* 16), in the 4th cent. by the Council of Nicæa (can. 8), Eusebius (*HE* vii. 2, an 'ancient custom'), the *Apost. Const.* (ii. 41), and at the end of the 5th cent. by the 'Gallican Statutes' (*Statuta Ecclesiæ Antiqua*), formerly in error ascribed to the 'Fourth Council of Carthage' (§ 80; see C. J. Hefele, *A History of the Councils of the Church*, Eng. tr., Edinburgh, 1896, ii. 411). But this custom is not referred to elsewhere in the NT, and one has a suspicion that the interpretation in question antedates it considerably. On the whole, the question must be left open.

The laying on of hands is no magical sign, effecting a change independently of all spiritual considerations. But the same thing is true of the water in baptism and the bread and wine in the Eucharist. The utility of an outward and visible sign is undoubtedly very great, but it is only a minor part of an ordinance, and does not enable those who receive it to neglect the spiritual disposition which is necessary. The outward sign is the help to faith. The vitally important factor in the ordinance is the Holy Spirit who works in it. See Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the NT*, p. 384.

4. The ordination prayer.—All the passages in Acts mentioned above (1^{24} 6^{6} 13^{3} 14^{23}) tell us of prayer being used, but, except in the case of the choosing of Matthias (where the words are no guide to us for the general case), we have no indication as to the nature of the prayer. The prayer preceded the laying on of hands (6^{6}). The earliest ordination prayer that we can even provisionally arrive at dates from perhaps the beginning of the 3rd century. By a careful comparison of the ordination prayers in the parallel Church Orders of the 4th cent., which are derived from a common original that is perhaps of the time of Hippolytus, we can conjecturally determine the ordination prayer of the lost original. But even this gives us only one out of what was doubtless a very large number of such prayers in use throughout the Church; and, further, those used at ordinations, like those used at the Eucharist, were probably at the first in a very fluid condition, if not extemporaneous. The great characteristic of all ordinations for many centuries after the Ascension was their extreme simplicity, no matter to what office a person was ordained; a prayer and laying on of hands were practically all, except that the kiss of peace, and, in the case of a bishop, enthronization, were added. But it is very noteworthy that while our Lord in Jn $20^{22f.}$ said, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost,' and 'Whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them,' etc., the Christian ordinations invariably took the form of a prayer. The introduction in the West, in the Middle Ages, of the declaratory form, in addition to (not instead of) the ordination prayer, was very probably due to a desire to follow our Lord's example exactly. But the earlier Christians would seem to have regarded such a procedure as irreverent. Their Master had used a declaratory form, had by His Divine power declared that their commission was given to them. They themselves believed that their own proper course was to *pray* that God would give the commission to the ordinands by their instrumentality. The same feeling comes out in the fact that in the early ages the eucharistic consecration by the Church was always conceived as effected by a prayer, and not by a declaratory form of words. See *ERE*, artt. 'Invocation (Liturgical)' and 'Ordination.'

5. Fasting.—In Ac $13^{2f.}$ we read that fasting preceded the solemn mission of Barnabas and Saul. In 14^{23} 'fastings,' as well as prayer, accompany the appointment of presbyters 'in every church' by Paul and Barnabas. The plural 'fastings' seems to mean that these apostles *at each town* held a solemn service of ordination with fasting; they did not ordain a large number for the whole district at one convenient centre.

Fasting was frequently in early ages associated with solemn prayer (Ps 35^{13}, Dn 9^{3}, Mk 9^{29} [some MSS], Lk 2^{37}); and so with baptism and the Eucharist. The pre-baptismal fast is mentioned in the *Didache* (7 f.), by Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i. 61), Tertullian (*de Bapt.* 20), Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cat.* iii. 7, xviii. 17), in the Church Orders (see *ERE* v. 768^{a}), and elsewhere. The fast before Communion is mentioned in Tertullian (*ad Uxor.* ii. 5) and in the Church Orders (*ERE* v. 768^{b}). In the *Testament of our Lord* (i. 22) and the *Arabic Didascalia* (23, 38) there is a fast for bishops *after* their ordination. But we do not find in early post-apostolic literature much emphasis laid on fasting in connexion with ordination.

6. God working through His ministers in ordaining.—It was not only when there was a special Divine intervention, as in the case of Matthias, Paul, and (probably) Timothy, that the first disciples believed that God was the real ordainer. He always worked through His human instruments. Even in the case of Matthias the special intervention extended only to God's selection (so they regarded the lot) of one out of two men; the choice of the two was made by the people. Yet no one would doubt that Matthias was really appointed an apostle by God. And this, as seems most probable, is the meaning of Ac 20^{28}. St. Paul tells the presbyters of Ephesus that the Holy Ghost has made them 'bishops.' Yet he doubtless had ordained them himself, though probably (as in 6^{3}) the people had elected them. It is perhaps due to this significant passage about the Ephesian presbyters that, as Swete remarks (*The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*, London, 1912, p. 290 f.), all the forms of ordination in the Church Orders recognize the Holy Spirit as the source of ministerial power, though the invocation of the Third Person in the Eucharist was not quite so universal.

7. The charisma in ordination.—St. Paul says to Timothy, 'Neglect not the charisma that is in thee, which was given thee through prophecy with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery' (1 Ti 4^{14}); and 'kindle (stir into flame, RVm) the charisma of God which is in thee through the laying on of my hands' (2 Ti 1^{6}: on these two verses see further below, 9). That this 'charisma' (gift) is not the office to which Timothy was appointed—whatever that was—but the inward grace which enabled him to discharge it, is seen from the words ἐν σοί which occur in both passages (so Alford, Ellicott, Liddon, *Comm. in loc.*; Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the NT*, p. 246; see also R. Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, bk. v. ch. lxxvii.). The nature of the charisma is referred to in 2 Ti 1^{7}, which immediately follows the second passage; it is a spirit of power and love and discipline (σωφρονισμοῦ, *i.e.*, possibly, 'self-control,' or better, 'the capacity of exercising discipline without abandoning love' [so Swete]). That the 'charismata' or gifts of the Spirit are not all of them what we call 'extraordinary,' but include those faculties which enable the regular ministry to carry out their work, may be seen also from St. Paul's description of the gifts in 1 Co 12. The gifts are indeed various, but they include 'apostles,' 'teachers,' 'helps,' 'governments,' as well as 'powers,' 'gifts of healing,' 'kinds of tongues' (v.^{28}; cf. the preceding verses). The same thing is seen from Ro 12^{6-8}.

The belief that in ordination a charisma of the Spirit is given does not (it need hardly be said) mean that those who thus receive it have not before received the Holy Spirit. The Seven, for example, were to be full of [Holy] Spirit and wisdom before they were elected by the people and appointed and ordained by the apostles (Ac 6^3). Stephen was already 'a man full of faith and Holy Spirit' (v.^{5}). But the gifts of the Spirit are many and various; and the charisma which Timothy was not to neglect but to kindle was that special gift which would enable him to be a good Christian minister.

8. The mission of Barnabas and Saul from Antioch.—In considering the present subject we must necessarily touch on the meaning of the ceremony in Ac 13^{1-3}, when these two great missionaries were sent out on their first evangelistic journey. Was it an ordination, or a 'dismission service'? Was it the appointment of Barnabas and Saul to the apostolate? We read that certain 'prophets and teachers' were at Antioch—Barnabas, Symeon, Lucius, Manaen, Saul. 'As they ministered (λειτουργούντων) to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. Then, when they had fasted and prayed and laid their hands on them, they sent them away.' The 'sending forth' is expressly said to be the act of the Holy Ghost (v.^{4}). This was after the return of Barnabas and Saul from Jerusalem, whither they had gone to take the alms of the Church at Antioch (11^{30} 12^{25}). St. Luke's pronouns are somewhat ambiguous. But his phrase in 13^3 must mean that Symeon, Lucius, and Manaen (and possibly other prophets and teachers, if any unnamed ones were present) * prayed and laid hands on Barnabas and Saul, and sent them away. It was clearly an important occasion. It was a solemn service or liturgy before God, during which the Holy Spirit indicated His Divine purpose—doubtless by the mouth of one of the prophets present. They then fasted and—apparently on a second occasion—prayed, laid on hands, and sent the two missionaries away. It is the view of some that this was an 'ordination' of Barnabas and Saul to the apostleship (so, *e.g.*, Rackham, *Com. in loc.*). It is said that hereafter, but not before, they are described as 'apostles' (14^{14}), and that though St. Paul was made an apostle by our Lord directly, yet that Divine appointment did not make it unnecessary for the Church at large by a formal act to recognize it. But (however that may be) the view that these two men were on this occasion made apostles appears to the present writer to be more than doubtful. In the first place, nothing whatever is said in the passage in question about the apostleship, or indeed about an appointment to any office whatever. Secondly, in Gal 1^1 St. Paul explicitly claims that he is an 'apostle not from (ἀπό) men, neither through (διά) man, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father.' His apostleship is of Divine, not of human, origin; the same is true of the apostleship of the Twelve also. Further, his apostleship is not *through* man—no man is the instrument by which this Divinely appointed apostleship came to him. Indeed, the whole argument of the first two chapters of this Epistle is based on the supposition that St. Paul did not derive authority through the Twelve—and *a fortiori* not through any Christian 'prophets and teachers.' And in the third place the suggestion about Church recognition, if it be pressed to mean (as it is pressed by Rackham) that Symeon, Lucius, and Manaen conferred the apostleship on Barnabas and Saul, means that those who were not themselves apostles could make others apostles. Rackham says that as the Divine will was indicated, this was possible, just as Ananias, a 'layman,' laid hands on Saul (Ac 9^{17}). The latter statement involves more than one unproved assumption; but at any rate this argument about Ananias runs counter to the proposition that 'the Church should by a formal act recognize the Divine operation.' 'The Church' does not mean any individual layman in the Church. More cautiously Gore remarks (*The Church and the Ministry*^{5}, London, 1902, p. 236 n.):

> 'It was essential to St. Paul's apostolate that he should not have received his spiritual gifts through other apostles. Again the prophets and teachers at Antioch lay hands on Barnabas and Saul. But here also we have *a special divine authorization*; and it is to set apart two already of their own "order" to a special work.'

For the reasons stated it seems impossible to view the incident at Antioch as a conferring of the apostleship on Barnabas and Saul. But it was a solemn assignment to them, under the direction of the Holy Ghost, of an extended work among the Gentiles, and all the accompaniments befitted this new departure. When Barnabas received the apostleship there is no record. But as he was constantly in touch with the Twelve, and was, so to speak, the connecting link between them and St. Paul, and as there is no claim that he received the apostleship direct from our Lord, it is probable that he received it from the Twelve on some occasion which is not recorded.

9. The action of the presbyters in Timothy's ordination.—We have hitherto refrained from asking to what office Timothy was ordained. And it is perhaps unnecessary for our present purpose to do so. But, at any rate, Timothy was one of those 'apostolic men' who shared in the itinerant ministry of the apostles, though they were not themselves apostles; he was not one of the local ministry, though for a time he was resident at Ephesus. There is no reason to suppose that he passed from one office to another, as the ordained of later ages have done; and we may in all probability take his ordination referred to in the Pastoral Epistles as being his only ordination, and as his ordination to the office which he held when St. Paul addressed his two letters to him.

Now in 1 Ti 4^{14} the charisma (see above, 7) is said to have been given to Timothy through (διά) prophecy (see above, 1), with (μετά) the laying on of the hands of the presbytery (πρεσβυτερίου). And in 2 Ti 1^6 the 'charisma of God' is said to be in Timothy 'through (διά) the laying on of [St. Paul's] hands.' It seems hardly possible to interpret these words otherwise than of Timothy's ordination.* And it is difficult to interpret the presbytery otherwise than as the body of presbyters referred to in 1 Ti 5^{17}, etc. The usual interpretation seems to be the right one, that in the above passages we have the prototype of an arrangement which was once probably universal, or certainly widespread, in both East and West, and which still survives in the West. We may think of St.

---

* The τινες of the TR is badly attested, and can hardly be original. D* and Vulg. have 'among whom [were] Barnabas,' etc., suggesting that there were others. But probably the list given is exclusive.

* Chase (*Confirmation in the Apostolic Age*, p. 35) takes 2 Ti 1^6 (not 1 Ti 4^{14}) as referring to Timothy's confirmation, though he stands almost alone in doing so. He interprets 1 Ti 4^{14} as is done by the present writer, and understands it to mean that St. Paul and the presbyters together laid hands on Timothy at his ordination.

Paul laying his hands on Timothy, with the active concurrence of the local presbyters, who lay on hands together with the Apostle. But the difference of preposition is significant; in the case of St. Paul *διά*, in the case of the presbyters *μετά*, is used. The latter word would seem to indicate that the act was one of St. Paul's in which the presbyters by their deed concurred. There is, indeed, a slight difficulty in this interpretation. The arrangement, formerly in the East and still in the West, to which reference has been made, is that at the ordination of a presbyter the presbyters lay hands on his head together with the ordaining bishop, though the latter alone says the words. But this custom is not mentioned till the 4th century. We find it in the *Egyptian* and *Ethiopic Church Orders*, the *Testament of Our Lord*, and the *Verona Latin Fragments of the Didascalia, etc.*; also *c.* A.D. 500 in the 'Gallican Statutes' (above, **3**); see *ERE*, art. 'Ministry,' **8**. The custom may probably be traced to the lost original of the parallel Church Orders—that is, to the 3rd century. Of the intervening period between the Pastoral Epistles and that date we know nothing in respect to this matter. It is therefore possible that the arrangement in question was not continuously in use, but was adopted in the 3rd cent. because of the interpretation then given to the passage in 1 Timothy. And it was confined to the ordination of a presbyter, for when a bishop was ordained the other bishops laid on hands, but no presbyters, unless possibly—this is very uncertain—in the *Canons of Hippolytus*; while in the NT there is no indication that the local presbyters laid on hands with Paul and Barnabas when they 'appointed' presbyters for each church: indeed, probably there were no presbyters present other than the newly-ordained. Nevertheless, though the arrangement may possibly not have been continued in the sub-Apostolic Age, and though the latter procedure was not altogether on all-fours with the apostolic arrangement, seeing that the whole local organization of the ministry had developed by the 3rd cent., it appears highly probable that St. Paul's meaning is that both he and the local presbyters laid hands on Timothy when the latter was ordained. Where this took place St. Paul does not say. It could hardly have been at Lystra, where Timothy was converted. A novice in the faith, such as he was when St. Paul took him into his company, would not have been ordained to the ministry (cf. 1 Ti 3^{6}). Alford (*Com.* on 1 Ti 4^{14}) suggests Ephesus, where Timothy was to exercise his ministry for a considerable time. And this would be in accordance with the idea that St. Paul refers to the concurrence of the presbytery because the Ephesian presbyters were likely to read his Epistle. But the point is of no great importance.

For the manner in which ordinations to the ministry have been conducted in subsequent ages, reference may be made to the present writer's article 'Ordination' in *ERE*.

LITERATURE.—H. B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the NT*, London, 1909, art. 'Laying on of Hands' in *HDB*; F. J. A. Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, London, 1897 (posthumous); the various Commentaries on Acts and the Pastoral Epistles, especially R. B. Rackham, *The Acts of the Apostles*^{2}, London, 1904; C. J. Ellicott, *The Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul*, do., 1856; H. Alford, *The Greek Testament*^{7}, do., 1874; H. P. Liddon, *St. Paul's First Epistle to Timothy*, do., 1897.

A. J. MACLEAN.

ORGANIZATION.—See CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

ORIGINAL SIN.—See SIN.

OTHO.—Otho is the name most often given to Marcus Saluius Otho, who, on becoming Emperor, was styled Imperator Marcus Otho Cæsar Augustus. He was the younger son of Lucius Saluius Otho and Albia Terentia, and was born on 28th April, A.D. 32. From his earliest youth he was distinguished for effeminacy and profligacy, and became a boon-companion of the Emperor Nero. He married Poppæa Sabina, already the wife of Rufrius Crispinus, and mistress of Nero, in order, it is said, that Nero might find her easier of access. Under suspicion of continuing marital relations with her, Otho, who had already held the quæstorship, was given a legate's post in Lusitania, where he remained from 59 to 68. The historians are unanimous that he was an excellent governor. When Galba in 68 revolted against Nero, Otho joined him and attended him to Rome, hoping, vainly as it transpired, that Galba would adopt him. Encouraged by an astrologer, who held out to him hopes of Empire, he plotted against Galba and brought about his murder (see under GALBA). Both the army and the Senate hailed Otho as Emperor on 15th January, 69. In spite of the treatment Nero had meted out to him, he liked to be called Nero, and it may be that he was the more welcome to the populace by contrast with the severity of his predecessor Galba. He was elected one of the consuls for 69. But his reign was short. A new claimant to the Empire arose in the person of Vitellius (*q.v.*). Otho marched from Rome to meet him, and was defeated at Betriacum between Mantua and Cremona (near modern Calvatone). He thereupon committed suicide at Brixellum (modern Brescello, on the right bank of the Po) after having ruled three months (17th April, 69).

LITERATURE.—Ancient authorities are Suetonius (*Otho*), Plutarch (*Otho* [ed. London, 1890]), Tacitus (*Histories*, ii.), Dio Cassius (lxiv.), etc. Modern works are *Prosopographia Imperii Romani*, sæc. i., ii., iii., pars iii., ed. P. de Rohden and H. Dessau, Berlin, 1898, no. 109, p. 168 f.; and the Histories of the Roman Empire by Duruy, Bury, Schiller, etc.; A. von Domaszewski, *Gesch. der röm. Kaiser*, Leipzig, 1909, ii. 86–96; E. G. Hardy, *Studies in Roman History*, London, 1906, pp. 295–334; there is also a valuable comparison of the leading ancient authorities in the same work, 2nd ser., do., 1909, pp. 158–202.

A. SOUTER.

OVERSEER.—See BISHOP.

P

PAGAN.—See HEATHEN.

PALACE (*πραιτώριον*, from Lat. *prætorium*).—St. Paul assured the Philippians (1^{13}) that the fact of his imprisonment had become known, and its cause understood, 'in all the palace' (AV), or 'throughout the whole prætorian guard' (RV). The interpretation of the phrase *ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ πραιτωρίῳ* has long been a vexed question, and no consensus of opinion has yet been reached.

The term 'prætorium' had an interesting history. In the early Roman republic, when the prætor (*præ-itor*, 'leader') was the general in the field, the prætorium was his part of the camp—the headquarters—with the secondary meaning of a council of war, because this was held in his tent. One of the gates of the camp was called the *porta prætoria*, and the general's bodyguard the *cohors prætoria* or *cohortes prætoriæ*.

In later times of peace, the prætors were the highest Roman magistrates, who, after administering justice for a year in the capital, were sent as proprætors to govern the provinces; and the prætorium was the official provincial residence, which might chance to be the palace of a former king (as in Mt 27^{27}, Mk 15^{16}, Jn $18^{28.33}$ 19^{9}; cf. Cic. *Verr.* II. v. 12 [30]). Under the Empire the *cohortes prætoriæ* were the Imperial bodyguard. As constituted by Augustus, they were nine in number, each with 1000 men, and one or more of them always attended the emperor, whether in Rome or elsewhere. Tiberius made an important and permanent change 'by gathering into one camp all the prætorian cohorts then dispersed over the city; that, thus united, they might receive his orders simultaneously, and by continually beholding their own numbers and strength, and by familiar intercourse, conceive a confidence in themselves, and strike terror into others' (Tac. *Ann.* iv. 2). The barracks formed a rectangle of 39 acres, and some parts of the ramparts, embedded in the later walls of Aurelian, can still be seen near the Porta Pia. The prætorians were recruited voluntarily, in Italy or in Italianized districts. They had better pay and shorter service than the regular army. On retiring each soldier received a bounty amounting to about £200. In the 2nd cent. the prætorian cohorts became ten in number, and in the time of Septimius Severus they consisted practically of barbarian soldiers, who were constantly in conflict with the people of Rome. The Prætorian Guard was suppressed by Constantine in 312.

On the supposition that the prætorium to which St. Paul alluded is a place, two interpretations have been offered. (1) The AV had the authority of the Greek commentators—*e.g.* Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Theodoret—for assuming that he had in view the Imperial residence on the Palatine. It is certain, however, that the term could not properly bear such a meaning. The Roman citizens would have keenly resented the use of a nomenclature suggestive of a military despotism, and the early Cæsars, too wise to wound their susceptibilities, were careful to maintain the appearance of republican liberty even after the reality was gone. If the Emperor was absent from Rome, he was indeed technically *in imperio*; and in the post-Augustan Age any spacious country villa could be called a prætorium; but no classical writer ever applies the word to the palace in the city. The utmost that can be said in favour of the exegesis in question is that St. Paul, as a provincial writing to provincials, may have been guilty of a 'terminological inexactitude.' But one of St. Paul's merits is his singular accuracy in the use of technical terms, and the *colonia* of Philippi to which he was writing was itself a miniature Rome, where fine shades of Imperial language were sure to be appreciated and mistakes at once detected. (2) The prætorium is often taken to denote 'the prætorian barracks at the Porta Viminalis on the east side of the city, in which Paul lay a prisoner at Rome' (Lipsius, *Hand-Com. zum NT*, *in loc.*). But this use of the word would be equally incorrect; for while the barracks were called *castra prætoria* (Pliny, *HN* iii. 9; Suet. *Tib.* 37) and *castra prætorianorum* (Tac. *Hist.* i. 31), they were never designated *prætorium.*

On the theory that the term is not local but personal, two meanings are again possible. (1) The word may collectively denote the Imperial Guards. J. B. Lightfoot (*Philippians*^{12}, 1894, pp. 99–104) argues strongly for this interpretation, which has been adopted in the RV. There is abundant evidence (*e.g.* Livy, xxvi. 15, xxx. 5; Tac. *Hist.* i. 20, iv. 46; Suet. *Nero*, 9; Pliny, *HN* xxv. 6; Jos. *Ant.* XIX. iii. 1; together with a number of inscriptions) that the word bore this meaning, which harmonizes with the καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς πᾶσιν that follows in Ph 1^{13}, whereas 'the others' is extremely awkward if it is conjoined with the name of a locality. If St. Paul, while abiding 'two whole years in his own hired dwelling' (Ac 28^{30}), was under prætorian custody, he would be able, owing to the frequent change of guards, to arouse an interest in his message throughout this famous body of soldiers.

(2) W. M. Ramsay, following Mommsen, holds that the prætorium 'is the whole body of persons connected with the sitting in judgment, the supreme Imperial Court, . . . representing the Emperor in his capacity as the fountain of justice, together with the assessors and high officers of the court' (*St. Paul the Traveller*, 1895, p. 357). There does not, however, appear to be any first or second century evidence for this use of the term. It is more probable that, on reaching Rome, St. Paul was handed over to the *præfectus prætorii* (called by St. Luke the στρατοπεδάρχης), who gave him for two years a large measure of liberty (always, of course, under the surveillance of a prætorian), and ultimately tried him, either in the *castra prætoria* at the Porta Viminalis, or more probably (see Ph 4^{22}) in the guard-room of the Imperial palace. Certainly from the 3rd cent. onward, and apparently much earlier, the *præfecti prætorio* (usually two, sometimes three, rarely one) exercised jurisdiction for the Emperor. In a letter to Pliny (*Ep. Plin.* 65) Trajan decides regarding a prisoner who had appealed from the governor's sentence: 'vinctus mitti ad præfectos prætorii mei debet.' It seems probable that St. Paul was handed over to the same tribunal. Before writing Philippians he had been tried once, and made a favourable impression upon the minds of his judges. Ever since his arrival in Rome it had been recognized that he was no ordinary criminal and no political agitator. He was seen to be a prisoner for his faith in Christ (Ph 1^{13}), and his bearing as well as his words commended him, and to a greater or less extent his message, to the *præfectus prætorio* (or *-ii*), to the whole *prætorium* (Imperial Lifeguards), and to 'all the others' with whom he was brought into contact. And some (especially *οἱ ἐκ τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας*) were not only impressed but converted.

LITERATURE.—T. Zahn, *Introd. to the NT*, 1909, vol. i. pp. 541 f., 551 ff.; M. R. Vincent, *ICC*, 'Philippians and Philemon,' 1897, p. 16 f.; H. A. A. Kennedy, in *EGT*, 'Philippians,' 1903, p. 423 f.

JAMES STRAHAN.

PALM (φοῖνιξ).—The only passages in the NT containing references to the palm are Jn 12^{13} and Rev 7^{9}. It flourishes in hot dry climates and is known to have been cultivated in Egypt and Babylonia at an early date. In the deserts of Arabia it is essential to existence, hence the Arabic saying that the palm has as many uses as there are days in a year. The palm referred to in the OT and NT is the *Phœnix dactylifera*, L.; in Palestine it still flourishes in the maritime plain but seldom ripens in the hill-country. Its cultivation in Palestine has been neglected for a long time past, and there can be little doubt that in ancient times it was much more common than it is to-day.

The trunk of the palm does not increase in thickness from year to year like other trees but only rises higher, putting forth new leaves each year. The lower circle of leaves, sometimes as much as seven years old, gradually withers away, and as the stumps of the old leaves wear off the trunk becomes more slender as it increases in height. The leaves, which are pinnate and are often 12 ft. long, form a kind of dome at the summit of the tall bare stem. The male and female blossoms are on different trees, and it is consequently necessary to impregnate the female blossoms if the seed is not to be barren. This is effected either by tying a bunch of male blossom on to the female trees or else by shaking out the pollen over the female flowers. The flowers grow on a single or branched tuft, covered by a spathe or sheath, some of which contain many thousands of flowers. The core of the trunk is soft and pithy, and palm wood is therefore of little use as timber, though it is of value for rafters and gate-posts.

The fruit is a staple article of food among the modern Bedouins. It is gathered by a man who climbs the trunk, severs the clusters of dates, places them in a basket, and lowers them to the ground. The date is utilized in many ways. A kind of brandy is made from its juice, and also *dibs*, a syrup resembling honey, which forms a useful substitute for sugar. Baskets, mats, and all sorts of utensils are manufactured from its leaves; the crown of barren trees is boiled as a vegetable; camels are fed on the pounded stones, horses on the fruit-stalks; and the fibres of the leaf-stalk and fruit-stalk are used for ropes.

Branches of palms were regarded as appropriate emblems of triumph and jubilation, and they were carried at the Feast of Tabernacles, while they were also used in constructing the booths on the house-tops on the occasion of this festival (Lv 23^{42}). In Rev 7^{9} the triumphal entry into Jerusalem (Jn 12^{13}) may be in view.

LITERATURE.—H. B. Tristram, *Natural History of the Bible*^{10}, 1911, p. 378 f.; J. C. Geikie, *The Holy Land and the Bible*, ed. 1887, i. 207 f., ed. 1903, p. 76; W. M. Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, 3 vols., ed. 1881–1886, *passim*, ed. 1910, p. 30; H. B. Swete, *Apocalypse of St. John*^{2}, 1907, p. 100; P. S. P. Handcock, *Mesopotamian Archæology*, 1912, p. 12 f.; *HDB* iii. 656 f.; *SDB*, p. 675; *EBi* iii. 3551 f.

P. S. P. HANDCOCK.

PALSY.—The more common word is 'paralysis.' Only two instances are reported in the Acts—8^{7} (many) and 9^{33} (Æneas). The condition referred to is marked by loss of muscular control, caused by cerebral or spinal lesion, or by local disease or disorder of nerves and muscles. Whether the paralytics who were healed by Philip in Samaria were brought to him on beds, were visited by him, or were able to come to him with others who were suffering from bodily disturbance, we are not told. Æneas was for eight years bed-ridden, and thus appears to have been in a desperate plight. In the absence of competent and explicit medical testimony, it would be idle to conjecture whether any of these cases was organic rather than functional, or how large a part suggestion played in their cure. The healings by Philip brought to an end the practice of sorcery by Simon and led to his conversion; the healing of Æneas showed anew the power which resided in 'the name of Jesus' (cf. 3^{6} 4^{10}). The recovery of all these paralytics followed the customary order of NT cases: no sooner was the word spoken than the cures took place.

C. A. BECKWITH.

PAMPHYLIA (Παμφυλία).—Pamphylia was the ancient name of a flat and low-lying country in the south of Asia Minor, 80 miles long from E. to W., and 20 miles broad in its widest part, skirted by the Bay of Adalia, and enclosed by a rough semicircle of lofty and precipitous mountains of the Taurus range. As no pass corresponding to the Cilician Gates afforded freedom of access to the interior, Pamphylia was always isolated. Its chief maritime cities—Attalia, Perga and Side—had to deal only with a limited traffic, and never rose to any great importance. Its climate, too, greatly interfered with its progress. The hot, moist, enervating plain, rarely swept by bracing northern winds, was unsuitable for a race of hardy colonists, and though many Greeks and some Jews (1 Mac 15^{23}, Ac 2^{10}) settled in its towns, the native Anatolian elements were too strong for an exotic Hellenism, so that Pamphylia as a whole remained one of the least civilized parts of Asia Minor. It was therefore late in attaining the dignity of Roman provincial government. Dio Cassius (lx. 17) indicates that Claudius instituted the province of Lycia-Pamphylia in A.D. 43, but Mommsen has proved by means of a recently discovered inscription 'that Pamphylia was a distinct procuratorial province for some time later, then was connected with Galatia for a short time, and at last was united to Lycia by Vespasian' (W. M. Ramsay, *Pauline and other Studies*, 1906, p. 265).

Paul and Barnabas crossed Pamphylia in both the outward and the homeward part of their first missionary tour. Landing at the river-harbour of Perga, they merely 'passed through from' the city (Ac 13^{14}), hastening northward over the Taurus to Antioch in Pisidia. Combining St. Luke's narrative with Gal 4^{13}, Ramsay infers that, while the original intention of the apostles was to carry on a prolonged mission in Pamphylia, which seemed, after Cilicia, to have the next claim to the gospel, a sudden illness—probably malarial fever—prostrated St. Paul and compelled them to change their plan and seek the cooler and more invigorating uplands of central Asia Minor (*St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 93, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, 1893, p. 61 ff.). A. C. McGiffert agrees that malarial fever was probably the 'infirmity of the flesh' which led St. Paul to preach to the Galatians, but regards it as more likely that the illness, though contracted in the Pamphylian plain, did not show itself until St. Paul was labouring in Antioch (*Apostolic Age*, 1897, p. 177). About two years later the return journey was made by Perga and Attalia (Ac 14^{25}), and on this occasion the gospel was preached in the former city, but apparently little impression was made. Christianity, which always had the best chance of success where Hellenism and Judaism had already prepared the soil, was late in taking root in backward and uncivilized Pamphylia. The provinces named in 1 P 1^{1} as having Christian converts within their borders sum up the whole of Asia Minor north of the Taurus, but Pamphylia and Lycia are conspicuous by their absence. Had these lands contained any considerable body of 'the elect,' the fact that they were regarded as 'without (*i.e.* to the south of) the Taurus' would not have prevented them from being enumerated with the other provinces.

LITERATURE.—W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, London, 1895, p. 89 f.; K. Lanckoronski, *Städte Pamphyliens und Pisidiens*, vol. i.: 'Pamphylien,' Vienna, 1890.

JAMES STRAHAN.

PAPER.—See WRITING.

PAPHOS (Πάφος, the modern Baffo).—Paphos was a seaport near the western extremity of Cyprus, the last place visited by Paul and Barnabas in their missionary progress through the island (διελθόντες ὅλην τὴν νῆσον, Ac 13^{6}). There they were near one of the most famous shrines of paganism, the home of Aphrodite, the foam-born 'Paphian Queen,' Old Paphos being the centre of her worship for the whole earth. The city in which the apostles stayed, however, was New Paphos, the seat of the proconsul (ἀνθύπατος), the administrative centre of the island since its annexation by the Romans in 58 B.C. Originally no more than the port of Old Paphos, it possessed a good harbour, from which the apostles sailed for Pamphylia (Ac 13^{13}). Like the more ancient and famous city, it was devoted to the cult of Aphrodite, to whom it had erected 'fine buildings' (Strabo, XIV. vi. 3). It was about 10 miles N.E. of Old Paphos (Παλαιὰ Πάφος or Παλαίπαφος, the modern Kuklia), which stood on an eminence over a mile from the sea—the 'celsa Paphos' of Vergil (*Æn.* x. 51). 'Along the road' between the two cities, says Strabo (*loc. cit.*), 'the annual processions are conducted, when a great concourse both of men and women resort thither,' not only from New Paphos, but 'from other cities.' In describing a pilgrimage which Titus made to this shrine on his way to the siege of Jerusalem, Tacitus expresses surprise at 'the form under which the image is adored, a form found in no other place' (*Hist.* ii. 2). What Titus saw was not the graceful, smiling Aphrodite of Greece, but the rude cultus-image of Phœnicia.

Cyprus was the meeting-place of two ancient faiths and civilizations—Hellenic and Syrian—each of which deeply influenced the other. Herodotus was not ill-informed when he heard 'on inquiry' that the temple at Paphos was built in imitation of a Syrian temple in Ascalon (i. 105). Excavations have proved that the Paphian shrine had the character of a Phœnician temple, with large open courts and several small chambers, and the same type of building is represented on many coins. Fragments of marble cones and of an altar have also been found, and the idea that the conical stone was anointed in the Semitic fashion is confirmed by an inscription which mentions a festival of the temple called *ἐλαιοχρίστιον*.

Had St. Paul remained longer at Paphos, he would inevitably have come into conflict with this worship—which Athanasius branded as the deification of lust (*τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν θεοποιήσαντες προσκυνοῦσιν* [*Contra Gentes*, 9])—as he did later with that of Artemis at Ephesus. How long the Paphian cult maintained itself against Christianity can only be conjectured. St. Paul's dispute with Elymas (*q.v.*) was purely personal.

LITERATURE.—D. G. Hogarth, *Devia Cypria*, 1889; D. G. Hogarth and M. R. James, in *JHS* ix. [1888] 158 f.; art. 'Aphrodite' in Roscher's *Lexicon*. JAMES STRAHAN.

PARACLETE.—1. The term.—One result of the authoritative place held by the Law among the Jews was that figures of speech borrowed from the sphere of judicial procedure came to play an important part in religious life. This cycle of figurative speech included the term 'paraclete.' In Greek usage a paraclete was one who accompanied an accused person to the judge's tribunal, and supported him by testifying and interceding on his behalf. The frequent use of the term 'paraclete' in the religious phraseology of the Jews is confirmed by the fact that when the term, as a Greek loan-word, at length found a place in the Hebrew writings of the Synagogue, it was employed not in a literal but in a figurative sense, as, *e.g.*, for the sacrifice by which the Divine forgiveness was secured for Israel.

2. Jesus Himself as the Paraclete (of Christians who fall into sin).—The idea that man requires a paraclete was associated first of all with the thought of the Divine decree by which the status and destiny of human beings are fixed, and it is in this reference that St. John, in his First Epistle (2^1), applies the term to Jesus Christ. As the vocation to a divine life puts an end to walking in darkness, believers separate themselves from sin by sincere and penitent confession. Still, this does not do away with the possibility of their choosing falsely and again doing evil; hence there arises the need of a fresh judicial act on God's part to decide what portion such a sinner retains in Him. Even when the Christian sins, however, Christ maintains fellowship with him, and brings him within the scope of the Divine grace. In that passage, accordingly, Christ is called a Paraclete because He obtains Divine pardon for those who have trespassed. His ability to shield the sinning one is based upon the fact of His own righteousness, for only the righteous, whose mind is at one with the will of God, can ask God to forgive others. This power, moreover, rests also upon the fact that Jesus has by His Cross purchased the world's forgiveness from God.

3. The Holy Spirit as the Paraclete (of the apostles in their work).—In the last discourse of Jesus, as found in the Fourth Gospel, the name 'Paraclete' is given to the power that secures for the disciples the presence of the Holy Spirit (Jn $14^{16.26}$ 15^{26} 16^7). Abstractly, it is not impossible that the Spirit Himself is here called the Paraclete because He too keeps the disciples within the Divine grace through which they are forgiven; here, in point of fact, the term applies to Jesus no less than to the Spirit, for the latter is called 'another Paraclete'; and thus the intercessory function of the Spirit on behalf of the disciples is conjoined with that exercised by Jesus until His departure. The leading thought underlying the passages in question, however, is in conflict with this interpretation, as Jesus is there speaking of how His disciples shall be enabled to complete their task and, as His messengers, to gather His community together. His words serve here to define the authority of the apostolic office, and therefore also of the Church. The relation of the disciples to God is regulated and assured by their union with Jesus, and no account is taken of the possibility that they may rupture that relation by fresh transgression. The parting utterances of Jesus speak of His fellowship with His disciples as indestructible; as perfected, not impeded by His death. He remains in them, and they remain in Him, and they are thus encompassed by the Divine love. This relationship, however, lays upon them their special task—that of living and witnessing for Him, of pleading His claims, and of calling upon men to have faith in Him. As branches in the true Vine they have now the power, as they have also the duty, of bringing forth fruit. This brings them, however, to take part in a dire struggle, and the last discourse of Jesus affirms in words of deep impressiveness that He has made every provision for their warfare with the world and their victory over it. Even now, indeed, their standing is being contested—not, certainly, their standing before God, sinners though they are, for that matter is settled by their fellowship with Jesus, but the sanction of that profession of faith in Him by virtue of which they glorify Him as the Christ.

Now the question whether, and how, the apostles are able to fulfil their mission, and how they may convince the world that their message is true, is solved for them by the fact that the Spirit is with them. The Spirit is their Paraclete because He is the evidence of their standing, the efficacy of their words, the source of their authority, and the guarantee of their success. The reason why they now require another Advocate—a new Paraclete, distinct from Jesus Himself—is that while hitherto Jesus, by His word and His works, vindicated the rights of their faith, and by His presence protected them against all assailants, He can no longer, now that He has passed into the unseen, be their Advocate in His own Person. They require an evidential force which will still be recognizable, a power that will constantly be with them, and become manifest to all to whom they proclaim the word. The historical ground of their authority—the fact, namely, that they had companied with Jesus—is not thereby invalidated (15^{27}), but it is not in itself sufficient. Their utterances regarding Jesus are free from every limitation. Thus they describe Him as the Eternal Son, through whom the whole work of God is effected; as the ever-present One, who is in perfect unity with His people; as the One who now worketh, bestowing light and life upon the world. To the historical foundation of the apostolate and the Church, therefore, there must necessarily be added the pneumatic foundation; and the deep significance that attaches to the term 'Paraclete' lies in the distinct expression which it gives to the fact that the historical sanction of the apostles and the community finds its requisite supplement and confirmation in their inward experience and the spiritual possessions they now enjoy.

4. The Deity of the Spirit.—One result of this process of thought was the fresh emphasis laid upon the idea that the Spirit shares fully in the nature of God. It is true that even in the earliest stages of Christianity, as elsewhere, the Spirit was spoken of as possessing the quality of Deity; in knowledge, in will, in work, He has part in the creative glory of the Divine power. But the fact that the Spirit now came to be conceived as the Paraclete of the disciples provided a peculiarly cogent reason why He should be thought of, not as a mere property of man's inner life, or as a force that enters into man, but as fully possessed of the Divine power which, coming from above, encompasses man, and so animates all things from within. For the prerogative of Jesus and His disciples was made manifest only when it was proved to be Divine. The disciples cannot demonstrate the Divine status of Jesus by appealing to what they are in themselves. Such demonstration could be given only if it were made manifest that the cause of Jesus was the cause of God. The Spirit is the Advocate of Christians simply because in His work it becomes clear to all that He comes from above and is no merely human possession. Nevertheless He could not be the Advocate of the disciples unless His presence and action were unmistakably related to Jesus; and this relation is made manifest by the fact that the Spirit is possessed by the disciples only, and not by the world (14^{17} 16^{7}), and that He speaks as the witness of Jesus, and creates faith in His mission (15^{26} 16^{14}). He causes the word of Jesus to become effective in the disciples, so that it becomes the basis of the teaching which reveals to them the will of God in their present situation (14^{26}). Hence the granting of the Spirit causes no separation between the disciples and Jesus, nor does it cut the Church apart from its historical roots; on the contrary, that which had been perfectly wrought by Jesus is brought to its full realization by being renewed in the inner life of the disciples, in their knowledge and in their work. In this connexion, too, we note the emergence of trinitarian formulæ, as, *e.g.*, 'the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name' (14^{26}). Since Christ and the Spirit both carry out the one purpose of God, and combine their operations in a perfect unity, the work accomplished by Jesus remains permanently effective, and is in reality completed, not superseded, by the work of His disciples.

5. The truth as the medium of the Spirit's manifestation.—A thesis that at this point acquired immense importance was that which defines the conditions and phenomena in which the Spirit manifests Himself, and the means by which His self-revelation is secured. The thesis is simply that He becomes manifest by the truth—by the truth alone, though with triumphant power. It is the truth alone which can demonstrate the Divine right of Jesus, of His disciples, and of His Church. Special operations of the Spirit are in themselves insufficient to supply this confirmation, although reference is made likewise to the Spirit as the source of prophecy (16^{13}). The latter statement involves the endowing of the apostles with the teaching office, so that in the amplitude of their knowledge and the clearness of their intuition they find the weapons with which they overcome the world; for in the Johannine writings the truth is set in opposition to both falsehood and error, and with constant thanksgiving John declares that Jesus has redeemed His disciples from lies and made them truthful, and that He has freed them from the dominion of error and brought them to the certainty that comprehends God. Similarly, they have received moral succour, for in John falsehood and hatred, darkness and sin, are closely allied, and the one dies away with the other. That nevertheless John speaks of the truth alone as the distinguishing feature of Jesus and His disciples is intimately connected with the fact that the Evangelist's whole characterization of Jesus is directed to the one end of establishing faith. Only in the truth can a genuine faith have its birth.

6. The source of this thesis.—In view of the momentous results that flowed from the doctrine of the Paraclete—a doctrine that supplied the norms and motives of the whole subsequent development of the Church—the question regarding the origin of this thesis becomes peculiarly important.

(*a*) *Its connexion with Jesus.*—The powerful links which connect the statements regarding the Spirit with Jesus Himself are clearly recognizable. Jesus had earnestly considered the gravity of the struggle in which the disciples would have to engage after His death (Mt 10^{16-23}), and had given them the assurance that in that struggle the Spirit would guide them. In Mt 10^{20}, etc., the peculiar situation arising out of persecution unto death is met by a reference, not indeed to the name, but doubtless to the thought, of the Paraclete. Similarly, that confidence in the truth which makes absolute devotion to it the distinctive characteristic of the Christian community has its source in Jesus; it is an outcome of the warfare which Jesus waged against all untruthfulness; and the like holds good also of that purely religious conception of the apostolic vocation which proscribes all self-interested ends and lays upon the apostles the obligation of making the power of God manifest to the world.

(*b*) *Its relation to the Johannine theology.*—At the same time the statements regarding the Paraclete are connected at all points with the peculiar content of the Johannine theology: with its absolute rejection of the world, as being the realm of darkness, its bringing the gospel under the single aim of evoking faith in Jesus, its subordination of all external results to the spiritual process of generating the knowledge of God, its synthesis of historical recollection with the mystic vision that looks within and there becomes assured of communion with God. What had come down from Jesus Himself, and what had emerged in the historical development in which the writer had shared, are inextricably combined in these statements; nor is it possible for us to dissociate them any more than John himself would do.

LITERATURE.—Besides the Commentaries (esp. Meyer on Jn 14^{16} and Düsterdieck on 1 Jn 2^{1}), J. Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald. Talmud. et Rabbin.*, ed. B. Fischer, Leipzig, 1866–74, *s.v.*; Grimm-Thayer, *Gr.-Eng. Lexicon of the NT*^{2}, Edinburgh, 1890, *s.v.*; H. Cremer, *Bibl.-Theol. Lexicon of NT Greek*^{3}, do., 1880, *s.v.*; G. C. Knapp, *Scripta Varii Argumenti*, 2 vols., Halle, 1805; J. Pearson, *An Exposition of the Creed*, new ed., London, 1872, p. 499 ff.; J. C. Hare, *The Mission of the Comforter*^{3}, do., 1876; R. C. Trench, *On the Authorized Version of the NT*^{2}, do., 1859; J. B. Lightfoot, *On a Fresh Revision of the English NT*, do., 1891, p. 55 ff.; E. Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*, Oxford, 1889, p. 82; J. Robson, *The Holy Spirit the Paraclete*, Edinburgh and London, 1894, p. 3 ff., *ExpT* v. [1893–94] 320 ff.; G. G. Findlay, *ExpT* xii. [1900–01] 445; M. Jastrow, *Dictionary of the Targumim*, etc., 2 vols., London and New York, 1903, *s.v.* פרקליט; J. Worthington-Atkin, *The Paraklete*, London, 1906; T. D. Bernard, *The Central Teaching of Jesus Christ*, do., 1892, p. 157 ff.; H. B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, London, 1909, *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*, do., 1912.

A. SCHLATTER.

PARADISE.—**1. Etymology.**—The word is most probably of Persian origin, and passed into Greek through Xenophon, and into Hebrew during the period of Persian influence. The LXX translators adopted the word as the translation of the Hebrew name for the Garden of Eden. Hence the term 'Paradise' is associated with the various lines of development connected with the conception of the primal Golden Age and the Garden of Delights. For a fuller discussion of the etymology see the art. 'Paradise' in *HDB*, and *EBi*, also *Oxf. Heb. Lex. s.v.* פַּרְדֵּס.

2. History of the conception.—A full discussion of the growth of the conception does not fall within the scope of this article. For this the reader is referred to the artt. mentioned above, and to the list of literature there appended. It is necessary here to notice the main lines of development, in order to understand the place which the conception of Paradise has in the Apostolic Age.

(*a*) *Primitive conceptions.*—Paradise, or the Garden of Eden, belongs to one important group of *motifs* which comparative religion shows to be present in nearly all primitive religions, the group of ideas associated with a Golden Age, a time of supernatural fertility and prosperity, lost in the past and to be restored in the future. This with other groups of fundamental *motifs* existed in primitive Hebrew religion, possibly in a form derived from Babylonian religion, but was taken up and used by the prophets as the form into which their visions of the coming Kingdom of God were cast.

(*b*) *Later spiritualization.*—In the development of later Judaism, the conceptions of Paradise and the Tree of Life became spiritualized, and they were used as symbols of spiritual felicity and moral excellence, especially in Alexandrian Judaism.

(*c*) *Mystic realism.*—In Palestinian Judaism, Rabbinical theology developed these symbols along the line of a naive realism. The term 'paradise,' apart from a few passages in which it means 'garden' or 'park,' as in late Hebrew, always has the technical sense of mystic theology or speculation, including trance and other ecstatic experiences. On the other hand, the Hebrew phrase 'Garden of Eden' is kept to describe the earthly or the heavenly place of bliss commonly denoted by the name 'Paradise.' The Rabbis developed a transcendental doctrine of Paradise, holding that it was one of the seven things (sometimes six), created before the world (*Ber. Rabba*, 20). There was also some doubt as to whether the earthly and the heavenly Paradise were to be identified or not.

(*d*) *Special apocalyptic development.*—In the Jewish apocalyptic literature Paradise, by a combination of elements from (*a*) and (*c*), came to be conceived of as one of the abodes of the righteous after death. It was in the third heaven (see art. HEAVEN), where God's throne was situated. The references are not always consistent, as there was no clear-cut consistent scheme of the future life in Jewish eschatology. The principal references for our period occur in the *Apocalypse of Moses*, more correctly known as the *Books of Adam and Eve*, in *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*; there is also one reference in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* ('Levi,' xviii. 10).

The most important passages in the *Books of Adam and Eve* and the parallel *Apocalypse of Moses* are: *Ad. et Ev.* xxv. 3: 'the Paradise of righteousness,' where God is seen sitting encompassed by angels; xxviii. 4: 'the paradise of "vision" and of God's command'; xlii. 5: 'Christ, descending on earth shall lead thy father Adam to Paradise to the tree of mercy' (this passage is an interpolation from the Christian apocryphal *Gospel of Nicodemus*); *Apoc. Mos.* xxxvii. 5: 'Lift him up into Paradise unto the third Heaven, and leave him there until that fearful day of my reckoning,' etc.; here Paradise in the third heaven is contrasted with Paradise on earth where Adam's body is lying (xxxviii. 5; so also xl. 2). While there is apparently some confusion of thought, the central idea is that, in the Resurrection, Adam will be restored to Paradise, and that meanwhile his spirit (apparently) is in the heavenly Paradise, in the third heaven. Hence the conception of Paradise as an intermediate abode appears here.

There are several important passages in *4 Ezra*, especially iii. 6, Paradise created before the world; iv. 8, Paradise in heaven; vii. 36, the Paradise of delight manifested in the last day over against Gehenna (so also vii. 123). In viii. 52, 'for you is opened Paradise, planted the Tree of life, the future Age prepared,' the conception of Paradise is parallel with that of Rev 2^7 22^2. The reader may be referred to G. H. Box, *The Ezra Apocalypse*, London, 1912, p. 195 f.

There are several important passages in *2 Enoch*: viii. and ix., where Paradise is described as in the third heaven, the place where God rests, with all kinds of sensuous delights, and reserved for the eternal abode of the righteous; lxv. 8, 10, at the completion of the Age, the righteous are collected and Paradise becomes their eternal dwelling-place; cf. also xlii. 3 and *2 Bar.* li. 11, lix. 8.

(*e*) *NT.*—Thus we find the background of the conceptions which appear in the three passages in which the word occurs in the NT—

(1) In Lk 23^{43}, as in the *Books of Adam and Eve*, Paradise is conceived of as a place of intermediate abode, though whether in heaven or in Sheol is not clear.

(2) In 2 Co 12^4 we have a combination of the Rabbinical conception of Paradise as denoting mystic contemplation and the trance-state, with the conception of Paradise as in the third heaven and the abode of God.

(3) In Rev 2^7 as in *4 Ezra* Paradise is presented as a reward in the future age for the righteous.

The probable reason for the scanty reference to Paradise in the NT has been pointed out in the art. HEAVEN. The movement of thought was clearly away from the sensuous and material side of Jewish eschatological expectation, even though in the later development of thought in the Church there was a return to this element, and a corresponding loss of the vitality and freshness characteristic of Pauline and Johannine eschatology. This return, however, lies beyond our period, and begins to be seen in the references of Irenæus and Tertullian.

LITERATURE.—See under art. HEAVEN. S. H. HOOKE.

PARCHMENT.—See WRITING.

PARDON.—See FORGIVENESS.

PARENTS.—See FAMILY.

PARMENAS.—Parmenas bore a Greek name, a shortened form of Parmenides. He is one of the 'Hellenist' Seven ordained to minister to the Hellenist widows (Ac 6^5). W. A. SPOONER.

PAROUSIA.—**1. General considerations.**—In earlier literature on this subject the relation between the conceptions of the Parousia in Jewish apocalyptic and those in the NT is treated as an open question. Further study and research have made this attitude impossible. It is certain that the whole of the eschatological and apocalyptic background of primitive Christianity is due to its Jewish source. The question for modern scholarship has assumed a different form. It is necessary to attempt a systematic reconstruction, if this be possible, of the eschatological scheme underlying primitive Christianity in general, and each of the apostolic writers in particular. It is also necessary to discover, if possible, the direction in which those elements peculiar to Christianity have modified the original lines of the Jewish apocalyptic. Thirdly, it is necessary to form some estimate of the place of the eschatology, and especially of its central conception, the Parousia of Christ, in the essential nature of Christianity. In his *Paul* *and his Interpreters* (p. 240 f.) Schweitzer has the following pertinent remarks :

> 'Not until Pauline eschatology gives an answer to all the "idle" questions of this kind which can be asked will it be really understood and explained. And it must be somehow possible, by the discovery of its inner logic, to reconstruct it from the scattered statements in the documents. We have no right to assume that for Paul there existed in his expectation manifest obscurities, much less that he had overlooked contradictions in it.'

The attitude here indicated towards Pauline eschatology is necessary towards the whole of primitive apostolic eschatology. At the same time, it must be recognized that the various apocalypses of the 1st cent. before and after the birth of Christ do not by any means present a coherent scheme of eschatology, and it is possible that the same vagueness and inconsistency in detail will be found to characterize the early Christian apocalyptic, including the Pauline.

For supplementary discussion of various points connected with the subject of the Parousia the reader is referred to the articles in this Dictionary on IMMORTALITY, RESURRECTION, HEAVEN, etc. For fuller discussion of the stage of eschatological belief represented by the Synoptic Gospels see the relevant articles in the *DCG*.

2. The Parousia in the literature of the Apostolic Age.—i. THE ACTS.—In Acts we come closest perhaps to the practical working of the eschatological beliefs in the early Church, and find the most direct expression of them in the early apostolic preaching. Whatever may be the opinion as to the literary tradition at work in the speeches of Acts, and the accuracy with which the words of the various speakers have been reported, there can be no doubt that they are a faithful representation of the kind of preaching that marked the early stages of the growth of the Church. These speeches are almost wholly eschatological.

In the first two addresses attributed to St. Peter, the Parousia is regarded as imminent, and baptism is the only way of escape for those who desire to flee from the coming woes and participate in the 'times of refreshing.' The rapid growth of the Church is represented as the filling up of the number of those destined to be saved (2^{47}). Salvation is not merely from sin and its consequences, though that is never out of sight, but from coming wrath and for the enjoyment of future blessings. In Acts salvation has always an eschatological colouring.

In the Pauline speeches it appears in the same way. In the speech at Athens the final appeal is emphasized by the announcement of an appointed day in which God will judge the world by Christ, and the resurrection of Christ is assigned as the pledge of the truth of this announcement. In the Miletus address the apostasy before the end is referred to. In the address before Agrippa the hope of the Resurrection is represented as the hope of the Jewish nation. Moreover, the practical effect of this immediate expectation of the Parousia upon the life of the Church is clearly seen in its abandonment of property and in its communistic organization. It was the particular form of their Messianic expectation that marked out the Christians among their own countrymen as a sect (*αἵρεσις*, 24^{14}). But it is not easy to find any trace of the special line of development which we shall follow out in St. Paul's correspondence. In St. Luke's representation of St. Paul's eschatology we see only the orthodox Pharisee, believing in the resurrection of just and unjust. The nature of the Book of Acts, and its object, make it unfair to expect more than a reflexion of the external current of feeling and action in the early years of the Church. This the book gives us with fidelity, and we cannot expect an insight into the deeper streams of thought that manifest themselves in St. Paul's correspondence, and in the later developments of the Johannine literature.

ii. ST. PAUL.—The general tendency of modern scholarship is to find a development in the eschatology of St. Paul from the 'cruder' eschatology of the earlier Epistles, *e.g.* 1 and 2 Thessalonians, through the central group of Epistles, Romans and Corinthians, to the Epistles of the Captivity such as Philippians,* and possibly Ephesians, which, if not by St. Paul, is generally recognized as Pauline.

R. H. Charles finds a stage of development between 1 and 2 Corinthians, but for convenience we may take the three main groups and examine their view of the Parousia separately.

(*a*) *1 and 2 Thessalonians.*—In both these Epistles the Parousia occupies a foremost place. It is not necessary to discuss here the Pauline authorship of 2 Thess. For the best and most recent statement of the whole position the reader is referred to Kirsopp Lake's *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul.* It is also a tenable position that 2 Thess. is the earlier of the two. But the two are in any case so close together in time that they may be taken together as they stand to represent St. Paul's views on the Parousia about A.D. 51 (see art. THESSALONIANS, EPISTLES TO THE).

The passages in 1 and 2 Thess. are important as much for what they imply as for what they explicitly state. They show how largely the eschatological element bulked in the primitive apostolic preaching. The most important passage in 1 Thess. is 4^{13}–5^{11}. The following are the principal points arising from it.

It implies that St. Paul had taught his converts the near approach of the Parousia of Christ and the consequent blessing, apparently on earth, of the living believers. But it also implies that he had not told them what place the believers who died in the interval of expectation would have. The implication is that the Thessalonians supposed the dead would lose their part in the Messianic Kingdom, and were sorrowing accordingly.

It also seems that St. Paul does not supply his solution to the question ready-made from Jewish apocalyptic material, but bases it on two grounds : (1) his own deduction from the death and resurrection of Jesus (v.^{14}), and (2) a word of the Lord (v.^{15}). Of course, this may be disputed, but to the present writer the passage is important evidence for the working of St. Paul's mind on the questions of the eschatological scheme, and for the method which he applied to their solution.

Hence St. Paul infers from the death and resurrection of Jesus, probably by way of his own fundamental view of the vital union between Christ and the believer, that as death is not a bar to Christ's entering on His Messianic Kingdom, neither will it prevent believers who die from sharing that Kingdom. The Resurrection is the key to both difficulties. God raised Christ and will raise believers in Christ for the Kingdom. That is the fundamental position and the principle upon which it is based. Then the details are apparently supplied from the primitive oral tradition of our Lord's teaching as known to St. Paul, although not preserved in the Synoptists (*ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου*). (For the interpretation of *ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου* as referring to the oral tradition rather than to a special revelation cf. 1 Co 7^{10} 9^{14} 11^{23} 15^{3}.) Accordingly, the order of events as presented in this passage is : (1) the resurrection of Christ takes place ; (2) during the present generation ('we which are alive and remain') Christ will descend into the air with a word of command, the archangel's voice, and the trumpet of God; (3) thereupon the dead in Christ rise first; (4) after a very brief interval of time, the living will be 'caught up,' with the raised dead, to meet the Lord in the air; (5) both living and dead will then be 'for ever with the Lord.' The Apostle does not say where, on earth or in heaven, nor does he speak here of any change in the living who are caught up. (6) He goes on to distinguish this event from the 'day of the Lord' (5^{2}). He implies that they know accurately the details about the 'times and seasons,' including the coming of the day of the Lord, whereas he had previously implied that they were not acquainted with the event described in 4^{13-18}, 'I would not have you ignorant.' The 'day of the Lord' comes as a thief in the night; it brings judgment upon the sinners, those who are 'of the night.' Believers will not be overtaken by it. God has not appointed them to wrath but to obtain salvation 'through our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that whether we wake or sleep we should live together with him.'

---

* It may be remarked that Kirsopp Lake now argues for an earlier date for Philippians, during the Apostle's stay at Ephesus. This will bring it into the Romans and Corinthians group (*Exp*, 8th ser., vii. [1914] 481 ff.).

This passage seems to distinguish the Parousia proper, the coming of Christ for the saints, from the 'day of the Lord' with its judgments. It is not easy to reconcile 2 Thess. with 1 Thess. except on the hypothesis that 2 Thess. is prior to 1 Thess., and that, in endeavouring to meet difficulties raised in reply to 2 Thess., the Apostle had worked out the form of Parousia doctrine which appears in 1 Thess. Otherwise, if the usual order be retained, the opening verses of 2 Thess. suggest that St. Paul had not realized the incompatibility of the new outline given in 1 Th 4^{13-18} with the older traditional view represented by 2 Th 1.

In this passage St. Paul represents the believers who are suffering persecution as about to be delivered from it by the revelation of Christ with flaming fire from heaven. Christ's appearance brings cessation of persecution (ἄνεσιν) for the persecuted saints, and tribulation for the persecutors—the traditional view of current Jewish apocalyptic (cf. *Ass. Mos.* x. 10, *2 Bar.* li. 1–6, lxxxii. 1–2). There is no mention of any resurrection of the dead or catching up of dead and living into the air, and it is rather a straining of the text to read all this into the one word ἄνεσιν. The only natural alternatives are either that St. Paul has drawn his account of the Parousia here from the older traditional view, unconscious of the inconsistency with his new view in 1 Th 4^{13-18}, or that the apocalyptic parts of 2 Thess. are not Pauline but interpolated, a view which has not been without support.

The 2nd chapter of 2 Thess. gives further important details as to the order of events, and also implies that all the details were already known to the readers and should have preserved them from the panic into which they had been thrown, apparently by a forged letter or false prediction (2^{2}). The cause of the panic was that they had been persuaded to interpret their persecutions as a sign that the 'day of the Lord' was already present (ἐνέστηκεν, 2^{2}). St. Paul points out that before the 'day of the Lord' and before the Parousia two events had to occur, as they knew already. '*The* apostasy,' not '*a* falling away,' but *the* well-known apostasy of current apocalyptic which we find in Daniel and in the apocalyptic portions of the Synoptics, had to take place. It was already working secretly, but had not yet reached its climax. Then, the 'man of lawlessness,' the Antichrist of the apocalyptic, was to be revealed, who would bring to a climax the rebellion against God and Christ, and bring about the Divine intervention of the Parousia which would destroy him and his followers.

The curious cryptic passage (2^{6-7}) concerning the presence of a restraining force has given much trouble to commentators, but does not touch our question of the Parousia. It is evidently perfectly intelligible to the readers (καὶ νῦν τὸ κατέχον οἴδατε), and seems to belong to the period when it was necessary to use cryptic references to Rome and Imperial things (cf. *Exp*, 7th ser., x. [1910] 374 f.). For a fuller discussion see Bousset, *Der Antichrist*, p. 77 ff.

A comparison of the two Epistles shows the following order of events:

1 Thess.	2 Thess.
(*a*) Resurrection of Christ.	(*a*) No mention of Resurrection as basis of teaching.
(*b*) Interval of waiting, some believers fall asleep.	(*b*) Saints persecuted.
(*c*) Descent of Christ into the air, with shout, trump, etc.	(*c*) Apostasy sets in.
(*d*) Resurrection of dead.	(*d*) The cryptic restraining influence is removed.
(*e*) Rapture of living who remain and dead who have been raised.	(*e*) The Antichrist is revealed and manifests his power by miracles.
(*f*) All are for ever with the Lord.	(*f*) The Parousia takes place accompanied by angels and flaming fire.
(*g*) Coming of the 'day of the Lord' and judgment for sinners.	(*g*) It causes deliverance to the saints, destruction to Antichrist, and judgment to the followers of Antichrist.

The point of view is so different that it certainly makes it extremely difficult to maintain, at the same time, the Pauline authorship of both passages and the theory of a rigidly consistent Pauline scheme of eschatology.

(*b*) The second group of Epistles, *Romans and Corinthians*, offers a number of important passages, but very few with such details of the order of the apocalyptic scheme as Thessalonians.

(1) In Rom. the whole outlook upon the Christian position is coloured by the thought of the future, the Parousia and its attendant results. But the Parousia itself is hardly mentioned directly. The picture of the future presented in Rom. is as follows: the general statement of a coming time of wrath and judgment when God will judge the secrets of men through Jesus Christ, according to St. Paul's gospel $(2^{5-6.\ 16})$; those who are justified look forward to the glory of God; they will be saved from wrath through Christ $(5^{1.\ 10}$; cf. 1 Th $1^{10})$, they will reign in life (5^{17}); the justified have been predestined for this purpose and will finally be conformed to the image of Christ $(8^{29.\ 30})$; their bodies will be quickened through the power of the Spirit of Christ already dwelling in them (8^{11}); when they are manifested the whole creation also will be delivered from the bondage of corruption (8^{19-21}); when the fullness of the Gentiles is come in (*i.e.* the full number of those predestined from the Gentiles for salvation), the elect of Israel, all Israel, will be saved $(11^{25.\ 26})$; 'salvation is nearer than when we believed' (13^{11}); all must stand before the tribunal of God (14^{10}); Satan will shortly be bruised under the saints' feet (16^{20}).

It is evidently difficult to draw clear conclusions from these passages. They suggest rather a fluid than a rigid eschatology. They present the appearance of the gradual, half-conscious modification of the older lines of eschatology by the working of the new principle of the consequences of the Resurrection, an element which is of course wholly foreign to the Jewish schemes of apocalyptic, and peculiar to the Christian scheme. The universalism of $3^{23.\ 26}$ 11^{32} is in apparent contrast with the older eschatological conception of a fixed number to be saved as reflected in 8^{29} 11^{5} (cf. Lk 14^{23}, Ac 3^{47}). The chief point as to the Parousia is the concen tration of interest upon the working of the principle of 'life,' which embraces both moral character and physical change, the two forming one correlated process of transformation, consummated at the Parousia.

(2) In Cor. we have a number of important and explicit passages requiring careful examination. The most important passage in 1 Corinthians is the 15th chapter. But there are a few shorter passages that must be noted in passing—1 Co 1^{7-8}: the Corinthians are awaiting the revelation of the Lord Jesus Christ, who will establish them blameless in His day, 'the day of our Lord Jesus Christ'; 3^{13-15}: 'the day' will try every man's work with fire. There will be rewards for those whose work abides, and those whose work is consumed will themselves be saved, but as through fire; 4^{5}: when the Lord comes, in contrast with man's day (*ἀνθρωπίνης ἡμέρας*) the secrets will be revealed, and praise will be from God; 5^{5}: the incestuous man is delivered to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that his spirit may be saved in 'the day of the Lord Jesus; $6^{2,3}$: a time is coming when the saints will judge the world, and even the angels; 7^{29}: 'the time is short' (*ὁ καιρὸς συνεσταλμένος ἐστί*), probably meaning that the interval of waiting for the Parousia has been shortened; cf. Mt 24^{22}, but the phrase is obscure; $11^{25,26}$: the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is directly connected with the Parousia, as it is in the Synoptic account of the Institution.

These passages all point to the same background of expectation, but offer very little basis for the reconstruction of a definite Pauline scheme of eschatology. In ch. 15, however, we have more detail, and once more the whole conception is dominated by the Resurrection. The first passage is 15^{20-28}. The order is—first, the resurrection of Christ, who is the *ἀπαρχή*, the firstfruits of the working of the new principle of life, in contrast with the results of the principle of death introduced by Adam (cf. Ro 5^{12-14}). Then those who are Christ's rise at His Parousia if they are dead, or are changed if they remain alive (cf. v.^{51}). This leads up to the consummation (*τὸ τέλος*) when Christ hands over the Kingdom to God the Father. The duration of the three stages is left undefined. The interval between the resurrection of Christ and that of believers is indirectly limited to one generation ('*we* shall not all sleep'), but the duration of the interval between this event, evidently the Parousia of 1 Th 4^{13-20}, and the complete subjugation of every enemy, including death itself, is left quite undetermined. This interval may be filled in by the events implied in previous passages, the coming of the day of the Lord, testing of every man's work, assigning of rewards, judgment of the world and of angels, destruction of Antichrist. But so far the distinction between the Parousia proper and the day of the Lord, suggested in 1 Thess., seems to be maintained. The description of the Parousia is more fully developed in vv.$^{50-56}$, with a fairly clear indication of the logical connexion between the account of the event and St. Paul's view of Christ's post-Resurrection state. Christ's present state is spirit, incorruptible, not flesh and blood. Flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God. Hence the point left undefined in 1 Thess. must be worked out here—the question of the form of existence of the living and the dead at the Parousia. The authority for the transference of *οὐ* in v.^{51} to the second clause is strong, but not so strong as that for the generally received text; and it is more than probable that the change was due to the difficulty that arose out of the non-fulfilment of the expectation. But the sense of the passage, and the supporting parallel in 1 Th 4, require the reading 'we shall not all sleep.' The solution of the problem is that all are changed, both dead and living. 'The dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we (the living) shall be changed.' The change is instantaneous (*ἐν ἀτόμῳ*) and takes place at the last trump. But no mention is made here of a rapture into the air, as in 1 Th 4. Hence it would seem that St. Paul's interest was turning to the manner of the Parousia, to the application of the principle displayed in Christ's resurrection, as he had apprehended it. It is a spiritualization, arising not from the difficulty of squaring eschatological predictions with their non-fulfilment, but from the inner logic of a view of the Resurrection which compelled St. Paul to cast his eschatological conceptions into that mould.

In the Second Epistle Charles sees an advance on the First. The interval is very short, but it is possible that between the two letters the Apostle had grasped more clearly the consequences of his own reasoning in ch. 15 of the First Epistle. The probable order and date of the three Epistles is: 1 Cor., spring of A.D. 56; 2 Cor., autumn of the same year; and Rom., early in A.D. 57. Of course the point cannot be debated here. The reader must refer to the abundant literature on the subject, especially Lake, *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*; Sanday-Headlam, *Commentary on Romans*; and Robertson-Plummer on *1 Corinthians*. But the main point is that the three Epistles are all very close together in time, making the view of development somewhat difficult, though it is not impossible. In Charles's view the Apostle in 2 Cor. arrives at the conclusion that the resurrection of the believer, his assumption of the glorified spiritual state, takes place immediately after death, and not at the Parousia. There are difficulties in this view which will be noticed as we examine the passages in 2 Corinthians. The crucial passage is in the 5th chapter, which forms the conclusion and climax of a long argument starting in ch. 3 and developing the conception of life, 'the ministration of the Spirit.' In 4^{13-14} the Apostle argues that God who raised Christ must on the same principle raise believers and 'present' them together on some unspecified occasion, apparently the Parousia. Meanwhile the spiritual process is at work, the inner man is being created anew day by day (4^{16}). Hence 'the taking down' (*κατάλυσις*, 5^{1}) of the earthly tent-dwelling, the outer man of 4^{16}, need not occasion alarm or grief, because the believer is aware that he possesses an eternal abode with God in the heavens, *i.e.* the glorified mode of existence already described in 1 Co 15, and implied in 2 Co 4^{16-18}. Charles interprets this verse, 5^{1}, to mean that upon death the believer immediately possesses this glorious dwelling. But the contrast between 'unclothed,' *ἐκδύσασθαι*, and 'clothed upon,' *ἐπενδύσασθαι*, is a serious difficulty. The passage as it stands seems to imply a contrast between two states in the future, one of which is desired, and the other distasteful. The Apostle is not longing for death, since death involves the 'unclothed' state, being 'found' naked at the Parousia, but he longs rather to be clothed upon, to be changed while still living, that what is mortal in him may be, not put off, but swallowed up by the life which is already at work. This view, of course, preserves the importance of the Parousia as an object of hope. If the attainment of the exceeding and eternal weight of glory follows immediately upon death, then death rather than the Parousia is to be desired as the consummation of the Kingdom. The consummation takes on an individualistic form instead of the corporate hope of the Parousia. The principal difficulty in the way of accepting Charles's interpretation is the phrase 'not be found naked,' which seems to imply the possibility of such a circumstance, and would seem to refer to the unclothed condition of the spirit in the interval between death and the Parousia. This unclothed condition would not ultimately prove a bar to entrance upon the blessings of the Kingdom, since the triumph of life was assured by the resurrection of Christ, but it was not a desirable condition in itself, although to be at home with the Lord was a counterbalancing consideration. Hence the πάντοτε: whatever state may be the immediate lot of the believer, there is ground for full confidence. If Charles's view be accepted, the form of hope connected with the Parousia will be the hope of a manifestation of a state already attained in the case of believers who die, and of a transformation for those who survive. The Apostle, however, continues to the end to lay stress upon the latter aspect of the Parousia, as will be seen, and to the present writer it appears difficult to accept the view that in 2 Cor. St. Paul advances to the view that believers enter the glorious state immediately upon death.

(*c*) The third group of Pauline Epistles, *Ephesians*, *Philippians* (but for Philippians see note above), and *Colossians*, certainly represents the last stage in the development of the Pauline eschatology. We perceive at once the predominance of the larger thought of consummation expressed in the word ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, the recapitulation of all things in Christ. But it is necessary to examine the place assigned to the Parousia in this great and comprehensive conception of a progressive summing-up of all things in Christ. It might seem that the progressive conception of the Kingdom implied in Eph 1^{10} excludes a catastrophic conception of its coming such as the Parousia implies. But there are passages which cannot be overlooked in this connexion—Eph $1^{13\text{-}14}$: the Spirit is the earnest of the inheritance until the redemption of the possession, where the redemption seems to imply the Parousia, although it is possible to interpret the sentence as the entrance of believers upon the inheritance of glory by death or any other means; 4^{30}: 'the day of redemption' also suggests the Parousia in the most natural interpretation of the words; 5^{27}: 'that he might *present* it to himself' (cf. 2 Co 4^{14}) suggests the Parousia.

In Col 1^{28} the same sense of 'present' appears. $3^{3\text{-}4}$ describes the Parousia as the time of manifestation both for Christ and for believers.

In Phil., probably the latest of the three Epistles, we have the phrase 'the day of Jesus Christ' (1^{6}), 'the day of Christ' (1^{10} 2^{16}); but the principal passage is in $3^{20.\ 21}$, where the Apostle says that the citizenship of the saints is in heaven, whence they are awaiting as Saviour the Lord Jesus Christ, who will transform their bodies of humiliation into the likeness of His own body of glory. This passage seems fairly explicit evidence that the Parousia still remained in the mind of the Apostle as the central hope, not merely as a moment of manifestation of glory already attained, but as a crisis of sudden transformation, the 'catastrophic' climax of a process already long at work. He can also still speak of believers as written in 'the book of life' (4^{3}).

Thus, in spite of the obvious development of thought in this group, the Parousia still remains to the Apostle what it had become in 1 Th 4 and 1 Co 15, the central point of hope. The principal difficulty, however, as to whether the dead receive their 'body of glory' after death or at the Parousia must be left undecided. The present writer inclines to the latter view, but the weighty authority of Charles in favour of the former shows that it has strong grounds of support.

The general conclusion to which an examination of St. Paul's teaching on the Parousia brings us may be given as follows.

The Pauline view of the Parousia is taken over from current Jewish-Palestinian apocalyptic, but is progressively modified by his view of the resurrection of Christ.

The process of modification leaves traces of unreconciled positions. The demand for a logical and self-consistent scheme of eschatology fails. The direction in which the view of the Parousia undergoes development appears in the increasing importance attached to the working out of the 'law of life,' first in Christ and then in believers, resulting finally in a complete moral and physical transformation expressed by the word 'glory.' Along with this stress on the transformation we find a gradual disappearance of the outlines of the traditional scheme of apocalyptic. The Parousia remains central all through the Pauline correspondence, but it becomes increasingly the consummation of the victory of life, rather than an act among a series in the passage of the great eschatological drama. With this change in the view of the Parousia comes a change in the conception of the drama; it becomes the working out of a great moral purpose of world-wide extent, embracing heavenly, earthly, and infernal existence, and summing up all life and all activities in Christ. But it would not be true to say that the catastrophic element, the idea of a final act of Divine intervention, is entirely eliminated in the closing Epistles.

Space forbids a fuller discussion of many important points in the summing up of Pauline doctrine, and we must pass to the Catholic Epistles, which do not add much to the development of the subject, and then to the most important of all—the Fourth Gospel.

iii. Catholic Epistles and Pastorals.—The Catholic Epistles, with the possible exception of Hebrews, do not show development. They rather exhibit the tendency which appears more markedly at the beginning of the 2nd cent. to lay stress on the Jewish and material side of the Parousia, and to emphasize its literal fulfilment as the expectation grew fainter in the Church.

(*a*) *Hebrews* presents a double tendency at work. There is the evident insistence on the nearness of the Parousia as a stimulus to those who were losing heart (cf. 9^{28} 10^{37}). But on the other hand there is the view, characteristic of Alexandrian Judaism and of St. Paul's later eschatology according to Charles, that the spirits of the righteous are already perfected, if we may so interpret 12^{23}, the same expression being used of the present state of Christ (cf. 5^{9} 7^{28}). Hence the Epistle to the Hebrews seems to offer the same perplexing appearance of the existence of contradictory positions side by side, the fact being probably, as with St. Paul, that the catastrophic view of the Parousia was not felt to conflict with the view that the believers entered upon their glorious and perfected state immediately after death. The Parousia was still needed as a theodicy, a manifestation of the triumph of the Kingdom.

(*b*) *James* has the phrase 'the coming of the Lord' twice—$5^{7.\ 8}$—as the hope of those who suffer oppression. The coming of the Lord is the time of judgment and vindication. The point of view is that of 2 Th 1, but there is no indication of the special place of the Parousia in the eschatological scheme. It is regarded as near.

(*c*) *1 Peter* has the Parousia far more prominent. The general outline is the same as that of 2 Thess. Those to whom the Epistle is addressed are suffering severe persecution, but 'the revelation of Jesus Christ'—the writer's phrase for the Parousia—is at hand, expected in the lifetime of the writer ($5^{1\text{-}4}$). It will bring salvation, glory, and reward to the righteous, and judgment to the sinner (4^{18}). The general judgment seems to be associated with the Parousia. It is the end of all things (4^{7}). The Parousia and the day of the Lord are identified, and there is no such separation suggested as that in 1 Th 4. The sufferings of believers are a sign that the day of the Lord is setting in; it is the last time; judgment must begin at the house of God. The principal interest in the Parousia is wholly different from that of St. Paul, and there is no sign of any independent development, or of the influence of St. Paul's thinking, as far as eschatology is concerned. The Parousia is the crisis of the coming of the Kingdom of God.

(*d*) *2 Peter and Jude.*—The author of 2 Peter connects the Transfiguration and the words addressed to Christ at that time with the Parousia. Prophecy relating to the Parousia there received its confirmation (1^{19}). The Parousia is identified with the 'day of God.' At the Parousia all things will be destroyed by fire, and the righteous will receive new heavens and a new earth (3^{13}); it will come as a thief (v.^{10}); the apparent delay is due to the longsuffering of God. The author of Jude quotes the description of the Parousia from *1 En.* i. 9, and agrees with 2 Peter in his description of the apostasy of the 'last days.'

(*e*) *The Pastoral Epistles* may be touched on here, as they cannot well be included in a discussion of the Pauline correspondence without assuming an authenticity which criticism does not concede.

In 1 Tim. there is very little eschatological reference. The 'last times' are come (4^{1}), and there is a vague general mention of the appearing of Christ ($6^{14.\ 15}$), as the time of judgment and reward. In 2 Tim.—the Epistle whose authenticity is, in part, most generally admitted—the eschatological colouring is much more evident. In 1^{18} 'that day' is the day of the Lord and of judgment; 2^{12} speaks of the future reign of saints with Christ, of His denial of those who deny Him (cf. Mt 10^{33}, Lk 9^{26}). In 3^{13} the apostasy of the last days is spoken of; in 4^{1} Christ, identified with God, is about to judge living and dead, at (if κατά be read) His appearing and Kingdom (but κατά is doubtful, and possibly τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν is the object of διαμαρτύρομαι). In 4^{8} the writer speaks of 'that day' as the day of the appearing of Christ, when he and all those who have loved Christ's appearing will receive the crown of righteousness. It is tempting to take the crown of righteousness as the consummation of that process of which St. Paul speaks in Ro 5—the complete transformation of the righteous into the likeness of Christ. But it is difficult to maintain that the Epistle, which if Pauline must be the last of St. Paul's letters, shows much trace of the eschatology which is characteristic of the last group of Epistles described above.

In Tit. there is the same vagueness of reference as in 1 Tim. The passages are 1^{2} $2^{13.\ 14}$ 3^{7}. It is a characteristic of the Pastoral Epistles that in speaking of the Parousia they use the term ἐπιφάνεια, and identify Christ with God, as the Saviour whose appearance is awaited.

iv. THE JOHANNINE LITERATURE.—(*a*) *The Apocalypse.*—For a detailed account of the apocalyptic scheme presented in this book the reader must refer to Commentaries on the Apocalypse. Here we can only point out the place of the Parousia in the general plan, and discuss the nature of the writer's conception. In this book the Parousia takes place at the close of a series of judgments, the 'woes of the Messianic Age.' The apostasy has fully developed itself, the 'earth-dwellers' have been deceived by the False Prophet, Antichrist, into rendering obedience to the mystic dragon, the Beast with the seven heads. The appointed number of martyrs has been slain. Then the Lamb rides forth out of heaven followed by the armies of the saints, to make war on the Beast and his armies. The defeat of the Beast and False Prophet, and the destruction of their followers by the sword that goes out of Christ's mouth, take place. This is the Parousia as the writer of the Apocalypse conceives of it. It is immediately followed by the binding of Satan in the abyss, and the resurrection of those who were slain during the tribulation of the apostasy period. Then comes the millennial reign, closed by the attack of Gog and Magog, their defeat, the passing away of the heavens and earth, the final judgment of the dead, and the coming in of the new heavens and earth. The book closes with the Church's prayer that the long-delayed Advent may take place. The nature of the imagery makes it difficult to define precisely the writer's attitude to various questions connected with the Parousia.

Several important points remain doubtful:

(*α*) It is not clear who are the different classes of 'saved' persons, and what part they have in the Parousia and the subsequent Kingdom. We have the 'elders,' seen in heaven from the first (4^{4}), the souls of the martyrs under the altar in heaven (6^{9}), the mystic number of sealed persons from the twelve tribes (7^{4} 14^{1}), a great multitude from every nation and tribe ($7^{9.\ 14}$), the company of those who had gained the victory over the Beast (15^{2}), the bride of the Lamb ($19^{7.\ 8}$), the armies in heaven (19^{14}), the risen martyrs (20^{4}), the holy city, identified with the bride of the Lamb ($21^{9.\ 10}$), and finally the nations of the saved who walk in the light of the city (21^{24}; but probably τῶν σωζομένων should be omitted). It is impossible to say how far these represent the same class under different aspects, and how far they represent really different classes of persons who play a part in the great final drama. If the writer conceives of those who are in heaven as having been brought there by a previous 'rapture' and change, such as is described in 1 Th $4^{13\text{-}20}$, he is silent about it. The Parousia for him occurs in ch. 19. The most obvious conclusion is that those in heaven are the believers who have died. Yet the only persons represented as raised at the Parousia are the martyrs (20^{4}).

(*β*) The nature of the change at the close of the Millennium is not clear. It is plain that the writer does not agree with the author of 2 Peter in identifying the 'day of God,' the destruction of heaven and earth by fire, with the Parousia. There is also no explanation of the transference of the saved from the old earth to the new.

(*γ*) The writer's view of the Church, and the Church's part in the Parousia, are also not clear. Apparently he identifies the Church with the Bride and the Holy City. The marriage of the Lamb seems to coincide with the victory over the Beast, *i.e.* the Parousia. But whether the dead and living believers are raised and changed in order to appear at the Parousia, and whether they are the armies in heaven, are not clear.

In general, we can only say that the writer does not show any signs of the influence of the creative work of St. Paul or of the Fourth Gospel in his treatment of the questions raised above. His greatness lies in another direction from that of the independent thinking of St. Paul. He makes full use of all the existing apocalyptic imagery and machinery to depict the final triumph of God and Christ over all the forces of evil at work in his day that seemed so invincible.

(*b*) *The Fourth Gospel.*—The outward change in passing from the Apocalypse to the Fourth Gospel is immense, although one note is fundamental and common to the eschatology of both—'I have overcome the world.' In the Fourth Gospel we are back in the atmosphere of creative thought, the re-interpretation of the old data in the light of the fuller meaning of the life, death, and resurrection of Christ. The important passages fall into two groups.

(*a*) Chs. 5–6.—In these chapters we have a group of important eschatological sayings. It is possible that the original order of the chapters is 6–5, and the sequence of eschatological thought is improved if the chapters are taken in this order. In ch. 6 the discourse arises out of the miracle of the loaves. The manner of participation in eternal life is developed. It is necessary to eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of Man in order to have life. Those who eat of this bread will live for ever; Christ will raise them up 'at the last day.' The last phrase is repeated four times (vv. $^{39. 40. 44. 54}$).* Although the possession of eternal life by faith (6^{46}) is unaffected by death, yet the 'last day' seems to be regarded as the consummation, the display of the victory of life, occupying the place that the Parousia does in St. Paul's later thought.

In ch. 5 a discussion arising out of the healing of the impotent man leads to a statement of the relation between the Son and the Father, and of the activities committed by the Father to the Son. The Son does all that the Father does (5^{19})—raises and quickens the dead, gives life to those who believe, and executes all judgment in His character of Son of Man. In connexion with the last statement we have the important passage 5^{28-29}, which Charles considers an interpolation, and alien to the eschatology of the Gospel. It arises, however, naturally from the statement about the judgment executed by the Son, although it is logically unconnected with the view of resurrection in ch. 6, as the result of possessing eternal life. Both St. Paul and the author of the Fourth Gospel practically regard resurrection as the working out of the principle of life in Christ. Hence St. Paul, if he held the doctrine of a general resurrection from his traditional Pharisaic eschatology, does not speak of it in his Epistles,† and its mention here, if the passage be retained, can be regarded only as the reflexion of the current belief in a general resurrection.

But the references to the future—'the last day,' 'the hour is coming'—are vague and not distinctly connected with a Parousia. For a fuller discussion of their bearing see art. RESURRECTION.

(*β*) The Supper discourses (chs. 13–17)—corresponding to the eschatological discourses of the Synoptists—contain the central statements of the Gospel concerning the Parousia. In 14^{2-3} we have the promise of the return: 'if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am there ye may be also'; 14^{18}, 'I will not leave you orphans: I come to you.' In 16^{16} the disciples are told that after a little while they will see Him, and are represented as puzzled by the 'little while.' He explains that the present is the time of sorrow, but that He will see them again, and no man shall take their joy from them (16^{22}). In 17^{24} He prays that those whom the Father has given Him may be with Him where He is. In 21^{22} the possibility is implied that the disciple whom Jesus loved may abide on earth until He comes, although this is explained as purely hypothetical by the writer of the Gospel.

It is difficult, in view of these passages, to accept unreservedly E. F. Scott's view that the author of the Gospel is abandoning entirely the view of a future Parousia, and that he has identified the Parousia entirely with our Lord's assumption of a spiritual state after His resurrection. The coming of the Spirit is always distinguished from the Parousia, and spoken of as the consequence of Christ's departure and absence. Hence Scott has to argue that the account of the coming of the Spirit is not logically connected with the writer's view of a present Parousia of Christ in His spiritual condition. It appears rather that the eschatology of the Fourth Gospel does not fit the mould into which Scott seeks to press it. The fact is that while the Parousia is retained as part of the belief of the Church, and is even felt by the author of the Gospel to have a definite place in our Lord's attitude towards the future and to be necessary as the consummation of the Church's hope, yet, like St. Paul, his interest is not in the purely eschatological aspect of the subject but in the working out of the consequences of life. Indeed, St. Paul is more occupied with the Parousia as the supreme display of the working out of this risen life in the bodies and spirits of believers. But St. John has hardly the same sense of the vital relation of the Parousia to the life, since his conception of eternal life in the believer is timeless. The difference in his attitude towards the Resurrection corresponds to his attitude towards the Parousia. The Resurrection is the central point of St. Paul's working out of his new lines. For St. John the central thing is that the Eternal Life, the Father's Logos, the Word of Life, has touched and entered into human life, and thus made it capable of a Divine transformation which takes place now. The believer cannot come into judgment, and has already passed from death to life. God dwells in him and he in God. Hence while the Parousia may be retained as a future hope and stimulus to holiness of life, yet it is not in any way such a crisis of attainment as it appears to be in St. Paul's thought. St. Paul desires to attain to the resurrection from among the dead. For St. John death is past already, and the believer in Christ will never die. Hence Charles seems to sum up the Johannine view of the Parousia more truly than Scott, when he distinguishes between the view of the Parousia as a future event and the conception of it as a spiritual experience. It is the fuller expression of the latter that constitutes the great advance of the Fourth Gospel.

(*c*) *The Epistles.*—The Epistles present the same two-fold view. On the one hand, the Antichrist belief is explained as the working of opposition to the Christian revelation of the Father in the Son; the Son of God has come, and believers already dwell in God and have no fear of a day of judgment. On the other hand, there is the expectation of Christ's appearing, the desire not to be ashamed before Him at His coming, the expectation of being like Christ when He is manifested, and of seeing Him as He is.

The Johannine view of the Parousia does not seem to be occupied with the problem that occupied St. Paul as to the place of the body in the scheme of redemption. Apparently the author of the Fourth Gospel has either transcended the conception of the material expression of life altogether or has not felt the pressure of the problem. Probably the truth is that he is so much occupied with the moral expression of the life, the life of the spirit, that the mode of expression of personal identity did not greatly trouble him. The post-Resurrection appearances of Christ cannot safely be taken as an indication of the writer's view of the resurrection state of the believer. When he speaks at all of such a state it is always in spiritual terms; even the word 'glory' has a more exclusively spiritual and moral sense than with St. Paul. The consummation desired by Christ is that believers may be 'with him,' may be one as the Father and the Son are. He has given them already the glory which the Father gave Him; when He appears they shall be like Him. Hence what is characteristic in St. John is the liberation of the thought of the Parousia from conceptions of time and space, while he still retains, like St. Paul, something of the older point of view. Space forbids a discussion of Schweitzer's ingenious but unconvincing theory of a sacramental quasi-material eschatology, where matter through the incarnation and glorifying of Christ becomes the vehicle of the Spirit's operation, and so, working by the sacraments in the believer, transforms the purely material elements of his body into what is eternal. But this view suggests that an exhaustive inquiry into both the Pauline and the Johannine attitude towards the relation between matter and spirit is greatly needed in the interests of eschatology.

---

* Wendt's excision of the words 'in the last day' in each of these passages is wholly unjustifiable.

† The author of Acts, in his report of St. Paul's speech before Felix, attributes to him a belief in the resurrection of just and unjust (Ac 24^{15}).

v. THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS.—The place of the Parousia in the Apostolic Fathers must be dealt with briefly.

The Parousia is connected by *1 Clement* with a future resurrection of the just (xxiv. 1, xxvi. 1); gifts of immortality and righteousness accompany it (xxxv. 4); the righteous who have fallen asleep from all generations will be manifested at the visitation (ἐπισκοπῇ) of the Kingdom of Christ; the combination of Is 26^{20} and Ezk 37^{12}, possibly from a catena, is interesting in this connexion as illustrating the methods of proof from the OT (l. 3, 4).

2 Clement has a very explicit doctrine of bodily resurrection and judgment at the Parousia (ix. 1–5). The day of the appearing of God is not known (xii. 1); the day of judgment is at hand; it is conceived of, as in 2 Peter, as the destruction of heaven (possibly 'some' of the heavens, if *τινες* be accepted) and earth by fire (xvi. 3). The day of Christ's appearing is the day of judgment according to men's works (xvii. 4, 5).

Ignatius is too absorbed by his own desire to attain to God to be much occupied with the Parousia. For him resurrection and the perfect state follow immediately after death (see art. IMMORTALITY). But he recognizes 'the last times' as present, and warns his readers of coming judgment (*Eph.* xi. 1). He speaks repeatedly of 'Jesus Christ our hope.' The resurrection is both of flesh and spirit (*Smyrn.* xii. 2); *ad Polyc.* vii. 1 is not clear, but may imply a future resurrection at the Parousia, when every man's work will be manifest.

Polycarp in his *Epistle to the Philippians* sets forth what probably represents the general orthodox view: Christ is coming as Judge of living and dead (ii. 1); God will raise up believers at the Parousia (ii. 2, v. 2); the saints will judge the world (xi. 2).

The *Didache* in its last chapter gives a brief résumé of primitive Christian eschatology: first the apostasy, then Antichrist, then the tribulation and final woes, then the three-fold sign of the end: the sign spread out in heaven (a reference to Mt 24^{30}), the sign of the trumpet, and the sign of the resurrection of the righteous; finally there is the Parousia. Of subsequent eschatological developments there is no mention. It is to be noted that the author does not support his doctrine of the pre-millennial resurrection of the righteous by any reference to 1 Thess. or Rev., but by an OT reference—Zec 14^{5}. Note also the mystic allusion 16^{5}, 'saved by the Curse itself.'

Barnabas refers to the approaching tribulation (iv. 3 [τό τέλειον σκάνδαλον] and xvi. 5 [a direct quotation from *En.* lxxxix. 56]). In v. 7 he refers to the coming of Christ to raise the dead and judge the risen, so also xxi. 1–3.

Hence in general, with the possible exception of Ignatius, the attitude of the Apostolic Fathers towards the Parousia represents arrested development, the tendency to stereotype the phrases of the Gospels and Epistles into set statements. There is the general acceptance of an outline of final events in which the Parousia forms the crisis, and is identified with the day of resurrection and general judgment. There is a wavering on the question of whether all are raised or only the righteous, but the doctrine of a bodily resurrection is generally accepted without question, even by Ignatius. Ignatius approaches more to the Johannine type of eschatology, but the nature of his Epistles makes it impossible to draw large generalizations from them.

3. Conclusion.—The general survey of the period gives us the impression of two tendencies at work—the progressive and the reactionary. Starting from the acceptance of a Jewish conception of the Parousia, we find the primitive Church modifying it by fitting into the Jewish apocalyptic mould the historical conceptions of the death and resurrection of Jesus the Messiah. While the general consciousness of the Church, after the first intensity of expectation of hope had died down, tended to stereotype the eschatology in set phrases as a vague future of blessing and judgment centring round Christ, the master minds first of St. Paul and then of St. John (if we may for convenience so speak of the author of the Fourth Gospel) seized on the implications of the historical facts of the life, death, and resurrection of Christ, and worked them out in all their bearings on Christian life and thought. But this working out, especially in St. Paul's case, was not a merely intellectual effort of systematization, but arose partly from the practical needs of his missionary work and partly from his own inward experience of the life in Christ. Hence his thinking bears the marks of fragmentariness and incoherence. Wonderful and far-reaching intuitions exist side by side with remains of the older framework of eschatology, which only gradually breaks down and never entirely disappears. In investigating the eschatology of the period, or any part of it, we labour under certain limitations which must not be forgotten, even in the demand, as quoted above from Schweitzer, for a coherent system of eschatology.

These limitations are: (1) the fragmentary nature of our sources: we have to imply and infer from scattered hints and phrases, and there is always a danger of implying too much, and attempting an artificial construction, assuming a common eschatology which may never have existed; (2) the conditions under which the primitive eschatology was gradually modified, the motive impulse being more the practical needs of the growing communities than the desire to systematize: hence the conditions were not such as to produce a coherent scheme, even if we assume a coherent scheme to start with, which is wholly improbable; (3) the disintegrating effect upon any scheme of eschatology of the change of perspective as the immediate hope was not fulfilled; (4) the obvious fact that the work of the greatest and most original minds of the Apostolic Age in this direction did not produce an effect on the thought of the Church in any way proportionate to its value. These considerations may serve to keep us from expecting a coherent eschatological system in which the place of the Parousia is always fixed and its precise nature always defined. The hope of the Parousia to the early Church was like the dawn in the east, taking on strange colours and varying forms, but bearing witness to the great fundamental fact that the day had come at last, the day-star had risen in the heart of the believer.

LITERATURE.—Artt. 'Parousia,' 'Resurrection,' 'Eschatology,' in *DCG*, *HDB*, and other Dictionaries and Encyclopædias; R. H. Charles, *Eschatology: Hebrew, Jewish, and Christian*^{2}, London, 1913; W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Doctrine of the Last Things*, do., 1908, *Evolution of the Messianic Idea*, do., 1908; S. D. F. Salmond, *The Christian Doctrine of Immortality*^{4}, Edinburgh, 1901; E. F. Scott, *The Kingdom and the Messiah*, do., 1911, *The Fourth Gospel*, do., 1906; Evelyn Underhill, *The Mystic Way*, London, 1913; P. Gardner, *The Religious Experience of St. Paul*, do., 1911; A. Sabatier, *The Apostle Paul*, Eng. tr., do., 1891; A. Schweitzer, *Paul and his Interpreters*, Eng. tr., do., 1912; J. A. Beet, *The Last Things*, new ed., do., 1905; P. Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie*, Tübingen, 1903; M. J. Lagrange, *Le Messianisme chez les Juifs*, Paris, 1909; W. Bousset, *Der Antichrist*, Göttingen, 1895; G. Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, Eng. tr., Edinburgh, 1902; W. M. Ramsay, *Letters to the Seven Churches*, London, 1904, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, do., 1893; A. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, Eng. tr., do., 1894–99, *Mission and Expansion of Christianity*, Eng. tr., do., 1908; Kirsopp Lake, *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, do., 1911; H. J. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Theologie*, Tübingen, 1911; G. B. Stevens, *NT Theology*, Edinburgh, 1899. Commentaries: Sanday-Headlam, *ICC*, 'Romans'^{5}, Edinburgh, 1902; Robertson-Plummer, *ICC*, '1 Corinthians,' do., 1911; J. Armitage-Robinson, *Ephesians*, London, 1903; T. K. Abbott, *ICC*, 'Ephesians and Colossians,' Edinburgh, 1897; G. Milligan, *Thessalonians*, London, 1908; B. F. Westcott, *Gospel of St. John*, do., 1908, and *Epistles of St. John*, do., 1883; F. J. A. Hort, *1 Peter I. 1–II. 17*, do., 1898; H. B. Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*^{2}, do., 1907; R. H. Charles, *Studies in the Apocalypse*, Edinburgh, 1913.

S. H. HOOKE.

PARTHIANS.—Parthians are mentioned in Ac 2^9 among the sojourners in Jerusalem on the Day of Pentecost. They were probably Jews who had become naturalized in Parthia, 'Jews of the Dispersion,' with possibly a few Parthian proselytes. Their ruler at this time was Arsaces XIX. (Artabanus III.), and their kingdom extended from Mesopotamia eastwards to the borders of India. The Parthians at first inhabited the mountainous country south of the Caspian Sea, between Media and Bactriana. Strabo (xi. 9. 2), Arrian (frag. 1), and Justin (xli. 1–4) agree in describing them as Scythians brought into this region by Sesostris. However this may be, they came under Persian rule in the time of Darius Hystaspis, and remained loyal to the Persian kings till Alexander the Great overthrew Darius Codomannus (333 B.C.) and conquered all his territory. Thereafter the Parthians acknowledged the suzerainty of the Seleucidæ till 256 B.C., when they revolted under Arsaces I., who became founder of a dynasty which lasted till *c.* A.D. 226.

Rome found the Parthians a difficult people to subdue, and the conflicts between the two nations were many and long-continued. Sometimes Rome prevailed; sometimes Parthia held its own. The Parthian soldiers were skilled horsemen and archers. They could move quickly on military campaigns, and shoot arrows with great precision while riding at full speed. Hence they were able to harass even the highly disciplined armies of Rome. The Parthians were not a literary people, and fell below the Persians, and very much below the Greeks, both in civilization and in art.

A. W. COOKE.

PASSION, PASSIONS.—The word 'passion' is used in the NT, both in the singular and in the plural, in senses which are now current only in biblical English.

1. 'Passion' in the singular is used of the suffering or death of our Lord in Ac 1^3, representing *τὸ παθεῖν*, which here denotes the Crucifixion ('after his passion'), and is exactly parallel with He 2^9, where *πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου* is rendered 'the suffering of death.' On the other hand, *παθήματα* in He 2^{10} means Christ's sufferings in a more general sense, as in 2 Co 1^5, Ph 3^{10}, 1 P 4^{13} 5^1. In his speech before Agrippa St. Paul says that Christ was 'subject to suffering' (*παθητός*, Ac 26^{23})—that is to say, in His humanity. That in His Godhead He was impassible but in His humanity passible was insisted on by Ignatius against Docetic error (*Eph.* vii.: *πρῶτον παθητὸς καὶ τότε ἀπαθής*, so *Polyc.* iii.), and by other Fathers; cf. *Apost. Const.* II. xxiv. 3, VIII. xii. 33 (ed. Funk). We may compare the nickname 'Patripassians' for the Sabellians, the logical outcome of whose doctrine was that the *Father* suffered. In the Thirty-nine Articles God is said to be 'without passions,' or, in the (equally authoritative) Latin, *impassibilis* (Art. i.).

2. In another sense, 'passion' in the NT is a neutral word unless qualified by the context; in Gal 5^{24} 'passions' (*παθήματα*, AV 'affections') is qualified by 'lusts,' and so the singular *πάθος* in 1 Th 4^5 (RV 'passion of lust,' AV 'lust of concupiscence'); in Ro 7^5 'passions' (*παθήματα*) is qualified by 'of sins,' and the phrase means 'sinful passions' (AV 'motions of sins'). Properly, then, 'passion' is any feeling, not necessarily strong feeling, just as *ἐπιθυμία*, 'lust,' is originally a neutral word. The adjective *ὁμοιοπαθής*, 'of like passions,' is entirely neutral; it is used in Ac 14^{15} of Paul and Barnabas, and in Ja 5^{17} of Elijah; in 4 Mac 12^{11} of men; and rather curiously in Wis 7^3 of the earth (AV 'which is of like nature' [with men], RV 'kindred,' RVm 'of like qualities'); the meaning seems to be that the earth is mother of all (cf. Sir 40^1).

A. J. MACLEAN.

PASSOVER.—In the NT we meet with two alternative names for the great Jewish festal season of the Passover—*τὸ πάσχα* and *τὰ ἄζυμα*. These are the LXX equivalents for the corresponding Heb. terms in the OT, *πάσχα* being a rough transliteration of Heb. *pesaḥ* (probably through the Aramaic form *pasḥa*), and *τὰ ἄζυμα* a translation of Heb. *hammaẓẓôth* ('the unleavened bread,' Ex 12^{17}), a brief form of reference to *ḥag hammaẓẓôth* ('the feast of the unleavened bread,' Ex 23^{15}). We have also one instance of the full phrase *ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων* in Lk 22^1. Similarly *τὸ πάσχα* is an abbreviation for *ἡ ἑορτὴ τοῦ πάσχα* (Lk 2^{41}); and this is parallel with the OT use of *happesaḥ* (*e.g.* Jos 5^{10}) for the full *ḥag happesaḥ* (*e.g.* Ex 34^{25}). In both cases the name of an essential feature of the feast (the lamb, the cakes) is used to denote the feast itself. The analogy of the use of the *maẓẓôth* ('cakes') as a short name for the festival suggests that *pesaḥ* was originally the special name for the lamb and that it is not the name of the feast transferred to the lamb. 'Killing' and 'eating' *τὸ πάσχα* are just as often spoken of as 'keeping' *τὸ πάσχα*.

It would be impossible for readers of the LXX, who were familiar only with Greek, to realize such word-play between 'passover' and 'pass over' as is found in Ex 12—word-play which is obvious alike in EVV and in Heb.; *e.g.* Ex 12^{27}: *zebhaḥ-pesaḥ . . . ăsher pāsaḥ*, 'passover-sacrifice (to the Lord) who passed over.' The LXX, which uses *πάσχα* invariably for *pesaḥ*, reads in the same passage, 'A sacrifice to the Lord is this pasch (*τὸ πάσχα*), for He screened (*ἐσκέπασε*) the houses of the people of Israel.'

The Vulg. handling of the term is very curious. At its first appearance in Ex 12^{11} it is a sort of transliteration yielding the odd form *Phase* followed by an explanatory parenthesis, '(id est, transitus) Domini.' So throughout the OT, except in Ezra and Ezekiel, *Phase* as an indeclinable substantive continues to be used, but some caprice is shown in using sometimes *Phase* and sometimes *phase*. In Ezr $6^{19. 20}$ and Ezk 45^{21} the form *Pascha* appears: and in the NT this term is invariably used. It appears to be generally intended to mark the distinction between the name as applied to the feast and as applied to the lamb by using *Pascha* in the former case ('facere, celebrare Pascha') and *pascha* in the latter ('immolare, comedere, manducare pascha'). Uncertainty, too, is shown as to the declension of the word, it being treated both as feminine and as neuter (*e.g.* Lk 2^{41}, 'in die solemni Paschæ'; 22^{8}, 'parate nobis pascha'). Similarly we have in Mk 14^{1} 'Erat autem Pascha et Azyma,' and in Lk 22^{1} 'appropinquabat autem dies festus Azymorum, qui dicitur Pascha.' In Ac 12^{3} 20^{6} is found 'dies Azymorum.'

Whether we have not here traces of two ancient Spring festivals, one pastoral (*peṣaḥ*) and one agricultural (*maẓẓôth*), now merged into one and invested with a new significance as a historical commemoration which almost wholly obliterates the primitive origins, is a question that lies beyond the scope of this article. This much, however, may be said. The real origin of the term *pesaḥ* (and so πάσχα) is, to say the least, obscure. The explanation given in Ex 12 quite possibly indicates the well-known tendency to supply a derivation for a term from itself, especially when it is to be adapted to new uses. For πάσχα, we know, a connexion with πάσχω ('suffer'), was found as early as Irenæus (2nd cent. A.D.), who says: 'A Moyse ostenditur Filius Dei, cuius et diem *passionis* non ignoravit, sed figuratim pronunciavit, eum pascha nominans' (*Hær.* iv. 10). Tertullian and Chrysostom repeated the error of connecting πάσχα with our Lord's Passion. There must have been very many, familiar only with Greek, to whom the term itself was meaningless.

1. The feast.—The Passover was a *ḥag*, *i.e.* a pilgrim feast characterized by joyousness; it was necessarily observed at the central sanctuary at Jerusalem. Josephus mentions more than once the large numbers that came up to the feast, and speaks of it as a particularly turbulent time when sedition was liable to break out on the slightest provocation (see *Ant.* XVII. ix. 3, XX. v. 3). He calculates that there were 2,700,200 capable of celebrating the Passover at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem (*BJ* VI. ix. 3; see also [for A.D. 65] *BJ* II. xiv. 3). Whatever exaggeration there may be in these numbers, it is clear that the concourse of people at the feast must have been great. According to the same authority, more than once in the unquiet years which preceded the fall of Jerusalem the Passover was made the occasion of massacre and bloodshed in which many perished.

With the fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple, the Passover necessarily ceased to be a *ḥag*. It became simply a domestic festival, though of peculiar preciousness. Their downfall as a nation, their being scattered abroad throughout the world, could not blot out for the Jews the memory of their redemption from Egyptian bondage, which the festival commemorated, whilst it also kept alive hopes for the days to come. The scene of the celebration was the home, and those who kept the feast were the family circle or household. But we are largely in the dark as to how the Jews observed the feast, say in A.D. 71, when it was no longer possible to go up to Jerusalem, and how exactly the celebration of the Passover (as well as other matters) was adjusted to the new order of things. All we know is that out of a period of uncertainty and dimness the Passover feast emerges as one of the most distinctive features of Judaism, one that has been made the subject of a special tractate of the Mishna (*Pesaḥim*), and one that has continued to this day as a specially valued festival.

2. The Passover as a note of time.—Twice in the Acts (12^{3} 20^{6}) we have 'the days of unleavened bread' referred to as a note of time. No absolute certainty is attainable with reference to NT chronology; everything, therefore, that can shed light on it is to be welcomed. In 12^{3} we have the fact explicitly mentioned that it was the Passover time when the occurrences there recorded took place; but unfortunately that does not give us information as to the year. The uncertainties, however, are narrowed down to the limits of a very few years, and careful calculation has shown that Herod Agrippa I. most probably died in A.D. 44. St. Peter mysteriously disappears from view, leaving us henceforth dependent on uncertain tradition for all further knowledge of his career. The unfortunate translation of μετὰ τὸ πάσχα in AV as 'after Easter' is an obvious anachronism, unless, indeed, 'Easter' was in the 16th cent. used indiscriminately for the Jewish and the Christian Pasch. Ac $20^{6f.}$ also probably indicates the Passover of A.D. 56 or 57 as marking the close of the missionary activity of St. Paul, who was arrested soon after (see art. 'Chronology of the NT' in *HDB* i. 416, 420).

Nothing could show better than these scanty notes of time how deep-rooted the custom was, how the feast was observed as regularly as the year came round. Men spoke naturally of 'the days of the unleavened bread' as a significant point in the calendar, just as we speak of 'after Christmas' or 'at Christmas.' Ordinary dates dwindle into insignificance beside these fixed, outstanding seasons. Similarly we find the other primary Jewish festivals (Tabernacles and Pentecost) used in the same way—Jn 7^{2} (Tabernacles), Ac 2^{1} 20^{16}, 1 Co 16^{8} (Pentecost).

3. How Passover was kept in apostolic times.—Even among the Jews the Paschal observance had undergone considerable changes in the course of time. Whilst a due reference was preserved to the all-important fact of the deliverance from Egypt, the emergence of the Jews as more or less a people, yet time and historical catastrophes had left their mark. What mention, *e.g.*, is there in the Pentateuchal legislation of the four cups of wine? When were they introduced? We cannot tell; yet they were a settled feature of the feast in our Lord's day. The cup which He took in the institution of the Lord's Supper was no new thing. It is generally admitted that this was the third cup or cup of blessing which is still drunk at the conclusion of the meal ('after supper,' Lk 22^{20}, 1 Co 11^{25}). The greatest difference, however, was made by the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. Up to that time the paschal lambs had been slain in their thousands year by year. Then it all ceased. A roasted shank-bone of a lamb is all that remains of the most notable element of the feast as originally ordained. On the other hand, the unleavened cakes and the bitter herbs (now taking the form of horse-radish) go back to primitive times.

But 'the present Passover liturgy contains comparatively very few relics from New Testament times' (A. Edersheim, *The Temple: its Ministry and Services as they were at the Time of Jesus Christ*, London, n.d., p. 231). Perhaps it is more correct to say that the present Passover liturgy contains large expansions of and additions to the ritual observed in the 1st cent. A.D. What that form was exactly it is impossible to tell. It was pre-eminently a time of revolution: the break-up and passing away of the old order to give place to a new. The transformation of Passover from a *ḥag* to a purely domestic festival was not so sudden as might at first appear. Even before the destruction of Jerusalem the domestic festivities were of growing importance, although that stupendous event made an end of the whole sacrificial system and yearly festal gatherings. We may be sure, however, that the kernel of the commemoration was jealously maintained, that the essential framework of the ritual to-day was there from the first. That ritual briefly is as follows. The search for leaven on the eve of Passover with quaint formulæ ushers in the feast. The festival commences with a sanctification; then comes the first cup of wine; the *aphiḳomen* (half a *maẓẓah*, which is reserved to be eaten at the close) is set aside; the question is asked, 'Why is this night distinguished from all other nights?' to which a long response is given; this is followed by the first part of Hallel (Pss 113, 114), the second cup of wine, washing of the hands; the unleavened bread (*maẓẓôth*) is eaten with bitter herbs (horse-radish); next comes Hillel's ceremony (eating a piece of horse-radish placed between two pieces of unleavened bread); the *aphiḳomen* is eaten, grace after meals is said with considerable additions; then there is the third cup of wine and the opening of the door; Hallel is resumed (Pss 115–118); Ps 136 is recited with large expansions, followed by the fourth cup of wine and prayer for the Divine acceptance of the service; '*Adir hu*', an impassioned song praying for the rebuilding of the Temple, brings all to a close.

Such a curious feature as the opening of the door is of uncertain date, but, though most likely later than the 1st cent. A.D., is yet of considerable age. The expansions are mostly seen in the Haggādic matter—the long narrative sections which are so conspicuous a feature of the observance. The compositions, 'How many are the benefits which God has conferred upon us?' 'And it came to pass at midnight,' 'Ye shall say, "It is the sacrifice of Passover,"' 'To Him praise has ever been and ever will be due,' and others, must be dated long after apostolic times. On the other hand, the Hallel and other portions of the Psalms are most probably amongst the oldest features.

One feature of the celebration on the second night of the Passover carries us back uninterruptedly to the primitive times when the Jews were settled in Canaan and were an agricultural people. It is the counting of the omer, and it most particularly reminds us that here we have originally a celebration of the recurring seasons of the year and the yearly ingathering of the earth's fruits. The first-fruits of barley harvest were offered on the second day of Passover, and from then seven weeks were counted by primitive methods of calculation; this brought them to Pentecost and the beginning of wheat harvest. 'Though one ephah, or ten omers, of barley was cut down, only one omer of flour, or about 5·1 pints of our measure, was offered in the Temple on the second Paschal' (Edersheim, *op. cit.* p. 259). Ages have passed, the Jews are scattered throughout the world, there is no longer flour to be offered, there is no omer; still at the evening service in the synagogue and on the second night of the festival in the home, as regularly as the Passover comes round, the words are said: 'Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast sanctified us with Thy precepts and commanded us concerning the counting of the Omer. This is the first day of the Omer. May it be Thy will, O Lord our God and the God of our fathers, to rebuild thy Temple speedily, in our days, and to make Thy law our portion.' And at evening service in the synagogue daily the counting goes on until the night before Pentecost (see art. PENTECOST).

Whenever the custom may have originated, it is curious to think that still in every Jewish home, just after the third cup, or cup of blessing, has been drunk, the door is opened to admit the prophet Elijah, for whom a spare cup of wine is always set, as the forerunner of the Messiah. 'May the All-merciful send us Elijah the prophet . . . who shall give us good tidings, salvation, and consolation.' We think of the question: 'Why then say the scribes that Elijah must first come?' (Mt 17^{10}), and of the answer: 'Elijah is come already.' That which differentiates between Jew and Christian is mainly the recognition of Jesus as the Christ. How can we fail to feel the pathos in the impassioned prayers with which the Paschal service closes? 'O mighty God, rebuild Thy house speedily, speedily even in our days, rebuild it. O God, rebuild Thy Temple speedily!' and in the aspiration repeated more than once, but especially before the fourth cup: 'Next year in Jerusalem!' We wonder how far these words really express the yearning of the Jewish heart. Words and formulæ often live on and survive the original desire, very intense and sincere, which prompted them.

The question arises, as in the matter of keeping Sabbath on the seventh day, whether the early Christians continued to observe these festivals just the same as the Jews. They did not at once break away from the practices in which they had been brought up (see, *e.g.*, Ac 3^1). 'The Christian Churches in Judæa existed as Jewish sects' (C. von Weizsäcker, *The Apostolic Age*, i.^{2} [London, 1897] 175), and it is with Jewish Christians that we are first of all concerned. In all probability they went on for years observing the festivals with their old Jewish significance as they also complied with other traditional usages. J. Bingham, indeed, on very slender grounds holds that the 'first Christians of Jerusalem . . . did not keep Easter with the Jews on what day of the week soever it fell, but on the Sunday following in honour of our Saviour's resurrection' (*Ant.* XX. v. 4 [in *Works*, Oxford, 1855, vol. vii.]). Apart even from the loose wording here, when we come to look into matters we see that he has little, if any, authority for the belief. The 'first day of the week,' the Lord's Day, was the regular, weekly commemoration of our Lord's resurrection. It is more than doubtful if there was an annual commemoration ('Easter') in apostolic times.

But the old runs into the new. Even though still marking events by 'the days of unleavened bread' (Ac 12^3), they might well invest the season with a new significance as time went on, and associate it with a new commemoration. 'When the apostles came to write of the bondage of sin and the new liberty and life in Christ, their teaching would be all the more easily understood and more lovingly accepted, because to many of their readers it recalled the Passover table of the family and the sound of silent voices' (G. M. Mackie, 'The Jewish Passover in the Christian Church,' *ExpT* xiii. [1901–02] 392).

St. Paul, however, who divined most accurately the true genius of Christianity as a religion with universal aims, evidently disapproved of the continuance of Judaism as a system crippling the spiritual energies of the Church, the new liberty in Christ. He explicitly deprecated the observance of Jewish feasts (Gal 4^{8-11}) on the part of purely Gentile converts. Col 2^{16} is equally decided. Though he was, as he himself proudly claimed, 'a Hebrew of Hebrews,' it is more than questionable if he kept the Passover after his conversion and after he had grasped the meaning of Christianity for the Gentile world. And when he makes an allusion to the feast in writing to the Corinthians (1 Co 5^{6-8}), it shows only that the feast *per se* has no longer any interest for him. It may, indeed, show incidentally that it was somewhere about the time of its celebration that he was writing his Epistle; but his allusions are purely symbolic. He gives to the Paschal lamb and to the unleavened bread a meaning of which his forefathers never dreamed. To St. Paul more than to any other is it due that Christianity broke away from the swaddling-clothes of Judaism and became a faith with a far more glorious redemption than the Exodus to commemorate.

As L. Duchesne remarks, 'There was no reason why Christians should observe the feasts and fasts of the Jewish calendar. They were allowed to drop out of use. Nevertheless, each year one of these holy days, the Paschal Feast or the Feast of the Azymes, recalled the memory of the Passion of the Saviour. The memories which Israel had connected, and still connected, with this anniversary might no longer be of interest; but it was impossible to forget that Our Lord had died . . . on one of those days. The Pasch was therefore retained, though the ritual details of the Jewish observance were omitted' (*Early History of the Christian Church*, Eng. tr. of 4th ed., i. [London, 1909] 207 f.).

4. 'Christ our Passover.'—We have already referred in passing to 1 Co 5^{6-8}, but both here and in $15^{20.\,23}$ there are allusions to Passover ('the firstfruits,' *ἀπαρχή*) which call for a rather more extended notice. For they show us better than anything else how the transition from the Jewish to the Christian Pasch was made, how the new interest and commemoration swallowed up and superseded the old. Once again Passover was in all probability being celebrated in the Jewish community. But St. Paul, perhaps for the very first time, was quick to see an illustration of Christ and His redeeming work in the sacrifice of the lamb, and in the complete removal of leaven which preceded the feast (Ex 12^{15}) an illustration of the moral purification which Christianity calls for. He sees, again, in the first-fruits offered at the Passover an illustration of what Christ is in His resurrection to the harvest field of the dead.

(*a*) *τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν*: '*our* Paschal lamb,' *i.e.* of Christians as distinct from Jews. It is altogether unnecessary to see in the lamb of the original institution an actual prototype of our Lord. To see in the Paschal lamb 'the prefiguration of Jesus Christ whose death is the sacrifice which averts the wrath of God from His community' (C. von Orelli, art. 'Passover' in Schaff-Herzog, viii. 370) is to go beyond what is warranted. The reference is too casual for so much to be built upon it. The Apostle never again speaks of Christ as a lamb. The lamb of the Passover, moreover, was partaken of in a festal meal, and St. Paul was probably thinking specially of this. For he immediately follows with 'Therefore let us keep festival' (*ἑορτάζωμεν*); not with a reference to any feast in particular, but to the new life of joyousness Christians are to live, in which 'sincerity and truth' are essential (so Chrysostom, *Hom. in 1 Cor.* xv. 3. 8). Again we have Christ compared to a 'lamb without blemish and without spot' (1 P 1^{19}), absolute purity, however, being a general requirement in any sacrifice offered to God (Dt 17^{1}). Allegory soon became busy with these representations of the Lord. He was 'the Lamb of God' (Jn 1^{29}) rather in antithesis to the whole sacrificial system of the Jews. The majestic apocalyptic figure of the Lamb which is all-prominent in Rev. is the outgrowth of this conception, and is mainly responsible for the *Agnus Dei* of Christian art.

(*b*) *ἀπαρχή*, LXX for Heb. *rē'shîth* (Lv 23^{10}), 'firstfruits.' It is almost impossible that St. Paul should use this particular term without having in mind a reference to the offering of firstfruits at Passover, especially when we take it in connexion with 5^{6}. R. F. Weymouth (*The NT in Modern Speech*^{3}, London, 1909, p. 469) translates (no doubt advisedly) 1 Co 15^{20}, 'being the first to do so of those who are asleep'; and again v.^{23}, 'Christ having been the first to rise': but this entirely obscures the beautiful figure of the harvest field. As used by St. Paul, the gathering of firstfruits and the presenting of them to God is a pledge that the whole harvest shall be reaped.

5. Passover and the Eucharist.—Is there any connexion between the Passover of the Jews and the Lord's Supper of the Christian Church? Our limitations forbid any treatment in detail of what is still a very vexed question. It must be admitted that the materials are scanty and not free from obscurity. The difference, *e.g.*, between the Synoptists and the Fourth Gospel as to the actual time when the Lord held His Last Supper, whether the meal was an 'anticipated Passover' or Passover itself, is well known. Referring to the repeated attempts to harmonize them, Duchesne sensibly remarks: 'It is wiser to acknowledge that, on this point, we are not in a position to reconcile the evangelists' (*op. cit.* p. 209, n. 4). And why trouble, when even the fact that the Lord instituted some memorial observance for His disciples is itself open to question? Wilder extremists see in the Supper, not a simple memorial instituted naturally by Jesus and suggested by the circumstances of the time, but the influence of mystery-religions and strange cults with their eating and drinking of a god.

One thing is pretty certain. There was a meal in some form or another associated with Christianity from the very beginning. In Ac 2^{42} the *κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου*, 'the breaking of the bread,' suggests a distinctive custom of the first disciples. Still more in 20^{7} is it apparent that this custom was observed 'on the first day of the week,' and it becomes a more definitely religious ordinance. More than all we have fortunately St. Paul's treatment of a crying scandal in the Church at Corinth which incidentally gives us some light on the practice of the times (1 Co $10^{16\text{f.}}$ $11^{17\text{ff.}}$). From the first, apparently, the commemoration (Eucharist) was observed in connexion with a common meal to symbolize and to foster fraternity (Agape). The Apostle's action here was to set a hedge round the commemoration and rescue it from the disgraceful abuses which attended the common meal. It distinctly contributed to the ultimate separation of the Eucharist as a purely religious and symbolic feast, although at the time of the *Didache* (*c.* A.D. 100) the Agape appears still to have been associated with it (§ 10), at any rate in certain localities.

But St. Paul's mention of the 'cup of blessing' (1 Co 10^{16}), coupled with the fact that he had already seen in the Paschal lamb an illustration of Christ, makes it clear that he at any rate viewed this ordinance as the Christian counterpart of the Jewish Passover. Edersheim (*LT*^{4}, London, 1887, ii. 511) is very decided as to this relation, and even goes so far as to venture the opinion that the broken bread was none other than the *aphiḳomen* or unleavened cake eaten at the close of the meal. A. C. McGiffert (*A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, Edinburgh, 1897, p. 70) seems hardly consistent in saying there is no indication in our sources that the Lord's Supper was viewed as thus related to the Jewish Passover, as he remarks, 'It can hardly be doubted, in other words, that it was believed, at any rate at an early day, if not from the beginning, in the church of Jerusalem, that Jesus had commanded them to do as they actually were doing.' If Jesus gave the command He gave it at the Paschal meal, or at least in close association with it. 'Whether in the words and acts of Jesus there is an implied reference to the Passover or not, the association of the Eucharist with the Passover was a natural one, though we may have to admit that the Paschal features in the language of St. Paul represent the later reflexion of a period when the idea of Christ as the true Passover (1 Co 5^{7}, Jn 19^{36}) had influenced the conception of the institution' (art. 'Eucharist' in *ERE* v. 543^{a}). We may notice that really St. Paul's language is separated from the Crucifixion only by a score of years or so, no great interval after all. It is the more natural to think, considering the relation of Christianity to Judaism, that we have here a close point of connexion between the old and the new.

6. Passover and Easter.—The true celebration of Easter, the festival of our Lord's resurrection, was, as we have seen above, a thing of weekly occurrence. 'The first day of the week' became established even in the Apostolic Church as the special day of joyful commemoration on the part of Christians. In that they were most sharply in contrast with the Jews. But whatever obscurity may hang round the original connexion between the Paschal feast and the Eucharist, there can be no question that when Easter came to be observed, as it was observed at the same season of the year, —in spring—it was regarded as the counterpart of the Jewish Passover. Speaking of the movable feasts, Duchesne says: 'Dans ces fêtes, comme en tant d'autres choses, l'Eglise est, à un certain degré, héritière de la Synagogue. L'année ecclésiastique n'est autre chose que la combinaison de deux calendriers, l'un juif et l'autre chrétien. Au calendrier juif correspondent les fêtes mobiles, au calendrier chrétien les fêtes fixes' (*Origines du culte chrétien*^{4}, Paris, 1909, p. 225). After observing that this symmetry must not be pressed too far, he remarks: 'Les chrétiens ne conservèrent point toutes les fêtes juives; et quant à celles qu'ils retinrent, ils y attachèrent de bonne heure une signification appropriée à leurs croyances. . . . On ne conserva que celles de Pâques et de la Pentecôte' (*ib.*).

This correspondence is made abundantly clear by the fact that the name for the festival of the resurrection of our Lord is in most countries simply the name 'Pascha' reproduced in various forms. Thus Lat. *festa paschalia*, which has passed into Fr. as *Pâques* (a plur. form), Ital. *Pasqua*, etc. (see *OED*, *s.v.* 'Pasch'). The name 'Easter' is, quite differently, from A.S. plur. *eástron*, a relic of heathenism with dim suggestions of the worship of nature powers awakening in spring. But even where 'Easter' became the settled name, some form of *Pascha* such as 'Pasch' existed side by side with it.

It was only to be expected that with the weekly celebration there should gradually grow up a special yearly commemoration of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. That is so tremendous and vital a fact that as each Paschal season came round the tendency would be more and more to give importance to the annual celebration at the very season when our Lord died and rose again. But this was after the Apostolic Age.

So there is no need to enter with any minuteness upon a controversy which, springing up in the 2nd cent., continued for long to agitate the Christian Church and was the occasion of great and widespread bitterness of feeling. Pity that such things should be! But it was a controversy that grew up out of this very relation of the Christian to the Jewish feast; and it had reference to the time when the festival should be kept. A large section of the Church, believing that on the 14th Nisan, the day of the Paschal sacrifice, Jesus also died, were firm in their resolve to keep their Pasch on the same day as did the Jews. (The term *Pascha*, it may be said, originally included a reference to the death as well as the resurrection of Christ. A distinction was made between τὸ πάσχα σταυρώσιμον, the *Pascha crucifixionis*, and τὸ πάσχα ἀναστάσιμον, the *Pascha resurrectionis.*) On the other hand, seeing that the 14th Nisan could fall on any day of the week, and therefore the celebration of Easter also, the Roman Church, and those who were influenced by it, kept the festival on Sunday as a fixed day, arriving at the date by more or less intricate calculation. It was not, however, by any means the same Sunday that Christians observed even where this principle obtained. The former, mainly Asians, were called Quartodecimans or 'Fourteenthers.' At first they agreed to differ. 'Polycarp [*c.* A.D. 150], during his stay in Rome, tried to convince Pope Anicetus that the quartodeciman use was the only one permissible. He did not succeed. Neither could Anicetus succeed in persuading the old master to adopt the Roman method. They parted, nevertheless, on the best of terms' (Duchesne, *Early Hist. of the Christian Church*, i. 210). A very different state of things followed when a later pope, Victor, interfered to secure one uniform way. It is a sorry story of schism and strife. But where now are the Tessarescædecatitæ, Audiani, Sabbatiani, Protopaschitæ and other curious sects, who 'would not hold any communion with . . . any that did not keep the Pasch at the same time that the Jews did'? (Bingham, *op. cit.* xx. v. 3).

The two festivals still exist side by side. It is true that, quite apart from the Jewish feast, Christians would still have celebrated the resurrection of the Lord. But, be that as it may, the historical connexion of Christianity and Judaism is indubitably signified as year by year at the same time the Christian keeps Easter and the Jew Passover —though, with what radical difference of meaning!

LITERATURE.—In addition to works and articles quoted throughout, see artt. 'Passover' in *HDB* (W. J. Moulton), in *EBi* (I. Benzinger), in *JE* (E. G. Hirsch); art. 'Pasch or Passover' in *CE* (C. Aherne); in *ERE*, artt. 'Festivals and Fasts (Christian)' (J. G. Carleton), 'Festivals and Fasts (Hebrew)' (F. H. Woods); A. Hilgenfeld, *Der Paschastreit der alten Kirche nach seiner Bedeutung für die Kirchengeschichte*, Halle, 1860; *Eighteen Treatises from the Mischna* (including Pesahim), tr. D. A. de Sola and M. J. Raphall, London, 1843; F. Delitzsch, 'Der Passahritus zur Zeit des zweiten Tempels,' *Zeitschr. für die ges. luther. Theologie und Kirche*, xvi. [1855] 257 ff.; P. Gardner, *The Origin of the Lord's Supper*, London, 1893; A. A. Green, *The Revised Hagada*, do., 1897; H. C. Trumbull, *The Blood Covenant*, do., 1887.

J. S. CLEMENS.

PASTOR.—Eph 4^{11} is the only passage in the NT in which 'pastor' occurs, although its Greek equivalent, ποιμήν, is frequent; everywhere else ποιμήν is rendered 'shepherd.' This exceptional translation is justified, because here only is ποιμήν used of some kind of Christian minister. It is used of Christ as 'the great shepherd of the sheep' (He 13^{20} from LXX of Is 63^{11}), as 'the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls' (1 P 2^{25}), and as 'the chief Shepherd' (1 P 5^{4})—expressions suggested by Himself (Jn $10^{11.14}$). But the metaphor is obvious, and is frequent from Homer onwards. The cognate verb ποιμαίνειν is used of tending Christian flocks; in Christ's charge to St. Peter (Jn 21^{16}), in St. Peter's charge to his 'fellow-elders' (1 P 5^{2}), and in St. Paul's charge at Miletus to the elders of the Church at Ephesus (Ac 20^{28}). In Eph 4^{11}, while 'apostles' and 'prophets' and 'evangelists' have each a separate article, 'pastors and teachers' are coupled by a common article, and probably form only one group, distinguished by being attached to particular congregations, whereas 'apostles,' 'prophets,' and 'evangelists' were itinerant preachers and missionaries. But 'pastors' and 'teachers' are not convertible terms; almost all 'pastors' would be 'teachers,' but not all 'teachers' were 'pastors.'

LITERATURE.—See Commentaries on Eph 4^{11}, esp. J. A. Robinson (1903) and B. F. Westcott (1906); A. Harnack, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity*^{2}, Eng. tr., 1908, i. 336–346.

A. PLUMMER.

PASTORAL EPISTLES.—See TIMOTHY AND TITUS, EPISTLES TO.

PATARA (Πάταρα, neut. pl.).—Patara was a maritime city in the S.W. of Lycia, about 6 miles

S.E. of the mouth of the Xanthus. For classical writers it had a romantic interest as a home of Apollo (Herodotus, i. 182), whose temple and oracle there were only less famous than those at Delphi: 'Pataræan Apollo who haunts the thickets of Lycia' (Hor. *Od.* III. iv. 64). Its more practical importance was two-fold; it served as a seaport for the fertile Xanthus valley, including the splendid city of that name; and it lay on the highway of ships trading between the Ægean and the Levant or Egypt. St. Paul did an ordinary thing when he changed ships at Patara (Ac 21^{2}). The coaster in which he had sailed from Troas had either reached her destination or else was about to continue her course along the south coast, whereas larger vessels bound from Lycia for Syria struck right across the high sea, passing Cyprus on the left (v.^{3}). Ships coming in the opposite direction usually found the straight course too difficult on account of the prevailing westerly wind, and had to keep closer to shore, passing Cyprus on the left, and making not for Patara but for Myra, about 30 miles to eastward (27^{5}). Patara derived an ample revenue from the vast traffic between the Ægean coast and Alexandria. Ptolemy Philadelphus enlarged and improved the city, calling it 'the Lycian Arsinoe' in honour of his wife, 'but the old name prevailed' (Strabo, XIV. iii. 6). Patara was the reputed birthplace of St. Nicholas. The harbour is now 'an inland marsh generating poisonous malaria' (T. A. B. Spratt and E. Forbes, *Travels in Lycia, Milyas, and the Cibyratis*, 2 vols., 1847, i. 32). There are extensive and well-preserved ruins, including a triumphal arch with the inscription, 'Patara, the metropolis of the Lycian nation.'

LITERATURE.—F. Beaufort, *Karamania*, 1817; C. Fellows, *Account of Discoveries in Lycia*, 1841; O. Benndorf and G. Niemann, *Reisen in südwestlichen Kleinasien*, vol. i.: 'Reisen in Lykien und Karien,' 1884; Murray's *Handbook of Asia Minor*, 1895.

JAMES STRAHAN.

PATIENCE.—The virtue of patience occupied a great place in the apostolic writings. We have two Greek words to consider, which are thus translated: (1) *ὑπομονή* (vb. *ὑπομένω*), (2) *μακροθυμία* (vb. *μακροθυμέω*).

1. *ὑπομονή* is the more important word. It is found only in later Greek, and answers to the classical *καρτερία*, *καρτέρησις*, with the meaning of holding out, enduring. The word, however, principally belongs to biblical and Patristic Greek, into which it was introduced by the LXX, where it translates various Hebrew words signifying 'hope,' a virtue very closely connected with endurance, as being its basis or ground. Cremer says (*Bibl.-Theol. Lex. of NT Greek*^{3}, Eng. tr., 1880, p. 420) of *ὑπομονή*: 'It denotes the peculiar psychological clearness and definiteness which hope attains in the economy of grace, by virtue, on the one hand, of its distinctive character excluding all wavering, doubt, and uncertainty; and, on the other, in conformity with its self-assertion amid the contradictions of this present world.'

The connexion of patience (*ὑπομονή*) with hope is brought out in such passages as Ro 8^{25}, 2 P 3^{12}, Col 1$^{11. 12}$. Its connexion with the contradictions of life appears in Ro 5$^{3. 4}$, Ja 1$^{3. 4}$; cf. also 2 Th 1^{4}, He 10^{36} 12^{1}, Rev 2$^{2. 3. 19}$, 2 P 1^{6}.

The Book of Revelation in particular emphasizes the need of endurance, written as it is in view of the persecution of the Church by the Roman State (cf., further, Rev 1^{9} 13^{10} 14^{12}). Particular expressions which call for note are 2 Th 3^{5}, *ὑπομονὴ Χριστοῦ*, 'the patience which waits for Christ,' *i.e.* for the Messianic salvation; Rev 3^{10}, *ὁ λόγος τῆς ὑπομονῆς μου*, 'the word which treats of patient waiting for me,' *i.e.* the word of prophecy. Interesting also is Ro 15^{5}, where God is called 'the God of patience' (*ὁ θεὸς τῆς ὑπομονῆς*), *i.e.* the God who inspires patience through the prophetic words of Scripture (cf. v.^{4}); see, further, for *ὑπομονή*, 2 Co 1^{6} 12^{12}, 1 Ti 6^{11}, Tit 2^{2}.

The similarity of atmosphere between the NT and the Apostolic Fathers makes it natural that we should find similar reference to patience (*ὑπομονή*) in them. 1 Clem. v. 5–7 is particularly interesting, where, after St. Peter and the other apostles, St. Paul is set forth as an example of patience: 'By reason of jealousy and strife Paul by his example pointed out the prize of patience. After that he had been seven times in bonds, had been driven into exile, had been stoned, had preached in the East and in the West, he won the noble renown which was the reward of his faith, having taught righteousness unto the whole world and having reached the farthest bounds of the West; and when he had borne his testimony before the rulers, so he departed from the world and went into the holy place, having been found a notable pattern of patience.' Cf. also 1 Clem. lxii. 2, lxiv.; Hermas, *Mand.* viii. 9; *Ep. Barn.* xxi. 5; finally Polyc. *Philippians*, viii. 1. 2, 'Christ Jesus . . . patiently endured (*ὑπέμεινεν*) all things for our sakes, that we may live in Him. Wherefore let us become imitators of His patience (*ὑπομονῆς*)'; xi. 1, 'I exhort you all therefore to obey the word of righteousness and to practise all patience, which you saw before your eyes not only in the blessed Ignatius and Zosimus and Rufus, but also in others of you and in Paul himself and the rest of the Apostles.'

2. *μακροθυμία* also is a word rare in profane Greek. It appears in the apostolic writings as a synonym of *ὑπομονή* (Col 1^{11}, He 6^{12} 10^{36}, Ja 5^{10}, 2 Ti 3^{10}). On the other hand, it has the special meaning of longsuffering (*q.v.*) and stands opposed to *ὀργή*, *θυμός*, and is synonymous with *πραότης* (cf. Gal 5^{22}, Eph 4^{2}, Col 3^{12}, 2 Ti 4^{2}). In these passages the word is used of the patience of men one towards another. But it is also used of the patience or longsuffering of God, who delays the punishment of sinners in order to give them time to repent (cf. Ro 2^{4}, 1 P 3^{20}, 2 P 3^{15}). In Ro 9^{22} the idea of giving time for repentance is absent, and the word refers simply to God's delaying punishment.

In the sub-apostolic writings *μακροθυμία* stands side by side with *ὑπομονή* as in the NT; cf. 1 Clem. lxiv. A noteworthy passage dealing with this virtue is Hermas, *Mand.* v. 1, which is all in praise of patience (*μακροθυμία*): 'In patience the Lord dwells, but in hot wrath the devil' (v.^{3}).

In conclusion, reference may be made to the fine development, on the basis of the apostolic teaching, of the idea of Christian patience (*ὑπομονή*), which A. Ritschl has given in *The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation*, Eng. tr. of vol. iii., 1900, p. 627 f.

Patience is that feeling which views the evils of life in the light of Divine providence. It is quite different from the Stoic idea of apathy, which aims at the suppression of the pain due to the evil from which we suffer. 'Patience in suffering implies that the pain continues' (p. 627).

This is true not only of ordinary patience, but of the Christian form of this virtue. 'The elevation of the general human exercise of patience into its special Christian form depends on the fact that man's feeling of self and of personal worth, by being combined with the thought of the supramundane God Who is our Father, and guarantees to us salvation through dominion over the world and participation in the Kingdom of God, is raised above all natural and particular motives, even when they are the occasion of troubles. This still admits of evils being felt with pain even by the Christian' (p. 628). Ritschl refers in a note to Calvin, *Inst.* iii. 8. 8: 'Neither is there required from us a cheerfulness, such as may take away all sense of bitterness and grief; there would be no patience of the saints in the cross, except also they were tormented with grief and pressed with trouble.' The NT, indeed, speaks of rejoicing in suffering, of glorying in afflictions and persecutions for Christ's sake. But we can quote against the idea that this joy is to exterminate the sense of pain not only the explicit confession in He 12^{11}, but also the example of Jesus and St. Paul. The actual position of things is, in fact, as follows:

'The consciousness of reconciliation with God places the assurance of personal worth firm above all the special motives which arise from the world; and therefore the pain which springs from their oppressive action can be subordinated to the joy which, in our feeling of self, denotes the incomparable worth of Divine sonship. But in the case in question, joy would not last; rather, it would veer round into indifference, unless underneath the joy the pain still continued. Moreover, the truth of the Fatherly care of God for His children suggests to us not only the inference that no evils arising from the world can overbalance the blessing of fellowship with God, but also this further application, that these evils, as tests of our fidelity to God, are elevated into relative blessings. And this comes about just through the exercise of patience as the peculiar and proper manifestation of Christian freedom' (p. 629).

LITERATURE. — H. Bushnell, *The New Life*, 1860; M. Creighton, *The Mind of St. Peter*, 1904, p. 22; H. Black, *Christ's Service of Love*, 1907, p. 130; H. M. Gwatkin, *The Eye for Spiritual Things*, 1907, p. 61; H. E. Manning, *Sermons on Ecclesiastical Subjects*, i. [1870] 173; J. H. Jowett, *The Transfigured Church*, 1910, p. 149; W. H. Hutton, *A Disciple's Religion*, 1911, p. 12; W. B. Ullathorne, *Christian Patience*, 1886; G. Hanson, *A Chain of Graces*, 1906, p. 57.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

PATMOS (*Πάτμος*).—Patmos, one of the group of islands named the Sporades, lies in that part of the Ægean Sea which the Greeks called the Icarian, and is visible on the right as one sails from Samos to Cos. It is a volcanic island, bare and rocky, 10 miles long from N. to S., and 6 miles wide at the northern end. Its hills command a magnificent view of the surrounding sea and islands. At its centre, where it narrows to an isthmus, between the bay of Scala on the E. and that of Merika on the W., are found the remains of an ancient Hellenic town, which prove that the island was once populous; and the name of 'Palmosa,' which it bore in the Middle Ages, points to another time of prosperity; but Turkish rule has had its usual blighting effect. To-day 'the isle' has 4,000 Greek inhabitants, who are mostly sponge-fishers. The modern town stands on a hill-top, 800 ft. above sea-level, in the southern half of the island. It clusters about the Monastery of St. John—founded by St. Christodulus in A.D. 1088, on the site of an old temple—which has lost most of the treasures of its once valuable library, including the 9th cent. edition of Plato, now in the Bodleian. Monastic piety shows the place where the Revelation was written by St. John, and halfway down the hill is a grotto (*τὸ σπήλαιον τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως*) the rocks of which are said to have been cleft by the Divine voice.

More important are the internal indications that the book was written amid the sights and sounds of the infinite sea. It has the word *θάλασσα* 25 times, and it is full of the clashing of waves. No fitter scene could be found for the composition of the Apocalypse than the traditional one, and, if there were any reason to question the story of the author's banishment to the island, one would have to say, 'si non è vero, è ben trovato.' Nowhere is 'the voice of many waters' more musical than in Patmos; nowhere does the rising and setting sun make a more splendid 'sea of glass mingled with fire'; yet nowhere is the longing more natural that the separating sea—the *oceanus dissociabilis* of Horace (*Od.* I. iii. 22)—should be no more.

Small and inhospitable islands were often used as places of banishment (*relegatio*) in the 1st cent. (Pliny, *HN* IV. xii. 23; Tac. *Ann.* iii. 68, iv. 30, xv. 71). According to Eusebius (*HE* iii. 18), Jerome (*de Vir. Illustr.* 9), and others, St. John was exiled to Patmos under Domitian in A.D. 95, and released about 18 months afterwards under Nerva. W. M. Ramsay thinks that, as St. John was not a first-class prisoner, he must have been condemned not only to banishment but to hard labour for life (*The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia*, 1904, p. 82 ff.). At any rate, St. John was in Patmos 'for (*διά*) the word of God' (Rev 1^{9}). The meaning of the phrase is much disputed, some holding that it expresses the human cause, others the over-ruling Divine purpose, of his exile. He was banished either because of his loyalty to truth already revealed, or for the reception of truth about to be revealed. The former interpretation probably gives the writer's real meaning, but the latter (preferred by B. Weiss and others) contains a thought well worth expressing. While the authorities of Ephesus, moved perhaps by some mysterious impulse to spare the saint's life, transported him to the lonely island in order that the city might be freed from his too insistent word and testimony, he was providentially taken into a retreat where he was beside 'the deep sea and the mighty things.' The story of his exile is outlined in two phrases: 'I was in the isle . . . I was in the Spirit' (Rev $1^{9, 10}$). The realism was transfigured, and in that Ægean where Æschylus heard *ποντίων κυμάτων ἀνήριθμον γέλασμα* (*Prom.* 89 f.), St. John listened to 'the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters' (Rev 19^{6}).

LITERATURE.—L. Ross, *Reisen auf den griechischen Inseln des ägäischen Meeres*, Halle, 1840–1845; V. Guérin, *Description de l'île de Patmos et de l'île de Samos*, Paris, 1856; H. F. Tozer, *Islands of the Ægean*, London, 1890, pp. 178–195.

JAMES STRAHAN.

PATRIARCH (*πατριάρχης*, from *πατριά*, 'clan,' and *ἀρχή*, 'rule').—A patriarch is the father or head of a *πατριά* or clan. As applied to Bible characters, the term usually denotes either the forefathers of the human race or the progenitors of Israel—Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and his twelve sons. In the LXX of 1 Ch 24^{31} 27^{22}, 2 Ch 19^{8} 26^{12} *πατριάρχαι* renders various Hebrew terms, which appear in our EV as 'principal fathers,' 'heads of fathers' houses,' and 'captains.' In 4 Mac 7^{19} reference is made to 'our patriarchs Abraham, Isaac and Jacob' (cf. 4 Mac 16^{25}). In the NT the term is applied to Abraham (He 7^{4}), to the sons of Jacob (Ac $7^{8 \text{f.}}$), and also to David, in a text (2^{29}) where it has greater dignity than the ordinary 'king' would have had. It was of David that St. Peter, speaking *μετὰ παῤῥησίας*, 'had to say something not altogether favourable, in order that thereby the glory of Christ might be the more enhanced. There is therefore in this passage a *προθεραπεία*, or previous mitigation of what he is about to say' (Bengel, *in loco*). JAMES STRAHAN.

PATROBAS (*Πατρόβας*, a Greek name, contracted from Patrobius).—Patrobas is the fourth of a group of five names (all Greek) of persons 'and the brethren with them' saluted by St. Paul in Ro 16^{14}. Nothing is known of any member of this group. It is suggested that together they formed an *ἐκκλησία* or household church, the locality of which we shall suppose to have been Rome or Ephesus, according to our view of the destination of these salutations. This is more probable than that they were slaves belonging to some great establishment, or members of a civic gild. Cf. the salutation to another group of five persons 'and all the saints that are with them' in the verse following. In each case the names mentioned probably represent 'the first nucleus, the leading individuals,' of the congregation (see C. von Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age*, Eng. tr., i. [1894] 398f.), and perhaps the first mentioned (Asyncritus, v.^{14}, Philologus, v.^{15}) was the recognized leader. All, however, may have been heads of separate Christian households. For the occurrence of the name Patrobas on inscriptions of the Imperial household see J. B. Lightfoot, *Philippians*^{4}, 1878, p. 176. T. B. ALLWORTHY.

PATTERN.—In the EV of the NT 'pattern' occurs seven times, representing four different words in the original—*τύπος*, *ὑποτύπωσις*, *ὑπόδειγμα*, and *ἀντίτυπον*.

1. *τύπος* (from *τύπτειν*, 'to strike') denotes primarily a mark or impression left by a blow (cf. Jn 20^{25} 'the print [*τύπον*] of the nails'). In classical Greek it is used of the impress of a seal or the stamp struck by a die, and so comes to mean the figure or copy of something else. But as the impression on the wax reproduces the engraving on the seal, and the coin or medal the device on the die, the word comes to be transferred, by a familiar process in the history of language, from the effect to the cause, and so is used not only of the copy but of the example or pattern from which the copy is made. In Ro 6^{17} the RVm offers 'pattern' as an alternative for 'form' of doctrine or teaching. In Tit 2^{7} the AV has 'pattern (RV 'ensample') of good works.' In He 8^{5} the AV and the RV both employ 'pattern' to render the *τύπος* shown to Moses in the Mount.

2. *ὑποτύπωσις* (from *ὑποτυποῦν*, 'to sketch out,' Lat. *adumbrare*) is strictly a 'sketch' or 'outline' (*αἱ Ὑποτυπώσεις* is the name given by Sextus Empiricus to his outlines of the Pyrrhonic philosophy). In 1 Ti 1^{16} ('a pattern [RV 'ensample'] to them which should hereafter believe') St. Paul may have used the word in its original meaning to suggest that his experiences as a saved sinner were an 'adumbration' of those of subsequent believers. But the secondary meaning 'pattern' is more probable, in view of the fact that the word is evidently used in this sense in 2 Ti 1^{13}, 'hold fast the form (RV 'pattern') of sound words.'

3. *ὑπόδειγμα* (from *ὑποδεικνύναι*, 'to show,' with the suggestion of placing what is shown under the very eyes) is properly a thing exhibited as an example or pattern. In this sense the word is used several times in the NT (*e.g.* Jn 13^{15}, 'I have given you an example'; Ja 5^{10}, 'an example of suffering affliction'). The AV takes it in this sense in He 9^{23} and renders 'patterns.' But *ὑπόδειγμα*, like *τύπος*, may denote a copy as well as a pattern; and in rendering 'copies' here the RV clearly conveys the correct idea, since the things referred to are 'the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry' (v.^{21}), which were only copies of 'the heavenly things themselves.' Cf. 8^{5}, where the RV rightly changes 'the example (*ὑποδείγματι*) and shadow of heavenly things' into 'a copy and shadow of the heavenly things.'

4. *ἀντίτυπα* (He 9^{24}) is probably to be taken as an adjective rather than a substantive (*ἀντίτυπος*= 'answering to the type,' 'corresponding to the pattern,' no doubt with reference to the *τύπος* of 8^{5}; see above). The RV, 'like in pattern to the true,' is therefore to be preferred to the AV, 'the figures of the true.' J. C. LAMBERT.

PAUL.—**1. Sources.**—The documents of the life of St. Paul are the Book of Acts, of which his biography occupies nearly two-thirds, and his own Epistles. To these, however, the student has to add all he can of the history of the Jews and their sacred books, as well as of the state of the world in the time of St. Paul. New sources of information are constantly being opened up, as, *e.g.*, by travel and exploration in the countries and cities in which St. Paul laboured, or by fresh knowledge of Roman law, either in general or in special application to the Jews.

i. THE BOOK OF ACTS.—A first glance into the Book of Acts reveals that it is a continuation of a previous treatise, which is without difficulty identified as the Gospel according to St. Luke. From several passages in the book where the author writes in the first person plural (16$^{10-17}$ 20$^{5-15}$ 21$^{1-18}$ 27^{1}–28^{15}—frequently referred to as the 'we' passages), it is manifest that he must, at certain stages, have been a companion of St. Paul on his missionary journeys; and a comparison of these with the references to St. Luke as a companion in the Epistles points to the conclusion that he was the man. This is also the testimony of tradition, and it is generally, though not universally, accepted.

(*a*) *Purpose.*—The Tübingen School conceived Acts to be a work written for a purpose—that of reconciling the rivalry between the Petrine and the Pauline elements in the primitive Church, and criticism has discovered in it, as in nearly every other biblical book, various separable documents, which were reduced by various editors and revisers to the form we now possess. But of late the current has been flowing strongly in an opposite direction. W. M. Ramsay, who began himself with the Tübingen views, found that the book answered better to the realities he was bringing to light with the spade in Asia Minor when it was assumed to be the work of one author, who was doing his best to tell the truth; and he has vindicated the claim of St. Luke to be one of the great historians of the world, possessed of the true historical insight, grasp, and accuracy; and Harnack, starting from prejudices equally pronounced, has arrived at practically the same conclusions. The latter, indeed, in summing up his investigations into the writings of St. Luke (*Die Apostelgeschichte* [=*Beiträge zur Einleitung in das NT*, iii.], 1908, p. 224 f.), charges conservative scholars, who have reached the same conclusions before him, with causing the truth to be suspected through their prejudices; and there is no doubt that interest attaches to the fact that he has reached the goal from so distant a starting-point. There are not wanting, indeed, scholars to support less conservative opinions. Even English-writing ones are found in J. Moffatt (*LNT*, 1911) and B. W. Bacon (*The Story of St. Paul*, 1905), though the former at least has humour enough to laugh at certain critical views not very unlike his own. C. Clemen, the author of the latest important German book on the subject (*Paulus. Sein Leben und Wirken*, 1904), has no humour at all, but ploughs his way stolidly through the Book of Acts, accepting as fact whatever is natural and rejecting whatever is supernatural. Anyone may realize for himself what such a procedure will make of the book by reading on this principle the account of what happened on St. Paul's first visit to Philippi, though, one would suppose, St. Luke must have had his eyes and ears specially on the alert there, as it was the first time he had seen his new master at work.

It is not so much a religious or a theological as a literary instinct that makes the present writer distrust the critical method of handling this book.

He does not believe that books worth preserving were ever made in this way. Nor does he believe that they were so easily altered. There is a reverence which a completed book inspires; and the idea that there was no conscience about this in ancient times or in the land of Judæa is one with nothing to justify it; on the contrary, as regards the Jews, cf. Josephus, *c. Apion.* i. 8. Besides, the Acts must very soon have begun to be read in the assemblies of the Christians, and this would be a protection. It may, indeed, be said that this book is an unfortunate one about which to make such a stand, seeing that it has undoubtedly experienced considerable alteration in the Bezan text. But the explanation of this phenomenon may be the simple one that the author had made two copies of his own book, and permitted himself a natural liberty in writing the second of them.

(*b*) *Plan.*—The plan of Acts is indicated in 1^{8}: 'But ye shall receive power, when the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth'; and the book divides itself as follows:—1^{1}–6^{6}, in Jerusalem; 6^{8}–9^{30}, in Palestine (including Samaria); 9^{32}–12^{23}, from Judæa to Antioch; 12^{25}–16^{4}, in Asia Minor; 16^{6}–19^{19}, in Europe; 19^{21}–28^{30}, from Achaia to Rome. The author is fond of summarizing a period, before setting out on a new stage, and such resting-places will be found at the end of the above divisions, viz. in 6^{7} 9^{31} 12^{24} 16^{5} 19^{20} 28^{31}. St. Paul first makes his appearance in 7^{58}, but it is not till 13^{1} that he becomes the hero of the book, the story thenceforward being merely an account of his missionary travels and other fortunes. The author narrates with extraordinary conciseness, a striking instance being where the name 'Saul' is exchanged for 'Paul' without a word of explanation (13^{13}); and, when the traveller duplicates a journey, the second notice is of the briefest possible description. Yet the style is marked by ease and freedom, scene following scene with the variety and lifelikeness of painting. Indeed, there is a tradition that the author was a painter as well as a physician, this being at least a tribute to the picturesqueness of his narrative. The speeches attributed to St. Paul are often said to be free compositions of St. Luke; because ancient historians, especially Thucydides, took this liberty. But why should St. Luke have done so, when he had the speaker himself to consult, not to mention his own recollection or the conversations of those about St. Paul, which must often have turned on the great sermons of their hero? Ramsay is of opinion that the first verse of the book implies that the writer intended to pen a third volume, similar in bulk to the Gospel and the Acts; and this would account for the narrative breaking off where it does, with a brief notice of the two years of imprisonment which followed the arrival at Rome. This would, however, be still more naturally accounted for if the book was written about the date to which it brings the history down; and the present writer knows nothing which renders this impossible. The chief objection to this early date for Acts is that it must have been written before the Gospel of St. Luke, which, it is assumed, was not written till after the destruction of Jerusalem. The reasons, however, for assuming this date for the Gospel are less cogent than those for believing the Acts to have been penned before the trial at Rome; so that the alternative is between allowing a highly argumentative dating of the Gospel to fix a late date for the Acts and making a clearly indicated date of the Acts determine for the Gospel an earlier date than it has been usual to assign to it. Cf. A. Harnack, *The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels*, Eng. tr., 1911, *Luke the Physician*, Eng. tr., 1911, and *The Acts of the Apostles*, Eng. tr., 1909.

Moffatt's explanation of the sudden breaking off of the narrative in the Acts is that the purpose of the book was to relate the progress of Christianity from Jerusalem to Rome; J. Weiss, in *Das Urchristenthum*, 1914, makes the suggestion that Acts was written for Roman Christians, who did not require to be informed of what had become of the hero; and Clemen actually brings in as an explanation Horace's rule, in *Ars Poetica*, 185 f., about not slaughtering the characters of a tragedy in the sight of the audience, forgetting that, in the beginning of this book, an immortal scene is constructed out of the martyrdom of St. Stephen. If, as many now assume, St. Paul's trial ended in condemnation and execution, it is easy to understand with what effect St. Luke could have used this as the winding-up of his story; and it is incredible that, knowing so pathetic and significant an event to have immediately followed the point to which he had brought his narrative down, he could have omitted to mention it. (On a supposed dependence on Josephus, throwing the composition of Acts late, see the remarks of J. Vernon Bartlet in *Century Bible*, 'Acts,' 1901, pp. 19, 181, 251, 340; also R. J. Knowling, *EGT*, 'Acts,' 1900, p. 30 f.

The narrative, from the point of St. Paul's arrest onwards, abandons its conciseness and gives an extraordinary amount of space to the incidents of his appearance before different tribunals. Bacon notes this in a tone of disapproval; but he falls too easily a victim to the temptation besetting critics who ascribe the form of biblical books to more or less incompetent editors, of attributing difficulties to these lay-figures, instead of exerting himself to find out the true explanation. Ramsay ascribes this amplitude to a deliberate plan, kept in view all through the book, by which St. Paul, the representative of Christianity, is made to appear a personage of consideration to Roman officials, who are nearly always favourable to him, not infrequently defending him not only from the violence of the mob but from officials who are not Roman; and from this he infers that the book was written at a date when persecution had been going on for a considerable time. It would be, however, a simpler explanation if the composition of the book had had in some way to do with St. Paul's trial; for, in that case, it would have been important to dwell on the events since the date when he fell into the custody of Roman officials; J. Weiss (*op. cit.* p. 106 f.) leaves room for this possibility, assuming that the principal source stopped here, though insisting on later editorial operations.

(*c*) *Chronology.*—The chronology is an extremely difficult question, because the fixed points that seem to be obtained by the sacred history touching on profane history (Aretas, 2 Co 11^{32}; Herod, Ac $12^{20\text{-}23}$; Claudius, $11^{27\text{-}30}$ 12^{25}; Felix and Festus, 24^{27}) fail, when closely scrutinized, to remain fixed. The nearest to an absolutely certain date seems at present to be the consulship of Gallio (Ac 18^{12}), which is fixed by an inscription found at Delphi, of which A. Deissmann has given a detailed account in *St. Paul*, 1912, App. I., p. 244 ff. From this it would seem that St. Paul must have been at Corinth, during his second missionary journey, in A.D. 50; and from this point the chronology can be traced both backwards and forwards. St. Paul cannot have been born very long after Jesus; and it is wonderful to think of any race having the fecundity to produce, within a few years or perhaps months, three such figures as John the Baptist, Jesus, and St. Paul. It is generally supposed that Jesus was three-and-thirty years of age at the time of His death; and we cannot be far wrong in thinking of St. Paul as about five-and-thirty at the time of his conversion. Few perhaps realize that between his conversion and the commencement of his missionary journeys there was an interval of not less than fourteen or fifteen years. To the three great missionary journeys may be assigned some ten years; whence it follows that, when he reached Rome, he must have been about sixty. In the last Epistle which proceeded from his pen he called himself 'Paul the aged'; and, although this is a phrase elastic enough to have different meanings in the mouths of different men, the probability is that he was not far from the threescore years and ten at which the Psalmist placed the term of human life.

The dates of three recent chronologists (Lightfoot, Ramsay, Harnack, quoted in A. E. Garvie, *Life and Teaching of Paul*, 1910, p. 181) do not vary much—for the conversion, 34, 33, 30; for the first missionary journey, 48, 47, 45; for the second missionary journey, 51, 50, 47; for the third missionary journey, 54, 53, 50; for the arrival at Rome, 61, 60, 57.

ii. THE EPISTLES.—Whereas an ordinary letter among us begins with a title of courtesy, addressed to the receiver, and ends with the signature of the writer, preceded by some phrase of courtesy or affection, while place and date stand either above or beneath the whole, an ancient letter commenced with the name of the sender, followed by the name of the recipient, together with a word of greeting, and it ended with the date and the place of writing. St. Paul developed the greeting into an elaborate form of his own, in which he described both himself and his correspondents in their relations to God and Christ, and wished them, instead of the goodwill of an ordinary letter, the primary blessings of the gospel. Sometimes he went on to express his thankfulness to God for their steadfastness in the faith and their progress in grace, and to pray for their further development. In one or two cases all this was not completed within fewer than a score of verses. If, at the end, he added date and place, these have been lost, with the exception perhaps of fragments; and the loss is to us a serious one, as it implies much research to fill up the blanks, and the results are more or less conjectural. As a rule the writer dictated to an amanuensis, who might be named in the superscription, as well as other comrades present when the Epistle was sent away. In one case (Ro 16^{22}) the amanuensis sent a greeting on his own account. The greetings at the close form a striking feature of the Apostle's epistolary style, betraying as they do the width of his sympathies and the warmth of his heart. Sometimes he would take the pen from the amanuensis at the close and add a few weighty words in autograph, to which, we need not doubt, extraordinary interest would be attached by the first readers. From the close of Galatians we gather that his own penmanship was large and sprawling: read, in 6^{11}, 'See with how large letters I have written unto you with mine own hand.'

It is frequently repeated that the Epistles of St. Paul were just ordinary letters, Deissmann going furthest of late in this direction. But this is not the case. Ordinary letters are addressed to individuals, and much of their charm consists in the intimacies which they disclose. But the majority of St. Paul's Epistles were composed for churches. Inevitably, therefore, they had edification in view; and some of them are little different from sermons. Indeed, some of them obviously reproduce the essence of his preaching, while the rhythmic and periodic flow of the more eloquent passages may be ascribed with confidence to the frequent repetitions of the wandering evangelist. As at all periods of his life their author was not only the propagandist of a definite faith but an opponent of contrary doctrines, a doctrinal or dogmatic character could not help appearing in what he wrote. The one bearing most resemblance to an ordinary letter is the brief Epistle to Philemon; but Philemon was not a very intimate friend, and this letter, though confidential, keeps a certain distance, as of one addressing a social superior. With Timothy and Titus St. Paul was on terms of much closer intimacy; but, in writing to them as youthful pastors, he could not help thinking of the churches over which they presided, and much of what he wrote was obviously intended for the general benefit. Still it remains true that St. Paul's Epistles are neither sermons nor theological treatises, but are written with the freedom and realism of actual correspondence. They afford occasion for displaying the height and the variety of their author's personality; for in them he is always himself—affectionate, irascible, passionate, radiant, and optimistic as long as his converts are faithful and his churches expanding, but ready to perish with vexation and foreboding should they be the reverse. His style adapts itself without constraint to the mood he is in and the situation to which he is addressing himself. It can be abrupt, headlong, abounding with interrogations and anacolutha, or it can follow closely the windings of an intricate argument and break out into a rapture of doxology at the close. It is always copious, filling the channel from bank to bank, yet only at rare intervals strikingly sublime or beautiful. Evidently the author is not straining after effect or aiming at excellency; yet here and there, through the sheer quality of the matter, his speech becomes a cascade, breaking in foam over the rocks, or it widens into a lake where plants of every hue dip into the water and birds of every note sing among the branches.

Much attention has of late been devoted to the language of St. Paul. It had long been known that it differed materially from the Greek of the classical age, and that it had been modified largely by the ideas of the Hebrew Scriptures and the language of the LXX. But through the unearthing of the remains of the literature and correspondence of the time, in the rubbish-heaps of ancient cities or in the recesses of Egyptian tombs, it has been demonstrated that there prevailed over all the Greek-speaking world a development of Greek speech, common to all peoples and therefore now known as Koine, and that to this the language of the NT in general, and of St. Paul in particular, is so closely related that a knowledge of the one is the key to the other; and St. Paul takes his place as a master of this language. 'He thinks in Greek, and it is the vernacular of a brilliant and well-educated man in touch with the Greek culture of his time, though remaining thoroughly Jewish in his mental fibre' (A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of NT Greek in the Light of Historical Research*, 1914, p. 2). See, in addition, Weiss, *op. cit.* ch. 13; also T. Nägeli, *Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus*, 1905.

(*a*) *Galatians.*—The Epistle to the Galatians, both in subject and treatment, bears so strong a resemblance to the Epistle to the Romans that it used to be assumed that the composition of both must be assigned to about the same time; and, as the latter indubitably belongs to the residence in Corinth at the close of the third missionary journey, it was taken for granted that Galatians must be placed there too. But, if its recipients were the churches of Antioch-in-Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe, evangelized during the first missionary journey, and if the visit to Jerusalem mentioned in Gal 2 be identified with a visit to Jerusalem preceding the Council held there—these two being the conclusions of what is called the South Galatian theory (see below)—it seems a natural inference that the Epistle was written before the commencement of the second missionary journey and before the Council of Jerusalem. This inference was not, indeed, drawn by Ramsay himself, when he was developing the South Galatian theory; he still held to the old view that Galatians must be placed side by side with Romans. But it was perceived to be inevitable by others who had accepted the South Galatian theory (J. V. Bartlet, *The Apostolic Age*, 1900, p. 84 f., and Garvie, *Studies of Paul and his Gospel*, p. 23); and Ramsay, in his latest publications, has come round to it (*e.g. The Teaching of Paul*, 1913, p. 372 ff.), holding Galatians to be the earliest of all the Epistles. The brevity of the introduction and the absence therein of the courtesies which abound in the later Epistles used to be attributed to the excitement in which the Epistle was written; but, if this was the earliest of the Epistles, it may be that the complimentary style of address had not yet been developed. Certainly the author was writing in haste and in indignation; and there is more of what may be called the natural man, as well as of the Rabbi, in this than in any other of his writings. This was the commencement of the most heated and painful of all his controversies, and he enters the fray without the gloves. The Judaists had captured his churches, denied his apostolic authority, and overturned his gospel; and it is with the passion of a mother bereaved of her young that he throws himself at the feet of his converts, entreating them not to render his labour vain or allow themselves to be robbed of salvation; while he turns on the enemy to defy and to blast. The theme is the contrast between law and gospel. In the strongest language he can find, he repeats, in every variety of expression, that the former is abortive and abolished, but that the latter is the glorious revelation which is the end of all the ways of God with men. It is not difficult 'to find in 1^6–2^{21} 3^1–4^{11} 4^{12}–6^{10} three successive arguments upon (*a*) the divine origin of Paul's gospel, (*b*) the complete right of Gentile Christians to the messianic inheritance, and (*c*) the vital connection between the Christian Spirit and the moral life' (Moffatt, *LNT*, p. 88, quoting Holsten, etc.).

(*b*) *1 and 2 Thessalonians.*—At the time when Galatians was, on account of similarity in temper and ideas, kept beside Romans, 1 and 2 Thess. used to be treated as the first-fruits of the Apostle's epistolary activity; and these two Epistles seemed to fit this position very well, being marked by extraordinary freshness and simplicity. They were written soon after the missionary left Thessalonica after his first visit. Their style is more like that of a lover to the object of his affection, from whom he has been unavoidably separated but to whom he longs to return. Indeed, he compares his own affection for his converts to that of a mother for her children; he declares that the newly made Christians are his glory and joy; and he tells them that he lives if they stand fast in the faith. He recalls his first meeting with them and their subsequent intercourse together; again and again has he tried to return to see them, and he still cherishes the same ardent desire. There are not a few indications of the amplitude of the gospel preached by him amongst them—as, for instance, in the very first lines of the Epistle, a reference to the trinity of Christian graces, faith, love, and hope. But he does not enlarge on doctrinal matters. Taking it for granted that the substance of his recent preaching amongst them must still be well remembered, he contents himself with the plainest exhortations to a life in harmony with the gospel of Christ—as, for instance, to abstain from the peculiarly pagan sin of fornication and to love one another. Special stress is laid on the duty of those who called themselves by the name of Christ to perform their ordinary daily work in such a way as to commend the gospel to those that are without; and this duty was not to be set aside by the fact that the time was short, and that Christ would soon return to judgment. He drew a vivid picture of the Second Advent, as he conceived it; but this appears to have acted on the minds of his correspondents in a way different from his intention. And this became the occasion for the Second Epistle, which succeeded the First after a brief interval and is occupied with the same themes, except that it gives a forecast of the history of the world, intended to calm the minds of those who had allowed themselves to become so excited about the Lord's coming that they were neglecting their business and bringing scandal thereby on the new religion. This passage is among the most difficult in the whole compass of St. Paul's writings, and has tested the competency of exegetes; but the drift of it is plain: the return of the Lord was not to take place as soon as had been expected; and, therefore, Christians, while always ready to meet Him, whensoever He might appear, must be prepared also for the other alternative—to perform the duties of their earthly callings with fidelity, if the coming was postponed. The Christians at Thessalonica were exposed to severe persecution, and the accounts in the Acts of St. Paul's own experience in that city and at Berœa make it easy to surmise from what quarter this came. Not only, therefore, does their spiritual father make use of every consideration fitted to comfort them, but he breaks out against the race to which he himself belonged in a style which reminds us of the manner in which even the loving St. John in his Gospel speaks of 'the Jews.'

(*c*) *1 and 2 Corinthians.*—1 Cor. was written from Ephesus during the author's prolonged sojourn in that city in the third missionary journey. It would, however, appear that it was not the first letter sent by the Apostle to the same church. He had sent one which has not come down to us (see 1 Co 5^9); and this raises the question whether he may not have written other Epistles which have shared the same fate. The sacredness now attaching to his writings might *a priori* be thought to render it impossible that anything as precious as a letter written by him to a church should perish; but it may be no more astonishing that writings of his should have been lost than that words of Jesus should have been carried irrecoverably down the wind. After receiving the Epistle now lost, the Corinthians had written to the founder of their church, describing their own condition and asking his opinion and advice about a number of problems and difficulties that had arisen among them. And this was not the only case in which a Pauline Epistle was evoked by a communication from those to whom it was addressed. Besides, St. Paul had heard of the condition of the Corinthians from 'them of the household of Chloe' (1 Co 1^{11}), and he was far from being satisfied that all was well with his spiritual children. There is a tone of strain and anxiety in the Epistle from first to last; at the same time, the impression is conveyed that the author feels himself to be dealing with a church holding a great place in the world and destined for a great future. The intimate nature of the questions propounded in the letter received from the Corinthians leads him to enter into minute details; accordingly, this Epistle exhibits by far the fullest picture in existence of the interior of an apostolic church. We learn the different ranks and conditions of which the membership is composed; we see the gifts of the Spirit in full operation; we are made aware of the flaws and inconsistencies which, had we not been informed on such good authority, could hardly be believed to have disfigured the period of the Church's first love; the rival parties and their wrangles, the backsliders and the sowers of tares among the wheat, all pass before our eyes. Yet it is this church and its affairs that draw forth from the Apostle the panegyric on love in ch. 13, the praise of unity in ch. 14, and the demonstration of the resurrection of the body in ch. 15. Such was the letter-writer's power of illustrating great principles in small duties. Several passages (*e.g.* $6^{12.\,13}$ 8^{1-4} 10^{33} $15^{12.\,35}$) become more intelligible if it be assumed that St. Paul is quoting the sentiments of the Corinthians, before replying to their queries.

Between 1 and 2 Cor., it is thought by some scholars, St. Paul paid a visit to Corinth not mentioned in Acts, and, returning to Ephesus after a stormy interview, wrote a tempestuous letter, part of which is preserved in 2 Co 10^{1}–13^{10}. The bearer of this missive was Titus, who, on his way back to Ephesus, was met by St. Paul in Macedonia, and was able to give so cheering an account of the effect produced at Corinth that at once he was sent back with another letter, conceived in a totally different tone, which has come down to us under the title of 2 Corinthians. This new Epistle has all the appearance of having been written in a recoil from painful excitement and in the exultation caused by the receipt of good news. In it the author lays bare his innermost feelings more fully than in any other production of his pen. If anyone wishes to know the real St. Paul, this is the opportunity. It has been called the *Ich-epistel*, also St. Paul's *Apologia pro Vita Sua*. A portion of it (2^{12}–6^{10}) has been taken by A. T. Robertson as a text for a treatise entitled *The Glory of the Ministry: Paul's Exultation in Preaching*, n.d.; and certainly it can hardly be fully understood except by those who have devoted their life to the salvation of others, and have felt what St. Paul calls the pangs of labour in bringing souls to the birth through the gospel. The mood throughout is one of triumph, but at the beginning of ch. 10 there is a sudden change to a tone of intense sharpness and even bitterness. By some this is accounted for by the supposition mentioned above; but others are satisfied with supposing an alteration in the mood of the writer, accompanied perhaps by some delay between the composition of the earlier and the latter halves of the Epistle. Happily, though the tone is changed, the autobiographical revelations still continue, and St. Paul completes the portrait of himself.

(*d*) *Romans.*—The Epistle to the Romans is, in not a few respects, the greatest of all the productions of St. Paul's pen. It lacks, indeed, the personal and affectionate note so characteristic of his writings; for it is the only Epistle of his sent to a church not founded or as yet visited by himself. To this fact, however, is due in some degree its greatness; because, while in writing to churches already visited he could take it for granted that his correspondents knew his gospel so well that he did not require to repeat it, he was compelled, when writing to those who had never seen his face in the flesh, to state his gospel at full length. Of this opportunity advantage is taken to the full in the present case; and there is no question that in Rom. we have the essence of what he preached in every city which he evangelized. As at Miletus he declared to the elders from Ephesus that for three years he had preached in the capital of Asia 'repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ' (Ac 20^{21}), so in Romans the need which all men, whether Gentiles or Jews, have of repentance is first fully unfolded, and this is followed by an equally ample and convincing exhibition of the happy effects due to faith in the Saviour. Here we have illustrations from Hebrew history, and especially from the Father of the Faithful, such as would be welcome in every synagogue, as well as a philosophy of the history of mankind such as would be more likely to captivate Gentile hearers. Although, as has been mentioned, the personal note is absent, yet, after his demonstration is complete, at the close of ch. 8, he turns to discuss the tragic fact that the Jewish race had missed its destiny and allowed the gospel intended for them to pass over to the Gentiles. How was this to be reconciled with the election of God, in which St. Paul was a firm believer? The answer occupies no less than three chapters, and it permits us to see into the very heart of the writer, who, though with the indignation of a Christian he could speak as he had done in Thess. of the chosen people, yet was a Jew to the marrow of his bones, and was ready, he declares, to be himself 'accursed from Christ,' if by so being he could save his brethren according to the flesh. The same noble unselfishness pervades the discussion of 'meats' in the chapters that follow, though his ethical genius would be considered by many to rise to its culminating point in ch. 12. In the book as it now stands there is, at the close, an unusually long list of greetings to friends; and the question arises how he could have known so many in a city which he had never visited. It may be replied that Rome was, in that age, such a centre that visitors might be present in it from many of the cities and towns visited by him in other lands. But this will hardly suffice, and a different explanation seems to be at least possible. An Epistle like this, so impersonal and didactic, was well fitted to be sent to various churches, and several copies might be executed and dispatched to different communities. The greetings, then, which now stand in Rom. may have been intended for one of these. It may have been Ephesus, and a close scrutiny of the names is said to point to Ephesus rather than to Rome.

(*e*) *Epistles of the Imprisonment.*—The Epistles written up to this point belong to the years during which the Apostle was engaged in his missionary travels. There follow four to which has been given the common title of the Epistles of the Imprisonment, because they were written during the years, subsequent to his arrest at Jerusalem, when he was in the custody of the Roman authorities. In those years he was moved from prison to prison, but at two places—Cæsarea and Rome—he experienced periods of imprisonment, lasting in each case about two years. Some of these letters may have been composed at the one place, some at the other; but the usual opinion has been that they were all written at Rome.

In one of his prisons St. Paul was visited by Epaphras, a minister from Colossæ, a town in the Lycus Valley not far from Ephesus, who had come to consult him about the condition of the church over which he presided and to solicit from him a letter to the members, in order that these might be persuaded by the authority of an apostle to abandon errors into which they were falling and return to the simplicity of the truth as it is in Jesus. The new heresy was not that already so thoroughly confuted by St. Paul in Gal. and Rom., but a kind of speculation such as he had already encountered in some degree among the Corinthians, and which was destined to spread through the churches till it came to be known in history, after the Apostolic Age, under the sinister name of Gnosticism. It had its principal hold in the Gentile, as the earlier heresy had had in the Jewish, section of the Church. As yet, indeed, it was only incipient; but Epaphras was afraid of it, and he had little difficulty in communicating his fears to the Apostle; so that he secured and carried back to his flock what is now known as the *Epistle to the Colossians.*

The anxieties awakened in the mind of the prisoner by what he had heard from Colossæ may easily have extended to other churches in the same quarter, and impelled him to write in the same strain to them also. Indeed, in the Epistle to the Colossians itself reference is made (4^{16}) to a letter he had written to the Laodiceans, the significant request being added that the Colossian Epistle be read also at Laodicea, and the Laodicean one at Colossæ. This may have suggested the idea of a circular letter to all the churches in that portion of Asia Minor; and the opinion has been held by not a few that what is now known as the *Epistle to the Ephesians* was originally a document of this description. This would account for the absence from it of the usual greetings at the end, which might have been expected to be more than usually profuse when he was writing to a church in the founding of which he had spent three years of his life. It might account also for an abstract and impersonal tone which undoubtedly clings to this Epistle. It is written at a great height above the common earth, and it may easily embody the ruminations of one who had long been in the solitude of a prison. It comes down, indeed, before it ends, to practical things, giving a more complete sketch of what may be called the ethics of Christianity than any other of the Epistles; but even in this portion of it there is something of the same abstract and distant tone, the author being less concerned with the duties themselves than with the motives out of which the discharge of these is to spring. To him the whole cosmical history of Christ is a source of motives, which he is constantly seeking to evoke in those whose spiritual welfare is his care. There is not much to commend the procedure of Moffatt (*LNT*, p. 375) when he accepts Colossians as from St. Paul but rejects Ephesians; Bacon, though also prone to negative criticism, is here led by a truer instinct, feeling the spiritual power of the text with which he is dealing (*op. cit.* p. 298 ff.). It is obvious that both the thought and the phraseology of Colossians and Ephesians are largely alike; but every writer of letters is aware that he sometimes puts the same facts, thoughts, and even words into letters written about the same time; and this was specially liable to happen when one of the letters had the general character belonging to Ephesians. The estimate of this Epistle by S. T. Coleridge as 'one of the divinest compositions of man' (*Table Talk*, 25th May 1830) has commended itself to multitudes not unworthy to hold an opinion on such matters; and this raises the question, by whom the Epistle could have been written, if it be not to St. Paul we owe it. Coleridge considered the Epistle to the Colossians to be the overflowing of St. Paul's mind upon the subjects already treated in Ephesians; but the present writer inclines to conceive the relation between them as the reverse. It is impossible, however, to do more than guess.

In Colossians there is a reference to one Onesimus (4^9), who is described as a faithful and beloved brother and a member of the Colossian Church; and the same is the name of an escaped slave who is the subject of the *Epistle to Philemon.* It would appear that he had defrauded his master and run away to the capital of the world, where, through some providence to us unknown, he was thrown into the company of St. Paul, through whom he was converted. St. Paul would willingly have retained him, since he appeared to be a handy man such as the prisoner was at the time in need of; but he considered it his duty to send him back to his owner; and the Epistle to Philemon is the letter of introduction and excuse sent with him. In spite of its brevity, it is a perfect gem of tact and courtesy; and it is fitted to awaken many reflexions on the relations of employers and employed.

The last Epistle of this group is that to the *Philippians*; and, if in Colossians and Ephesians there be a lack of the personal element, this is amply made up for in this new Epistle, which assures us that imprisonment had in no way soured or damped the spirit of the writer, who was still as emotional and as optimistic as he had always been. In tone it bears a close resemblance to 1 Thess., and it is worthy of note that it was directed to the same quarter of the world, Philippi and Thessalonica being neighbouring cities. Though penned in a prison, it has joy for its keynote; and, though addressed to a persecuted church, it expects its recipients to be glorying in the Cross. It is of special value as a document of St. Paul's prison-life. We can see with the mind's eye the Roman soldier to whom he is chained, with the various articles of the panoply mentioned in the last chapter of Ephesians. As his guard would be changed every few hours, numbers of soldiers would be brought in contact with him; and among these there had broken out a work of grace, which had become a theme amongst the prætorian guards and had spread from them to the household of the Emperor, from the members of which the author is able to send greetings to his correspondents. (Cf. separate notes on 'prætorium' and 'Cæsar's household' in Lightfoot, *Philippians*^{4}, 1878, pp. 99 ff., 171 ff.) Besides, his trial, certain stages of which were already past, was turning out favourably, and he was able to believe that he would soon be at large again, when he would use his freedom to revisit his beloved Macedonians. Because the Epistle seems about to end at the close of ch. 2, Bacon fancies there may be two letters united into one (*op. cit.* p. 368).

(*f*) *Pastoral Epistles.*—There remains another group, known by the name of the Pastoral Epistles and consisting of *1* and *2 Timothy* and *Titus.* They owe this title to the fact that they are addressed to youthful pastors by the aged pastor St. Paul, who, out of his own rich and prolonged experience, instructs them how it is necessary to comport themselves in the house of God. From their internal structure and contents it can be easily seen that all the members of this group are of one piece and originated at the same time; but it is so difficult to find a place for them in the portion of St. Paul's life covered by Acts that they have been assigned to a portion of it subsequent to this, when, it is supposed, being released from prison, he resumed his apostolic wanderings, till he was re-arrested. In 2 Tim. he is seen in prison at Rome, not, as when he wrote Philippians, expecting release, but looking forward to immediate martyrdom. But in 1 Tim. and Tit. he is at large and in motion, having, when he wrote the one, just left Timothy in Ephesus, and, when he wrote the other, left Titus in Crete, an island which he visited on his way to Rome but could not have evangelized whilst he was a prisoner. About no other portion of St. Paul's writings, however, has there been so much doubt as to whether he was really the author. In certain quarters it is at present taken for granted that these Epistles did not come from his pen. Thus, the latest book published in Germany on the subject (H. H. Mayer, *Ueber die Pastoralbriefe*, 1913) assumes this without discussion. But on such a subject votes require to be weighed as well as counted; and the completest and ablest discussion, by Zahn, the Nestor of NT criticism, takes the opposite view (*Introduction to the NT*, 3 vols., 1909, ii. 1–133), which is the prevalent one in England and America, though some recent scholars, like Moffatt (*LNT*, p. 395 ff.), Bacon (*op. cit.*, p. 375), and Garvie (*Studies of Paul and his Gospel*, p. 30 n.), have gone over to the other side. It cannot be denied that anyone passing from Col. and Eph. into these Epistles would feel himself in a different intellectual atmosphere, though he would feel this much less if he made the transition from 1 and 2 Cor., the subjects handled in which are more akin to those taken up here. The question is, whether the change can be sufficiently accounted for by the fact that the author is writing to individuals instead of churches, his correspondents being disciples intimately acquainted with his doctrine, so that he does not require to repeat what they already know. Much is made by opponents of the Pauline authorship of the number of words in these Epistles used by St. Paul only once, the number of these being stated by Moffatt at 180. This sounds fatal; but on reflexion the discerning reader will perceive that such a figure has no value unless we know what is the writer's habit in this respect. Whatever may be the reason for it, St. Paul employs more of these ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, as they are called, the longer he writes, the proportion to the chapter being, roughly speaking, 5 in Thess., 7 in Rom., 8 in Eph. and Col., 10 in Phil., and 13 in the Pastoral Epistles; so that actually a convincing argument against the Pauline authorship could have been fashioned out of the number had it been small. There are frequent coincidences of thought such as would not easily have occurred to an imitator; note, *e.g.*, the lists of sins in 1 Ti $1^{9.\,10}$ and 2 Ti 3^{1-5}, and cf. Ro 1^{24}, 1 Co $6^{9.\,10}$, Gal $5^{19.\,20}$; and there are passages which may be said to contain the very essence of Paulinism, such as 1 Ti 2^{4-6}, 2 Ti $1^{9.\,10}$, Tit 2^{12-14} 3^{4-7}. Against the Pauline authorship it is contended that ecclesiastical development is more advanced than in the Epistles which are certainly St. Paul's. But, with the exception of what is said about female officials —and what is said about them is the reverse of distinct—the office-bearers are the same as are found in Acts and Phil., and it is highly significant of an early date that not the slightest hint is given of any distinction between bishops and elders, Tit 1^{5-7} clearly proving these to be identical; whereas in the Ignatian Epistles, at no great distance in time, the distinction has become very marked, if indeed the passages are genuine, as they are held to be by both Lightfoot (*The Apostolic Fathers*, pt. ii., 'Ignatius,' i.^{2} [1889]) and Zahn (*Ignatius von Antiochien*, 1873). The principal consideration is, however, the moral one. Let anyone read the references to St. Paul himself in these Epistles (1 Ti 1^{11-20} 2^{7} $3^{14.\,15}$, 2 Ti 1^{3-18} $2^{9.\,10}$ $3^{10.\,11}$ 4^{6-21}, Tit 1^{1-5} 3^{12-15}), and say whether anyone but St. Paul could have written these words without knowing himself to be guilty of misrepresentation and falsehood. It is obvious that the author is a good man, and that he writes for a holy purpose. Could such a person be guilty of such deceit? It is said that the ideas of literary property which we now recognize did not then prevail. But what proof of this is there? The nearest approach that Moffatt can think of to this pseudonymous authorship is the composition of the romance entitled *Paul and Thecla*; but the author of that foolish and lying production was deposed for his pains. Gnostics, it is true, composed abundance of pseudonymous literature, and weak adherents of orthodoxy sometimes imitated them; but in the Pastoral Epistles we have to do with a personage and an enterprise of a totally different character. As Ramsay has remarked, there are not a few traits of St. Paul's genius which we should miss were it not for these unique writings.

The *Epistle to the Hebrews* has sometimes been attributed to St. Paul. But there is no superscription making this claim, and the language and ideas are so different from St. Paul's that scholarship has long since, with practical unanimity, decided against the Pauline authorship.

2. Life.—(*a*) *Early influences.*—St. Paul was a Jew; he was born at Tarsus, in Cilicia; and he inherited the Roman citizenship. In these three clauses is indicated his connexion with the three great influences of the ancient world—the religion of Palestine, the language and culture of Greece, and the government of Rome.

In his case the first of these was the oldest and the deepest influence. We hear little or nothing of his parents; a sister's son intervened at one point with good effect in his earthly fortunes; but all the indications suggest that he was reared in a religious home. He speaks of himself as 'circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of Hebrews; as touching the law, a Pharisee' (Ph 3^{5}); and these terms betoken an intensely Jewish atmosphere. Still, he was born not in the land of the Jews, but in the territory of the heathen. Cilicia was not very far from Palestine; but any heathen country was 'far off' in a sense other than local. This distance St. Paul was sure to feel; yet he could boast of his birthplace as being 'no mean city' (Ac 21^{39}). It was beautifully situated at the foot of the Cilician hills and at the mouth of the Catarrhactes; it was a place of cosmopolitan trade; and it was a university city—the very place in which the man should be born whose destiny it was to be to break down 'the middle wall of partition' (Eph 2^{14}) and become the Apostle of the Gentiles. A freer air blew round his head from the first than if he had been born at Jerusalem. There were several ways in which the Roman citizenship could be acquired, and it is not known through which of these it came into St. Paul's family; but he was 'freeborn' (Ac 22^{28}). Even to a Jewish boy of sensitive nature this would impart a certain self-consciousness; but it was to become of enormous consequence in his subsequent career, probably even saving his life.

In youth St. Paul learned the trade of tent-making, this being, it would appear, the characteristic industry of Cilicia, where a coarse haircloth was manufactured on a large scale, to be used for tents and other purposes. This circumstance might be supposed to indicate that he belonged to the lower class of the population. But it is said that among the Jews it was the custom at that time for even the sons of the wealthy to acquire skill in some manual art, as a resource against the possible caprices of fortune; and, in the sequel, the possession of this handicraft proved of eminent service to St. Paul, enabling him to earn his bread by the labour of his hands, when it was not expedient to accept support from those to whom he preached the gospel. Ramsay (*St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, p. 311 ff.) has accumulated evidence to prove that St. Paul's relatives were persons of substance and social standing, and he considers himself able to show that, in later life, he came into possession of an inheritance, by which he was enabled to defray the heavy expenses of his trials before the Roman courts. Evidence more convincing of social standing is supplied by the fact that St. Paul was a member of the Sanhedrin, if this can be inferred with certainty from the statement in Ac 26^{10} that, when the followers of Jesus were put to death, he gave his 'vote' against them. It is frequently stated that members of the Sanhedrin had to be married men, and from this the inference has been drawn that he was married in youth. If so, his wife must have died early, as there is no hint of a wife in the records of his life, the fancy that he married Lydia and addressed her in the Epistle to the Philippians as 'true yokefellow' being ridiculous, though it goes back as far as Eusebius (*HE* iii. 30) and has been revived in recent times by E. Renan (*Saint Paul*, 1869, p. 115).

So comparatively near to Jerusalem was Tarsus that, as a boy, St. Paul may have been taken by his parents to one of the annual feasts, as Jesus was at the age of twelve; and from the experience of the boy from Nazareth we may infer what were the feelings of this other Jewish boy at the first sight of the Holy City. It cannot have been very long afterwards that he was sent thither, to reside in the place, learning to be a Rabbi. Along with other aspirants to the same office he sat 'at the feet of Gamaliel' (Ac 22^{3}), whose intervention in the Book of Acts on the side of clemency and common sense is probably intended to be looked upon as a characteristic act. But, whatever else the disciple may have learned from this master in Israel, he did not copy this trait of his character; for the first thing we hear of him after the termination of his education is his persecution of the Christians.

There seems little doubt that Jesus and St. Paul were treading the soil of Palestine at the same time; and it is an old question whether they ever crossed each other's path. Though Weiss (*Paulus und Jesus*, 1910) and Ramsay (*The Teaching of Paul*, p. 21 ff.) have recently attempted to make it probable that they did, there is little to be said for this view of the case. It is argued, indeed, that on the way to Damascus St. Paul could not have recognized Jesus, if he had not been already familiar with His appearance. But he did not recognize Him by sight: he had to ask, 'Who art thou, Lord?,' and it was only through the hearing of the ear that he ascertained who was speaking. It is true that, in one place, St. Paul demands, 'Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?' (1 Co 9^{1}), but the sight referred to was that on the way to Damascus.

(*b*) *Persecution.*—The whole situation creates the impression that St. Paul's first collision was not with Christ in the flesh, but with Christianity in the hands of its first representatives and apostles, and it is not difficult to understand the violence with which he opposed it. As a man of logic, he considered the case against Christianity complete. Jesus had died the cursed death of the Cross. This the Messiah could not have done. It was the destiny of the Messiah to live and to reign. A Messiah who dies and is buried must have been a pretender; and an exposed pretender is no very respectable figure. As a Pharisee and a patriot, Saul cherished Messianic hopes; indeed, these formed the most sacred part of his religion; but they had been turned to shame by One who died upon a tree. No doubt it was this resentment at the despite done to that which to him was so sacred that led to his taking up the rôle of grand inquisitor; and he fulfilled in his own person the prediction, made by Jesus to His disciples, that a day was coming when whosoever killed them would think he was doing God service (Jn 16^{2}). His zeal was winning for him golden opinions in the minds of the authorities of the nation, and he was confident that it was, at the same time, accumulating merit in the hands of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

It may be presumed that, in the course of the persecution, he became well acquainted with the state of mind of those whom he was subjecting to every kind of examination. Did it ever occur to him to think what would be the result if he ever came to have as clear proof as they believed they had that He for whose sake they were suffering was not dead but alive? St. Stephen was a singularly clear and forcible reasoner, who went far on the very pathway of revolution which St. Paul was afterwards to travel himself. Did Saul perceive the cogency of the logic, if it were not for one great assumption? But to him this assumption was not only an impossibility but a blasphemy; and so he emerges for the first time into history as the keeper of the clothes of the men who stoned Stephen.

(*c*) *Conversion.*—For a time, which was not very brief, the persecutor raged like a wolf in the fold of the followers of the Nazarene; and it was because there were no more victims left, as he supposed, in Jerusalem and Judæa that he begged for instructions from the authorities to go in quest of fresh victims as far as Damascus. Of what took place on the way thither the author of the Acts has given a most graphic account, and, as St. Paul turned out subsequently to be one of those religious persons who are not indisposed to narrate their most intimate experiences, there are in Acts no fewer than three accounts of the conversion, the other two being from the mouth of the subject himself (9^{1-19} 22^{1-21} 26^{1-23}). These accounts are not painfully alike. On the contrary, they might almost be said to be so constructed as to give the caviller a chance. Indeed, the event itself is exposed to obvious objections, for the persecutor was posting forward in the heat of midday, when he ought to have been taking a siesta, and what he saw might all have been the effect on an overstrained brain of the unnatural experiences through which he had been passing. Full advantage has, of course, been taken of these circumstances; but both St. Luke and St. Paul go forward with the utmost freedom, and there can be no question what they believed the event to be. St. Paul classes the vision vouchsafed to himself with the appearances of the Risen Saviour to the disciples after His resurrection, and those who regard the latter experiences as only subjective infer that his was only subjective also. But it is certain that he himself reasoned the opposite way: he believed the appearances to the Twelve and to the other disciples to be not visionary but actual, and he was convinced, at the time and ever afterwards, that he had himself seen the living Lord. This was the datum on which his entire subsequent life was based.

Accordingly, he appeared immediately after his conversion in the synagogue at Damascus, bearing the testimony of the Apostolic Church, that Jesus is the Messiah (Ac 9^{20}). Happily for us, however, he was not content with this simple statement, but, under the overpowering impression of what had happened to him, went away to Arabia, in order to think out all that it implied, and he did not consider the theme exhausted till he had pondered on it for three years (Gal 1^{17}). Where was this retreat? No exact information is supplied, but the probability is that he betook himself to the scenes of the earlier revelations made to his forefathers. As Elijah the prophet, in a period of mental crisis, wandered southwards to Mount Sinai, feeling it congenial to be where the thunders and lightnings had girdled the mountain and, in the centre, Moses had stood before the Lord, so St. Paul courted the same associations, and, aided by the memories of Moses and Elias, attempted to understand Him in whom Law and prophecy were fulfilled. This incident is passed over in Acts; but it is probable that in 9^{23} we are informed how his testimony recommenced at Damascus with such power that the Jews took counsel to kill him, and he had to flee from the city.

Naturally, Jerusalem was the place to which he now directed his steps. But his long absence, after his conversion, had one serious result: it barred the way for his cordial reception by the Christians, who could not believe that he was really one of themselves, but supposed his pretended conversion to be a ruse of the persecutor. Then it was that Barnabas showed himself a friend in need, by introducing him to the company of the disciples and persuading them to accept him as a brother. He seemed on the point of linking his forces with those of the original witnesses for the resurrection of Christ; but so much opposition did his opening testimony arouse among the Jews that he had, for safety, to be sent away to his native Tarsus.

(*d*) *Evangelistic activity.*—Here, for a long time, he was almost entirely lost to sight; but there can be little doubt that, during these years, he evangelized his native province of Cilicia; and it is an interesting question whether the church in this province founded by him was Jewish or Gentile. It has been almost universally taken for granted that it was Jewish, even St. Paul not being able to anticipate the development of Providence. But both he himself and St. Luke render it indubitable that he was already acquainted with the purpose of God to make him the missionary of the Gentiles; and it is generally recognized that in Arabia he had thought out the substance of his subsequent teaching. There is one word in the narrative of the Acts which seems sufficient to prove that he was already, both in theory and in practice, the evangelist of Gentiles as well as of Jews: this is the mention of Cilicia (15[41]) among the churches to which, after the Council of Jerusalem, the apostles' message was sent, to relieve them from the obligation of being circumcised. If this was required in Cilicia, and if it gave satisfaction there, as it did elsewhere, then the church founded during the unrecorded years of St. Paul's sojourn in his native province must have contained Gentiles.

Meantime the great truth, already learnt by St. Paul, was being revealed to others. Its official revelation to the Church was made through St. Peter, in the affair of Cornelius; and it is easy to perceive how appropriate it was that St. Peter, and not St. Paul, should have been the organ of revelation in this case. Other incidents involving the principle took place here and there, but it was at Antioch that the conversion of Gentiles on a large scale first occurred (in Ac 11[20] 'Greeks,' meaning heathens, is correctly substituted in the RV for 'Grecians' in the AV, who are Greek-speaking Jews). From the headquarters in Jerusalem Barnabas was sent down to Antioch, to take cognizance of this new development; and he not only approved of it but, in co-operation with others, extended the movement with such success that the work increased beyond their powers. Then it was that the happy inspiration occurred to him that St. Paul was the man required for the emergency. Away, therefore, he went to Tarsus in search of him—not a long journey—and, when he had found him and brought him to Antioch, the work at once responded to the energy of the new-comer to such a degree that 'the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch' (v.[26]). Thus for the second time did Barnabas intervene, with the happiest effect, in the course of St. Paul's fortunes, and all that the great Apostle subsequently contributed to the spread of Christianity may, in a sense, be attributed to this 'good man.'

(*e*) *First missionary journey.*—In Ac 13[2] the inception of St. Paul's missionary journeys is ascribed to a communication from the Holy Spirit, made through certain men of prophetic gifts in the Church at Antioch; but it is not inconsistent with this to believe that it was also due to the genius of St. Paul, or that it sprang out of the work which Barnabas and he had been doing in that city; and, if the course of the first missionary journey be glanced at on the map, it will be seen that it passed, nearly in a circle, round the region of which he had already taken possession as the evangelist of Cilicia. Its primary direction, towards Cyprus, was doubtless due to his companion, Barnabas, who was a native of this island. At the outset this gracious figure was the head of the enterprise, the combination being indicated by the phrase, 'Barnabas and Saul.' But, when they quit the island, the phrase is 'Paul and Barnabas,' this change indicating that the inferior had become the superior. The change of name, which took place at the same point, must have been connected somehow with this alteration in the leadership; and it is difficult to believe that it was not also connected in some way with the name of the governor, Sergius Paulus, with whom they had been brought into remarkable contact on the island.

There is no reason to think that Barnabas, the generous, in any way resented his own displacement, but the same magnanimity may not have been vouchsafed to his nephew, John Mark; and this may have been one of the reasons why the latter, who had been 'useful . . . for ministering' (2 Ti 4[11]), broke away when they reached the mainland, and returned to Jerusalem. Another of his reasons may have been fear of the perils attending a journey into the interior; for it was a wild and inhospitable region through which the travellers had to pass in order to reach the next halting-place, Antioch-in-Pisidia. Ramsay (*St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 94 ff.) is of opinion that St. Paul was driven into the interior, which was highland, by a severe attack of malaria fever experienced on the coast; but, if the course of this journey was intended to go in a circle round Cilicia, the upper regions must have been included in the original design. Besides, in the interior there were Roman roads and cities of importance, such as always exercised an attraction on the mind of St. Paul.

On this virgin journey we observe the characteristics of all St. Paul's missionary tours—*e.g.*, at Paphos the conflict with magic, in the person of Simon Magus, as well as the favourable relations with the Roman governor; at Antioch-in-Pisidia, the commencement of the work in the synagogue of the Jews with an address exactly suited to Jewish predilections, but the subsequent turning to the Gentiles, when it had been made manifest that the Jews had not known the day of their visitation; at Lystra, a thoroughly pagan spectacle, when the cure of an impotent man caused the two evangelists to be taken for a couple of Greek deities, and to be offered divine honours—though the temper of the fickle populace quickly changed when the missionaries did not fall in with their fancies, so that St. Paul was stoned and left for dead.

From Derbe, the last point in their itinerary, it would have been easy, by descending through the Cilician Gates, to reach Tarsus and thence sail to Antioch, from which they had set out; but the pastor's passion for his converts had been aroused by the successful labours in the various cities, and, in spite of all they had suffered and the danger of facing again the excited mobs, the evangelists went back the way they had come, in order to encourage those who had embraced the new faith; and it is specially worthy of note that, as they went, they 'appointed for them elders in every church' (Ac 14[23]). To scholars who have had no personal acquaintance with the practical working of Christianity this may seem an unimportant trait or even a throwing back into a too early period of an arrangement which prevailed at a later time; but those who have had experience in such matters will see it in a different light. St. Paul was not only a preacher and a thinker, but an organizer. It is true of him, as it is of Jesus Himself, that his efforts would soon have been swallowed up by the sands of the desert had there not been provided for them, through the organization of the Church, channels for conveying their results to subsequent ages. Though it is not stated in every case, it is to be understood that he thus organized the Christian community in every place which he visited and in which he found any footing. From the interior the evangelists descended to the coast, whence they speedily made their way to Antioch; and the news they brought back of the conversion of the Gentiles filled with great joy those who had sent them forth.

This sentiment was not, however, universal. The influx of so many Gentiles into the Church threatened to swamp the Jews; and many of these, at this juncture, began to demand that all Gentile converts should be circumcised and compelled to live as Jews; and they cherished anything but kindly feelings towards the man through whose labours their own exclusive position in the Church was imperilled. They made light of his authority and proceeded by degrees to deny it altogether. At Antioch they were able to establish such a reign of terror on behalf of Jewish strictness that St. Peter, who had been the first to admit Gentiles to the Church, happening to visit the city, refrained from sitting at food with Gentiles; and even the companion of the recent missionary journey, Barnabas, was carried away by these fanatics. At length they went so far as to send agents to visit the churches which St. Paul had just founded, in order to undermine his authority and to represent his gospel as being not genuine Christianity but a novelty of his own invention. It is easy to understand how such opposition would act on the Apostle's fiery temperament. He publicly challenged St. Peter and Barnabas, and exposed their inconsistency; and he dispatched to his converts the letter of indignant reproof which we know as the Epistle to the Galatians.

At length it was decided to refer the whole question to the authorities at Jerusalem, where, accordingly, a Council was held—the first of the kind in the history of Christianity. Here both St. Peter and St. James, to whom the Judaizers had appealed, decided the question of principle, through their speeches and votes, in favour of the full and free admission of the Gentiles; and St. Paul, on the other hand, for the sake of peace, consented to certain restrictions on the walk and conversation of the Gentile converts. So at least is the issue represented in Acts. But there are those in our day who deny that it can have been so; by consenting to any compromise, St. Paul would, in their opinion, have betrayed the Christian liberty of which he was the champion; and, in short, the representation is a fiction invented for a purpose. This, however, is too cheap a way of dealing with the problems of history. St. Paul was the champion but not the fanatic of liberty, and this was not the only time when he listened to suggestions of compromise from the same quarter. As long as he secured the freedom implied in the non-circumcising of his Gentile converts, he was not the man to offend against the prejudices of those whose experience had not been exactly the same as his own. The prohibition of fornication occasions no difficulty, except that it is wonderful to see it associated with things which to us seem so trivial. 'Blood' and 'things strangled' awoke in a Jew a *horror naturalis*, and Gentiles had to be reminded that by the use of such things they were excluding Jews from the very communion to which they were seeking admission themselves; and it was never the teaching of St. Paul that born Jews should live as did the Gentiles. 'Meats' involved two questions—the frequenting of sacrificial feasts in idol temples (1 Co 8^{10}), and the purchase in the shambles, for domestic use, of meat which was cheap because it had been offered in sacrifice (1 Co 10^{25}); and it was possible utterly to condemn the one whilst making the other an open question. These remarks may help to clear up the difficulties found in the decision of the Council (Ac $15^{20.29}$). There may, however, be a simpler solution. If, in accordance with certain textual authorities, 'things strangled' be deleted from the decree, and if 'meats offered to idols,' 'blood' and 'fornication' be understood as idolatry, violence, and sensuality—the sins to which converts from paganism were peculiarly exposed (cf. Rev 22^{16})—then there was no compromise, and the biggest stone of stumbling in the criticism of Acts is removed. (So Harnack, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 1909, pp. 248–263.)

St. Paul may have seen that the compromise—if there was compromise—could be only temporary, and this may account for the silence about it in his writings. But the decree, when delivered to the Gentile communities, created great joy, and there is no reason to doubt that it was satisfactory to St. Paul also. Yet the insinuations and machinations of his enemies were not brought to an end. On the contrary, these continued for years, making St. Paul's life a burden to him. This, indeed, was the greatest controversy of his life, from which comes much of the fire still smouldering beneath the surface in such Epistles as Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Romans.

(*f*) *Second missionary journey.*—The immediate impulse to the second missionary journey is represented as having come from St. Paul, who said to his companion, Barnabas, 'Let us return now and visit the brethren in every city wherein we proclaimed the word of the Lord, and see how they fare' (Ac 15^{36}). But he lost his comrade through a dispute about Mark, who, as has been mentioned, had deserted the mission on the preceding journey; and one wishes one could be certain that at this juncture St. Paul was sufficiently conscious of how much he owed to this friend. In his place he obtained Silas, who had come to Antioch as one of the bearers of the decree of the Council at Jerusalem; and, before going far, he found at Lystra, in the youthful Timothy, one to take the place of Mark.

They are said to have gone first through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches; and it is to be observed that these churches were the fruit not of the first missionary journey, but of earlier labour. It was at Derbe that they first came upon the fruits of the foregoing journey, and it is probable that they followed them up further by visiting Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch-in-Pisidia. Then, it used to be supposed, they struck away to the north-east and evangelized Galatia. But it was against this supposition that St. Luke gives no account of this new conquest, though it is his habit to give ample information whenever new ground is opened up, whilst observing great brevity in mentioning visits to parts that had been visited already. Accordingly, Ramsay has championed the view that by the phrase 'the region of Phrygia and Galatia' is meant no more than the scenes of the first missionary journey, this contention, which is most fully explained by Ramsay, artt. 'Galatia,' 'Galatia, Region of,' 'Galatians,' in *HDB* ii., being what is known as the South Galatian theory. The basis of this theory is that 'Galatia,' while designating the country occupied by the Galatians, was also the name of a political province, which was of varying extent at different times, and at the time of St. Paul's visit included Phrygia, or at least the part of it in which the towns in question lay. This theory has been widely accepted by English-speaking scholars, but has encountered strong opposition in Germany.

The course of the missionaries' movements was under some constraint, the nature of which is not clearly indicated, but which prevented them, apparently against their will, from evangelizing the province of Asia, in the west of Asia Minor, as well as Mysia and Bithynia, in the north-west of the peninsula, and brought them down to the coast at Troas, the ancient Troy, near the southern entrance to the Hellespont. It may have been illness which was thus forcing St. Paul forward against his will, for at Troas he is seen in the company of a physician, St. Luke, who, if he rendered medical assistance to the Apostle, was rewarded by the gift of the gospel, of which he ultimately became a servant. The reason, however, for the haste and the direction of this journey hinted at in the narrative itself is that it was in order to see and to obey the vision of the night which, at Troas, called him to proceed to Macedonia, thereby determining the direction taken by the gospel to be westwards to Athens and Rome, the centres of the ancient civilization. It is difficult, however, to get rid of the impression that at this point, so critical not only for his own fortunes but for the future of Christianity and the history of the world, there were, besides the providential causes hinted at, reasons in St. Paul's own mind and genius similar to the passionate desire, to which he gave expression at a later stage, to preach the gospel 'also . . . in Rome' (Ro 1^{15}). He was the Apostle of the Gentiles, and this was a call to the great seats of Gentile influence.

Landed in Macedonia, he proceeded from city to city along the Roman highway—Philippi, Thessalonica, Berœa—in each of which there took place some peculiar development of Providence, the adhesion of 'honourable women' to the new religion being a conspicuous feature of Macedonian Christianity. But it is as we approach Athens, 'the eye of Greece,' that the excitement of the reader is aroused; and St. Luke rises to the occasion, too, dipping his brush liberally in the colours of classical association. Indeed, the scenes are so lifelike and dramatic that he has been accused of exaggeration, E. Norden, in a work entitled *Agnostos Theos*, 1913, accusing him of putting into the mouth of St. Paul a speech which was delivered later at Athens by another religious figure of the age, Apollonius of Tyana, and which exhibits the qualities of the artificial prose practised in the circles to which Apollonius belonged. But Harnack has come to the vindication of St. Luke, demonstrating in his pamphlet 'Ist die Rede des Paulus in Athen ein ursprünglicher Bestandteil der Apostelgeschichte?' in *TU*, 3rd ser., ix. 1 [1913], by a close examination of the facts, that it is extremely doubtful whether Apollonius ever delivered at Athens any such speech, and showing that the speech attributed to St. Paul enters into the very structure of the Book of Acts as a whole, while the rhetorical form is due to the lofty style of the thoughts demanding expression.

While, however, the visit to Athens enchained the interest of St. Luke, and enchains ours still, it was far from giving unqualified satisfaction to St. Paul himself. His apostolate was never so nearly a failure as in this city of wisdom and renown; and, when he quitted it and went on to the next stage, Corinth, he was, we know from his own words, in a state of 'weakness and fear and much trembling' (1 Co 2^{3}). In Corinth, however, he was encouraged by one of those dreams or visions in which the Lord visited him at critical moments; and he was further restored to himself by finding, at this stage, in Aquila and Priscilla, tent-makers like himself, with whom he lodged and laboured, the nearest approach to an earthly home it was ever his fortune to enjoy. He remained longer in Corinth than he had done in any other city up to this point, and founded a large church, which, though it tried him not a little, laid a strong hold upon his heart.

This journey had been the most remarkable adventure ever attempted by any missionary; it had been powerfully under Divine direction; it had abounded with thrilling incidents; it had carried Christianity from the continent of its birth to the continent in which at that time resided the power of the world; and it was rich in beginnings full of possibility and promise. It was as one who returns rejoicing, bringing his sheaves with him, that he appeared again in Syria and Palestine at the headquarters of the mission.

(*g*) *Third missionary journey.*—The narrative in Acts hardly takes time enough, however, to report the termination of this journey before it starts him out on the third missionary journey, on which he repeated his previous visits to the churches lying between Antioch-in-Syria and Antioch-in-Pisidia at the one extremity and to those lying between Troas and Corinth at the other. But the great object of this third journey was to evangelize the province of Asia, which he had had to pass by on the preceding journey, and especially to capture for the gospel the city of Ephesus, one of the great centres of population, as well as of worship, art, and commerce, in the ancient world. Here he made the longest stay with which any city evangelized by him was favoured—a space of three years. During this interval he may have visited some of the cities in the neighbourhood, which were afterwards under the pastoral charge of the apostle John, who addresses letters to them in Rev 2. 3. Some think that he paid a visit to Corinth, not mentioned in Acts, and room has been sought here for a visit to the island of Crete, mentioned in the Epistle to Titus. In such suggestions there is no impossibility, for in the account given by himself (2 Co 11) of his journeyings, labours, and sufferings, mention is made of not a few remarkable adventures of which there is no account in Acts, and it is certain that his life was far fuller of vicissitude than even the comprehensive narrative of the Acts suggests. On the whole, however, Ephesus was large enough to account for all his time, especially when, as he says (1 Co 16^{9}), 'a great door and effectual' was opened to him there. There were, however, as he adds, many adversaries, and the narrative of the Acts exhibits him in conflict with several of these. His travail culminated in a conflict with the worship of the great goddess Diana, whose annual festival brought hundreds of thousands of pilgrims from far and near to her temple, enriching the inhabitants with the money they squandered. So adversely affected had the attendance become through the spread of the gospel that the silversmiths, who vended shrines of the goddess to the visitors, felt their vested interests to be in peril. A riot was the result, St. Luke's account of which is, for vividness and humour, the best record of such an incident in literature. But the determination of the disturbers of the peace was invincible, and St. Paul had to flee, not, however, without leaving a church which flourished for centuries to such an extent as to make Ephesus one of the foremost names in early Christianity.

On the third missionary journey St. Paul did not really advance farther to the west — the direction of progress—than in the second, and his ambition for the extension of Christianity was far from satisfied, as may be ascertained from what he says at the close of the Epistle to the Romans, written while he was at Corinth, about his desire to see Rome. But the days of his free and unimpeded activity were nearing an end. As he was about to sail for headquarters, perhaps in a pilgrim-ship carrying many Jews to an approaching feast at Jerusalem, he became aware of a plot to take his life during the voyage. So he had to resort to a land-journey instead, being accompanied by a number of deputies from his various churches, who were the bearers of a collection he had for some time been amassing for the poor at Jerusalem. But in the various places at which he touched the prophets in the churches began to forbode some calamity about to befall him at Jerusalem. This imparted to the speeches he delivered on the way, especially the one to the elders of Ephesus, who came down to the port at Miletus to greet him as he passed, a peculiar pathos. Yet he did not feel himself debarred from going forward by these providential intimations. He appears, in fact, to have made up his mind that his hour had come; and he was ready to die at Jerusalem.

(*h*) *Imprisonment.* — At the feast there were multitudes of his fellow-countrymen who had come into collision with him in the cities of the Dispersion, where they dwelt, but had been prevented by the Roman authority under which they lived from proceeding to extremes. When these became aware of his presence in the Holy City, they felt that they could now indulge the feelings of revenge which they had had to restrain elsewhere. An opportunity was afforded through St. Paul yielding to the advice of St. James and the other apostles, who advised him to perform in the Temple a rite which would prove that he still lived as a Jew. In the sacred edifice he was laid hold upon and would have been torn in pieces had he not been rescued by the Roman guard in the castle of Antonia, which overlooked the Temple area. For days the Jews made the wildest efforts to get him into their clutches, not scrupling to enter into a plot for his assassination. But the Roman authorities kept firm hold of their prisoner, and it was not long before he was in safety within the fortress of Cæsarea. His safety, indeed, was only that of a prison; nor was he perfectly safe, because the governor, Felix, was a man who might have yielded to a bribe to deliver him up. Indeed, when, after two years, a new governor, Festus, came to take the place of Felix, the prisoner was so afraid of some such treachery befalling him that, making use of his right as a Roman citizen, he appealed unto Cæsar. It was the law that, when a prisoner had done so, he must be sent to Rome at once; and so, in a manner very different from any of which he had dreamed in his evangelistic projects, he found himself on the way to the Eternal City. His biographer, St. Luke, was in the company, which consisted of no fewer than 276 souls; and the narrative of the voyage which he has put together from the experiences of the weeks they were on their way is said to be the most remarkable record of travel which has come down from ancient times. Many perils were encountered; and, before all was done, St. Paul had become virtually both captain of the ship and general of the troops, all on board owing their lives to him. After being shipwrecked on the island of Malta, they obtained another ship, which carried them to Puteoli, on the south-west coast of Italy, and from this place they marched along the famous Appian Way to their destination. News of his approach having reached the Church at Rome, some of the brethren came out to meet him on the way, at which 'he thanked God, and took courage' (Ac 28^{15}). In the AV it is stated that on their arrival at Rome, 'the centurion delivered the prisoners to the captain of the guard' (v.^{16}); but in the RV the statement has been transferred to the margin, and now reads, 'The centurion delivered the prisoners to the captain of the prætorian guard'; and it so happens that the officer who held this position at the time is known from profane history to have been one Burrus by name, a person of justice and humanity. But scholarship inclines at present to the opinion that the officer into whose charge he passed was the *princeps peregrinorum*, the head of the Roman *frumentarii*, who acted as agents between the Emperor and the armies in the provinces.

The trial ought to have come on at once. But the delays of the law are proverbial, and they were not likely to be less prolonged than usual when the reigning Emperor was a man who would postpone any call of duty for a call of pleasure. Imprisonment was, however, for Roman citizens confinement of a very mild description; and St. Paul was permitted to live in his own 'hired dwelling' (v.^{30}), guarded only by a soldier, to whom he was chained. Here he was allowed to receive visitors; and he made ample use of the privilege. The local Jewish community came to interview him; so, no doubt, did the members of the Christian community. Visitors and delegates from his churches, far and near, came to relieve his bodily wants or to consult him on the state of their own affairs; young men, who had laboured with him elsewhere, flocked round him and carried his messages wherever he desired. In short, though humble to the bodily eye, his prison-room became a pharos, shedding the beams of the gospel and the light of this missionary's genius towards all quarters of the known world.

(*i*) *Last years.*—From what has been said above about the Pastoral Epistles, it will have been gathered that the present writer accepts the evidence for a second imprisonment and for an interval between the first and the second imprisonments, during which St. Paul resumed his missionary wanderings. For this the evidence is strong. Eusebius writes: 'After he had made his defence, it is said, the Apostle was sent again upon the ministry of preaching, and, upon coming to the same city a second time, he suffered martyrdom' (*HE* ii. 22); and, much earlier, Clement said of him that 'having taught the whole world righteousness, and for that end travelled even to the utmost bounds of the West, he at last suffered martyrdom, by the command of the governors, and departed out of the world, and went unto his holy place, being become a most eminent pattern of patience unto all ages' (*ad Cor.* i. 5. 7). As this was written at Rome, it is hardly likely that by 'the utmost bounds of the West' Rome itself can be intended. What further is meant is to be learnt from St. Paul's own words in the Epistle to the Romans (15^{22-28}): 'I was hindered these many times from coming to you: but now, having no more any place in these regions, and having these many years a longing to come unto you, whensoever I go unto Spain (for I hope to see you in my journey, and to be brought on my way thitherward by you, if first in some measure I shall have been satisfied with your company)—but now, I say, I go unto Jerusalem, ministering unto the saints. . . . When therefore I have accomplished this, and have sealed to them this fruit, I will go on by you unto Spain.' There is a persistent tradition, though it is late, that he visited Spain. But the strongest evidence is in the Pastoral Epistles themselves, in which we see him evangelizing Crete, which he cannot have done when he touched at that island on his way to Rome as a prisoner, though he may have been so interested in it at that time as to desire to return, if ever he should have the opportunity. We find him, also, back at Ephesus, though he had said to the Ephesian elders that they should see his face no more, this being his conviction at the time. It is often said that St. Luke would not have admitted this statement into Ac 20 had he known that the anticipation was to be belied by the goodness of Providence; but if he wrote his book at the time the present writer supposes, he did not know himself that St. Paul was to be released. From Ephesus it would be easy to get to Spain, if St. Paul actually went there, there being constant communication by sea between Ephesus and Marseilles.

Under what circumstances he was arrested the second time we have no information; but, when Nero was persecuting the Christians, the most conspicuous Christian in the world was not likely to escape. It is very interesting to approach Rome, as St. Paul did the first time, along the Appian Way, and see not only the features of nature on which his eyes must have rested, but even some of the works of man, such as the tombs of the Roman nobility on the sides of the road and the remains of the aqueducts, which supplied the city with water, still standing in the fields. After passing through the city-gate, it is uncertain whether he turned to the left towards the Palatine Hill or towards a camp lying in the neighbourhood where now stands the British Consulate. Two sites are exhibited as his 'hired house,' one of them being on the borders of the Jewish Quarter. The second imprisonment would be one without mercy, and no more suitable place for it could have been found than the Mamertine Prison, just outside the bounds of the Forum, at the Capitol end, in which, tradition strongly asserts, both St. Peter and St. Paul were confined before martyrdom. It is an unholy place, a symbol of Roman ferocity and cruelty, with numbers of cells and a hole to let down prisoners into a dungeon, out of which they did not pass till their corpses were thrust into a sewer passing by. But it was not thus that St. Paul ended his life. It is said that he was beheaded a mile or two out of the city, beside the Via Ostiensis, and a monastery, enclosed in a wood of fragrant balsam trees, now marks the spot. A Christian lady, taking possession of the precious dust, buried it on her own property near by; and over the remains has been erected one of the noblest architectural structures in the world, the Church of St.-Paul's-outside-the-Walls.

3. Beliefs.—B. Weiss, in *Biblical Theology of the NT*, divides the teaching of St. Paul into four sections: (1) his gospel before his great controversies began, this being found in 1 and 2 Thessalonians; (2) his gospel during the principal controversy of his life, this being embodied in the four great Epistles, Galatians, Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians; (3) his gospel during his later conflict with incipient Gnosticism, as found in what are called the Epistles of the Imprisonment, viz. Colossians, Ephesians, Philemon, and Philippians; (4) his gospel in the period following his first imprisonment, this being found in the Pastoral Epistles. It has sometimes been hinted that, while Weiss has collected the materials with diligence and grouped them with neatness round these four centres, he has, in so doing, crushed the life out of them. But this is an ungenerous judgment. Weiss's exegesis is so searching and his exposition so comprehensive, adapting itself unconstrainedly to the varying phases of the experience and the fortunes of the Apostle, that it may still perhaps be pronounced the most instructive study of the whole subject, in spite of the recent multiplication of books on NT Theology (Feine, Schlatter, Weinel). The attraction of Weiss's partition lies in the process of development which it exhibits in St. Paul's ideas. Garvie, in *Studies of Paul and his Gospel*, goes to the opposite extreme, denying altogether that there was a development in St. Paul's mind. He is of opinion that the Apostle had only one gospel, and that it was revealed to him suddenly and catastrophically. He does not deny that the events of his life may have determined the order in which different portions of his doctrine came to full expression, but the whole of his gospel was implicit in his conversion. In this there is a great deal of truth; yet to sacrifice the idea of development is to lose an element of interest, which not only falls in with the intellectual habits of the present day but is inherent in the subject. St. Paul was a living and growing thinker all his days; and, on the face of the documents, there is a marked contrast in the point of view and in the topics absorbing his attention at different stages of his career. If Galatians was the first of all the Epistles, as scholarship at present inclines to suppose, the four-fold division of Weiss falls to the ground; and, at the opposite end of Weiss's scheme, the investigations of W. Lütgert (*Die Irrlehrer der Pastoralbriefe*, 1909) tend to identify the false teachers of the Pastoral Epistles with those of Colossians and Ephesians so closely that the teaching in which they are confuted must be conceived as a unit. But, at all events, a two-fold division, into the gospel of his earlier and that of his later writings, is generally acknowledged—the earlier comprising Galatians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans, and the later Colossians and Ephesians, Philemon, Philippians, 1 and 2 Timothy, and Titus. Though the later Epistles number seven and the earlier only six, the former are nearly twice as bulky as the latter. Of these two divisions of St. Paul's thinking many designations have been attempted, of which that of Wernle, viz. Apologetic and Gnosis, has attracted a good deal of attention. The most obvious and perhaps most useful designation would be from the controversialists he was opposing at the different periods, or perhaps from his own leading doctrine in each period. We shall, however, content ourselves with speaking of the earlier and the later Paulinism.

(*a*) *Earlier Paulinism.*—Among the influences from the pre-Christian stage of St. Paul's life which bore upon the shaping of his theology by far the most important was his experience as a Jew, and to this it would, in the present writer's opinion, be hardly possible to ascribe too much. He was profoundly conscious of belonging to that race to which pertained 'the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises' (Ro 9^4), and to which were entrusted the oracles of God. With these oracles he was so familiar that, as he spoke or wrote, quotations from every part of them flowed unbidden to his tongue or pen. He often goes on arguing at great length in the very words of the OT. All his thinking is steeped in the spirit of the prophets, and all his own experiences appear to him the continuation and fulfilment of those of the fathers of his race.

He studied the OT not only with the devoutness of a Jew but with the learning of a Rabbi; and, unless we are to suppose that inspiration obliterated altogether his own personality, it must be recognized that he made use of Rabbinical modes of thinking and arguing when he came to expound Christian ideas. Of this consideration use has been made, in recent times, to relieve Christianity of responsibility for certain of the Pauline notions, these being set down to his pre-Christian habits of thought and, consequently, deducted from the revelation through St. Paul attributed to the Spirit of God. This is a convenient way of getting rid of a number of difficulties which have long puzzled orthodox interpreters, especially in the Apostle's use of quotations from the OT. But the idea requires delicate handling. There are those who would apply it even to the teaching of our Lord Himself; and, when it is applied to St. Paul to the extent of treating as a fragment of negligible Rabbinism such a saying of his as 'Him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf; that we might become the righteousness of God in him' (2 Co 5^{21}), the proceeding is on a level with that of a Roman Catholic who places so much confidence in the modern theory of the development of doctrine that he is able to regard a practice of his Church, which is the very reverse of that found in the NT, as a legitimate outcome from apostolic teaching.

Whether St. Paul's language and ideas were due, in any considerable degree, to the classical culture which he may have picked up in his youth at Tarsus or in his subsequent wanderings through the world, is a question about which scholars have differed widely; but recent opinion tends rather towards an affirmative reply. In his imagery a prominent place is held by references to the stadium and the training of athletes. Does this imply that he frequented the games, and expected his converts to do so? or may these references be due to some stolen pleasures of his boyhood? It is certain that his most recurrent conception of heathenism was as a concrete embodiment of sin; and when, as he frequently does, he breaks out into lengthy enumerations of sins, this is to be traced to the pressure on his spirit of the pagan atmosphere by which he felt himself oppressed wherever he moved.

The bearing of the teaching of Jesus on the teaching of St. Paul is one of the most important questions of modern theology. Can Christ's doctrine of the Kingdom of God in the Synoptists and of eternal life in St. John be identified with St. Paul's doctrines of the righteousness of God and union with Christ? It is quite certain that St. Paul must have claimed this, had the question been submitted to him in this form. But the form in which he was challenged was rather that of the conformity of his doctrine with the views of the original apostles, it being assumed that these could prove the identity of their own teaching with that of their Master. Feine (*NT Theologie*, 1910, p. 200 ff.) has dwelt with emphasis on the influence exerted on St. Paul by the testimony of the Church, as it existed before he came on the scene. Especially on the two cardinal points of the Deity of Christ and His atoning death does this scholar hold St. Paul's convictions to have been identical with those held unanimously by believers in general before him. But, however true and however important it may be that the beliefs of the primitive Church on these two great truths coincided with those of St. Paul, yet the manner in which he arrived at these convictions was too original and personal to allow us to speak of them as derived from any mundane source.

The supreme influence was undoubtedly the conversion itself; and not a few of the best interpreters of St. Paul's thinking have treated his entire system as a deduction from this single event. The opportunity for leisure and reflexion, during the three years in Arabia, to think out the implications of this experience, must, however, be taken into account in estimating the result; and then the provocation of the controversy with the Judaizers came in, to give point and sharpness to all his ideas.

However revolutionary the conversion of anyone may be, it has always antecedents; and the basal element in St. Paul's religious experience was the awakened conscience he inherited from his Jewish ancestry. He grew up with the conviction so ingrained in his mind as to be a portion of his very being that the only real blessedness which a human being can enjoy, in time or eternity, lies in the approval of God, pronouncing him righteous. This belief is wrought into the minds of children in pious homes, and the absence of it in many of those who occupy the pews at the present day is that which makes preaching difficult; because the offer of the gospel to those who have never hungered after righteousness is like offering water to those who are not athirst. In heathen lands missionaries have to create a conscience, they tell us, before they appeal to it; and it is this which makes their work so laborious. But from his fathers St. Paul had inherited this invaluable sensibility; and so it comes to pass that he sometimes speaks of his Christian life as continuous with his Jewish experience, though at other times he speaks of the two as separated by a great gulf.

The way of satisfying this passion for the Divine favour taught to him by his ancestors and teachers was the fulfilment of the Law, to which he devoted himself with the concentration of a nature which did nothing by halves. It was probably his failure to satisfy himself with these efforts that drove him to the persecution of the Christians; because he was in need of some extra service, to make up for the lack by which his performances were beset. From the time when the Tenth Commandment taught him the spiritual and interior nature of the Law (Ro 7^7), he never could appease his conscience, and there went on in his breast continually a struggle between the law in the Book and the law in the members, described in Ro 7. This was the goad against which he was kicking in his unconverted state, and it is not unlikely that the pain may have been aggravated by observing the heroism and spiritual exaltation of the martyrs, whom he could not but suspect to be better men than himself.

In the early chapters of Rom. St. Paul gives universality to these experiences of his own, concluding that Gentile and Jew are under sin, and proving that all alike have come short of the glory of God. It might have been thought that, according to his own principles, the Gentiles could not be guilty of sin, because they had no Law. But they had a law, written not on stones but on the tables of the heart; for in every human being, as he comes into the world, there is a conscience, informing him of the existence of God and of the elementary demands of the Divine will, so that he is without excuse if he sins against this natural light. In this sense the Gentiles had without exception been sinners, and even great sinners, descending from one degree of wickedness to another; because, when they forsook God, He gave them over to themselves ever more and more, punishing sin with sin. From such depths of heathen corruption the Jews might expect to have been saved by the restraining force of their Law; but he charges his fellow-countrymen with practising the very same sins as were committed by the Gentiles, and that to such a degree that by the scandal of their wickedness the name of Jahweh had been made a by-word among the heathen. The greater the light the more aggravated is the sin; and so the Law, which in itself is holy and just and good, had become an instrument not of justification but of condemnation. Not infrequently has St. Paul been accused of exaggeration in thus making all men out to be sinners, with no difference among them; but he has the saints as well as the sinners on his side in making the accusation universal. It cannot, however, be denied that St. Paul is entering into a region of speculation where it may not be so easy in our time to follow him, when he traces this universal liability to sin and punishment to the fall of Adam and the imputation of the guilt of Adam's first sin to his posterity. It is, indeed, debatable whether the latter is really one of his beliefs, or whether his idea was not rather that all human beings, having fallen into sin on account of their connexion with the first man, are held guilty not of Adam's sin but of their own. In either case we recognize the energy with which a logical mind pursues back to their ultimate source the facts of which it is conscious in its own experience or which it has observed in the conduct of others. St. Paul's theology sprang directly out of experience, and the religious experiences of his boyhood and youth culminated in an overpowering sense of guilt and sinfulness.

Corresponding with this anterior exercise of conscience there was, at the heart of the conversion itself, an element of terror, which is apt to be overlooked. When St. Paul heard himself accused of persecution by the Interlocutor addressing him from above, and was told, in answer to his question, that He whom he was persecuting was Jesus, and when thereupon there flashed into his soul an overwhelming sense of guilt, because the transactions of the foregoing months of his life were suddenly revealed as odious crimes, he anticipated that the next step must be the pouring out on his devoted head of the Divine wrath in some indescribable form. But, when, instead of being so treated, he found himself caught up, as it were, in the Divine arms and pressed to the Divine heart, he knew in an instant that God was a Being totally different from his conceptions of Him hitherto, and that all for which he had been in vain striving with so much labour and sorrow was given to him in a moment without money and without price. This is what he calls the grace of God, and he is never tired of celebrating it.

The grace of God came to him in the vision of Christ; and God and Christ are always associated in his writings as the joint source of salvation, as when in 1 Th 1[1] he says: 'Paul, and Silvanus, and Timothy, unto the church of the Thessalonians in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ: Grace to you and peace.' The vision of Christ did for St. Paul what had been done for the older apostles by the Resurrection and the Ascension: it convinced him that, in the controversy with the rulers and the teachers of the nation in which Jesus had been engaged, He had from first to last been in the right and they in the wrong; that, therefore, all His claims were justified; that, though He had missed the throne of the Jews, He had thereby been exalted to the throne of the universe; and that now He belonged to a supernal world of light, the rays of which, seen by himself, had smitten him to the ground and blinded him for days. Formerly the death of Jesus on the Cross had been to St. Paul conclusive evidence that He had been an impostor, whose pretensions were put to shame; but now it was manifest to him that the Cross must enclose a Divine mystery, compatible with all the life of Christ both before and after; and this mystery was explained by the belief that He had died not for any sins of His own, but for the sin of the world, and that His sacrifice of Himself had been accepted as a propitiation for the guilt of mankind. This was certainly a bold speculation; but it was in harmony with all that he knew about Jesus, as it was in harmony with the conceptions of sin and sacrifice of which the OT is full. St. Paul had always been a man of conscience; he believed in a God of righteousness as well as of love; and the wonder and glory of the gospel for him consisted in this, that God could be at once a just God and a Saviour.

This is the 'righteousness of God' which, in the verse (1[17]) which forms the keynote of the Epistle to the Romans, 'is revealed by faith unto faith: as it is written, But the righteous shall live by faith.' So grand and perfect is the work achieved by the grace of God and the sacrifice of Christ that, on the part of man, there is room for nothing more than faith; and faith is no more than receptivity: it is man ceasing from his own works, in order that God may work in and for him. Anything additional to this attempted on man's part is a return to the error, from which St. Paul had been so marvellously redeemed, of seeking salvation through works. Such a simple means of salvation is, however, purely human, there being nothing in it for which any human being is not competent. It has nothing to do with such distinctions as Jew and Gentile, male and female, bond and free. It is universal; and the mere knowledge of it, when it came to his understanding, contained within itself the call to be the missionary of the Gentiles; for he could not know a gospel so glorifying to God and so charged with blessing for mankind without feeling an irresistible impulse to make it known to the ends of the earth.

The above is the sum and substance of his apologetic or missionary testimony; though it must be confessed that in any such condensed statement injury is done to St. Paul's thought, the natural tendency of which is to break out on every hand into additions and excursuses; so that the student is like a traveller in a mountainous country who, while keeping to the central road, so as to take in the outline of the whole, is continually being tempted by sunny valleys stretching away into the distance, and perceives that what he took for the mountain-tops have mountains behind them still.

It has recently been contended by A. Schweitzer (*Geschichte der paulinischen Forschung*, 1911) and H. Windisch ('Die neuesten Bearbeitungen der NT Theologie und die zwei Leitmotive des Urchristenthums,' in *ZWT* xix. [1912]) that all the Pauline message must be framed in eschatology, and that, indeed, this is the most essential feature of the whole. When the same rule is applied to Jesus, as it has often been of late, it goes perilously near to converting Him into the apocalyptic dreamer that the Jews believed Him to be, and to justifying them for taking His life. The eschatology of the Gospels was, in reality, the body of humiliation which His position in history caused to cling to the teaching of Jesus. But this was a body destined to vanish away; and in St. Paul we see it in the very process of disappearing. While the eschatological point of view clings to certain of his least important utterances, such as those on the relation of the sexes, it has little to do with his thought in general, which would have been very nearly what it is if his eschatology had been quite different.

A similar attempt has been made to give to the sacraments a preponderant place in his thinking and to connect these with similar rites practised in pagan days by those who subsequently came over to Christianity. But such a notion has still less to justify it. St. Paul said (1 Co 1[17]): 'Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel'; and, had occasion arisen, he would have added, with the same downrightness: 'Jesus sent me not to administer the other sacrament, but to preach the gospel.' He was not a dispenser of sacraments, but a preacher of the gospel. His own conversion was complete, and the gospel involved in it had been revealed to his understanding, before he was himself baptized. He was, indeed, baptized thereupon; but the rite was only a means of emphasizing that which had already taken place. He did not believe in sacraments as effecting anything apart from faith in the mind of the recipient. His careful account of the Lord's Supper proves how highly he honoured that sacrament and how firmly he believed in its efficacy. But to him there was nothing magical in the administration. No kind of virtue was communicated through it which is incommunicable through other means. It was only the seal or signature affixed to the testimony of the preached Word. Not the faintest glimpse of the genius of the man has been vouchsafed to any who can believe him an apostle of salvation through forms and ceremonies; and little credit is done to his thinking capacity by those who believe him capable of preaching sometimes a salvation of this sort and at other times a salvation through grace and faith.

(*b*) *Later Paulinism.* — The title proposed by Wernle for the later Paulinism is Gnosis; but the present writer would prefer Wisdom; because, in English at least, Gnosis has a derogatory sound. To account for the rise of this phase in St. Paul's thinking there cannot be cited any crisis equal in distinction to the conversion in the earlier part of his life. In fact, the peculiarity of his later experience to which his later teaching is traceable is rather the absence of crisis. The crisis was long past, with its exciting experiences and startling effects; and there had supervened the monotony of middle life. What was there now to make up for the glow and energy of the earlier period? Perhaps, indeed, this hardly required to be asked in regard to St. Paul himself, whose enthusiasm never cooled; but it was certainly a critical question for the generality of his converts. Of these St. Paul had probably at one time thought as being all like himself—not less prompt in decision or less enduring in conviction. They had, as well as he, gone through a crisis of conversion; and he expected this to supply them with motives potent enough to last the rest of their lives. But in ordinary souls first love is apt to cool, and human nature to recur to its normal proclivities; and, in course of time, he became well aware that in none of his churches were there wanting gross abuses or glaring sins. What was there in Christianity to provide for a chronic necessity such as this? This is the Christian problem of middle life.

In the first period there had been vouchsafed to him, immediately after his conversion, the residence in Arabia, during which, it is believed, he worked out in his own mind the fundamental principles of his gospel. And something of the same kind may be recognized, also, at the commencement of the later stage of his life; because he spent, in imprisonment at Cæsarea, a period hardly less prolonged than that passed in Arabia. This enforced leisure was a providential opportunity for revising his beliefs and combining with them any new experiences afforded by the external course of his history. Nor was this spur to meditation lacking; because, from more quarters than one, he heard of the rise among his converts of what is now known as incipient Gnosticism; and this furnished him with food for thought.

As interpreted by Lightfoot, in his well-known dissertation on the Colossian Heresy (*Colossians and Philemon*, new ed., 1879, p. 73 ff.), this incipient Gnosticism had for its root-idea an aversion to matter, which it looked upon as a principle opposed to God and as the cause of sin in human beings. It was, therefore, to be avoided and overcome; but, in the endeavour to do so, different Gnostics chose different paths. On the one hand, some practised asceticism in regard to food, marriage, and other bodily enjoyments, thinking that the best way to overcome matter was to have as little to do with it as possible. Others, on the contrary, adopted a bolder course. Sensual desires, it seemed to them, were natural and inevitable, and the only way to overcome them was by glutting them with that for which they craved. Desire would be extinguished by exhaustion; and then they would be able to cease thinking about the objects with which fancy had been obsessed.

These opposite tendencies occupy a prominent place in St. Paul's later writings; and it is easy to imagine with how much pain and annoyance it was that he became aware of their prevalence among his churches. He may, however, have been conscious that both parties were able to appeal to doctrines of his own, which occupy a prominent place in his earlier writings. In discussing the question of meats offered in sacrifice to idols, he had counselled the strong to adopt the magnanimous attitude of abstinence for the sake of the weak, though not conceding that the scruples of the weak had any justification. The weak, however, have a strength of their own, and they sometimes turn concessions thus made to them into tyrannical rules binding upon all. At all events, the exhortations to defer to the weak do not recur in the later Epistles; but asceticism is strongly repudiated, and the principle enforced that 'every creature of God is good, and nothing is to be rejected, if it be received with thanksgiving: for it is sanctified through the word of God and prayer' (1 Ti $4^{4.5}$).

There is good reason for believing that St. Paul became sensible in later life that even his own doctrine of the righteousness of God was capable of being construed in a sense totally different from that intended by him, and with pernicious results. In the Epistle to the Galatians he had attacked the Law with ferocity, and he had drawn no distinction between ceremonial and moral law. But experience was to teach him that freedom from law can be adopted as a watchword by unsteady spirits, who convert it into licence. In Germany, a generation after the death of Luther, justification by faith alone had been converted into such an idol that in many quarters there was no longer any dread of certain forms of moral corruption; and the wiser of Luther's followers had to recognize that there is a use of the Law even for the regenerate, to instruct them as to what the will of God is, when once they have, through grace, been made willing to do it. St. Paul had never been unaware of this; but he states it with more clearness and urgency in his later Epistles, where the standard set up for all who call themselves by the name of Christ is that they be 'furnished completely unto every good work' (2 Ti 3^{17}).

If the Lutheran Church had to learn by experience that its favourite doctrine could be turned into lasciviousness, the Reformed or Calvinistic Church had no less to learn, in the century after the Reformation, that its favourite doctrine was capable of misuse. Now, election is one of St. Paul's doctrines also; and he sometimes gives to it very strong expression indeed, as, *e.g.*, in the paragraph about Jacob and Esau in the latter half of the Epistle to the Romans. Nor does he abandon it in his later writings; but he states it more cautiously, laying emphasis on the choice of God on the part of man which is necessary to salvation as well as the choice of man on the part of God. In the Pastoral Epistles there is a universalism of the Divine love and of the death of Christ (1 Ti 2^{4-6} 4^{10}, 2 Ti 1^{9}, Tit 2^{2}); but it is carefully balanced by the ethical requirements addressed to those who hear the gospel.

It may be that the prominent place given in the later Pauline letters to the doctrine of the Church is traceable to the same considerations and anxieties. This new development is in two directions: on the one hand, there is a very exalted conception of the Church, culminating in the image, in Ephesians, of the bride of Christ, who is to be presented to the Bridegroom without spot or wrinkle or any such thing; and, on the other hand, there is the organization of offices, elaborated in the Pastoral Epistles. Why was St. Paul so anxious that such a lofty view of its own constitution should possess the mind of the Church? And why did he provide that it should be so thoroughly organized? Is not the explanation to be sought in his growing sense of the perils to which his converts were exposed through contact with surrounding paganism, and especially the orgies connected with the idol-festivals? Refuge from these temptations of a corrupt society could be found only in a pure society; and he desired the Church to be a place so attractive that those who had left the world for it might feel that they had made a good exchange.

There was another aspect of incipient Gnosticism which gave a direction to the Apostle's thinking of which note must be taken. In its dread of matter it instinctively separated the Deity from it as much as possible. Hence fully developed Gnosticism attributed the creation of the material universe to an inferior deity, whom it termed the Demiurge; and even incipient Gnosticism interposed between the Deity and matter a multitude of fantastic creations of the fancy, sometimes conceived of as abstractions but at other times impersonated as angels of different ranks. This causes St. Paul, in his later writings, to speak of Jesus Christ as both the author and the end of the universe—'Of him, and through him, and unto him, are all things' (Ro 11^{36})—and it is probably this also which leads him to celebrate the Son of God as the Lord of angels and of all the denizens of the spiritual world. Out of such references to supernatural beings there was constructed by Dionysius Areopagiticus an elaborate system of angelology, which was adopted by the theologians of the Middle Ages and deeply affected the cosmical conceptions of both Dante and Milton. But it is open to question whether St. Paul intended these references to be taken so seriously. All he intended may have been to say that, whatever principalities and powers there may exist anywhere, they are all under the dominion of the Son of God. It is, however, in one of the least polemical of his writings that we come upon the ripest expression of such meditations on the transcendence of Christ, viz. Ph $2^{6ff.}$, where we read of one 'who, being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and, being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross. Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father'—a passage which, though it presents to scholarship not a few difficulties, has done, and ever will do, much to steady the faith of the Church, in the glory of her Lord.

Not only, however, is Christ thus transcendent in the universe: He is also immanent in believers and in the Church. This is the teaching of all the Epistles from first to last, but it is most prominent in the later ones; and this emphasis and reiteration fall in with the thought which has been shown to be characteristic of the later Epistles. Even in the earliest Epistles, in which freedom from the law is vindicated as the negative pole of Christian experience, possession by the Spirit appears as the positive pole, and in Galatians all the features of Christian experience are described as 'the fruit of the Spirit' (5^{22}). That the Spirit is the Third Person of the Godhead is proved by the Apostolic Benediction, which forms the closing verse of 2 Corinthians. Now it seems to be a rule of Scripture, that whatever is done by one Person of the Godhead may be spoken of as done by the others; and, accordingly, not only is the Spirit said to dwell in believers, but the Father is also said to be in them, and they are said to be in the Father. It is, however, about the Son of God that such statements are most frequently made; and the phrase 'in Christ' or 'Christ in you' is the most common expression for this Divine indwelling, which is the guarantee of Christian progress and perfection. In Eph 1 and 2 the phrase 'in Christ' occurs more than a score of times; and it is significant of the warmth generated by this idea in the mind of St. Paul that he has invented a whole series of metaphors to set it forth, the union between Christ and believers being compared to that between a temple and the stones of which it is composed, to that between trunk and branches in a tree, to that of head and members in the human body, and to that of husband and wife. The whole of Deissmann's *St. Paul* is illuminated by the thorough exposition of this idea and by the proof of how it ruled the Apostle's consciousness in every direction.

Union with Christ is usually represented as connecting us with the living Christ in the same way as faith does with the Christ who died; the one is related to sanctification in the same way as the other is to justification; and with this agrees the saying of St. Paul himself (Ro 5^{10}): 'If, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, shall we be saved by his life.' But the conception for which 'in Christ' is the symbol is much more comprehensive than this would suggest. The connexion with Christ was formed in a past eternity in the mind of God, and it will continue to all eternity; because 'neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord' (Ro $8^{38f.}$). It is not only vital, bringing into the soul the virtue resident in Him who is now seated at the right hand of power, but legal also, making our debt His and His merit ours. In short, Christ to St. Paul's mind fills the entire universe, from horizon to horizon; and faith saves because it is the receptivity of the soul which appropriates all the virtue of every kind derivable from this transcendent Being.

4. Personality.—St. Paul was, in the fullest sense of the word, a personality. There is about him the same modernness as about St. Augustine in his *Confessions*. While many figures of the past are unintelligible and incomprehensible, he is as human as if he had walked in upon us out of the street. This may be partly due to the details of his life being so well known and his words read so frequently in our hearing; but it is traceable still more directly to the largeness of his humanity and the realism of his thinking. There are, no doubt, however, things about him, due to his circumstances and training, which affect us less favourably; and, on the other hand, the expansion of our own experience may train us gradually to a completer comprehension of him. Scholars like Ramsay and Deissmann have written with enthusiasm of the new power of appreciation derived from witnessing with their own eyes the scenes of his labours; and anyone privileged to live through a revival of religion would ever afterwards have a new comprehension of every page in the Book of Acts, while the experience of an evangelist or a pastor, in hungering and thirsting for the salvation of those under his charge, or in watching over the development of young converts, with a sensitive consciousness of the perils to which these are exposed, would supply the best of all qualifications for feeling the innermost throb of the Epistles.

(*a*) *The man.*—Without question Nature had expended on the making of St. Paul a fine bit of the material with which she works in her secret laboratory, and had cast his personality in one of her largest moulds. He was specially strong in intellectual endowment. This can be appreciated by reading any exposition of his thinking such as is supplied in works on NT theology, for there the topics are not only numerous but full of weight and substance; and, besides, they are so closely articulated as to form an orderly and connected system of ideas. The question whether St. Paul was the author of a dogmatic system has, indeed, been disputed, some holding that it is in the sphere of religion rather than dogma that he lives and moves; but, at all events, he was one of those who need to know the why and the wherefore of whatever they are experiencing or doing, and whose views and convictions all piece themselves together into a connected view of the world. He has been one of the most influential teachers of mankind, multitudes in every century adopting from him their way of conceiving all the greatest objects of human concern.

While, however, it is this side of his greatness which first attracts the eye, closer intimacy reveals him as not less distinctively a man of heart. He could love, and he had the power of compelling love. So numerous were his companions and fellow-labourers, that the study of these is a subject which has more than once been treated by itself (J. S. Howson, *The Companions of St. Paul*, 1871; E. B. Redlich, *St. Paul and his Companions*, 1913). It is astonishing how often he is seen in tears; and it is certain that the Ephesians at Miletus were not the only converts of his who, at parting, fell on his neck and kissed him, sorrowing because they were to see his face no more. By no author has this side of his character been so perfectly seized as by Adolphe Monod, whose little book, entitled *St. Paul* (1851), far outweighs in value many ponderous tomes. Yet this writer does not fail to point out that the feminine traits in St. Paul acquired their significance from the strength of the masculine ones. When a woman weeps, it occasions no surprise; but there is something profoundly moving in the tears of a strong man.

Still, St. Paul had not all the gifts. His bodily presence was weak and his speech contemptible. Whether his 'thorn in the flesh' was connected with this natural defect, it is impossible to say; but the way in which it is introduced, as if it were something sent to keep him humble, after he had received extraordinary visions and revelations, would rather suggest that it was additional to his congenital weakness; and that it was sufficiently painful and annoying is obvious without the exaggeration of Farrar, who characteristically speaks of it as his 'stake' in the flesh (*The Life and Work of St. Paul*, 2 vols., 1879, i. 214). It has been supposed to have been epilepsy, because the sufferer says that the Galatians did not 'spit' (4[14] *οὐδὲ ἐξεπτύσατε*) at him, and in the ancient world it was common to spit at the sight or mention of epilepsy, as among ourselves some people 'touch wood' in certain circumstances by way of deprecation. Similarly, the theory that it was a disease of the eyes can be supported by his statement that the Galatians would have plucked out their own eyes and given them to him (v.[15]). Ramsay's notion, that it was malarial fever, has the recommendation that he himself suffered from this in the same region of the world, and is of opinion that the symptoms correspond (*St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 94). What it really was will probably never be ascertained. It is enough to know that the astonishing work done by this man was accomplished not in the robustness of a healthy body or in the self-consciousness of one able at all times to have absolute confidence in himself, but amid weariness and painfulness, shyness and self-distrust. To a sensitive mind any bodily weakness or deformity must be a kind of torture, especially in the presence of strangers; and St. Paul loved the gospel so entirely that he would have liked to give it the advantage of all the graces of voice and bodily presence which he lacked. Yet, in more ways than one, his very defects turned out to the furtherance of the gospel; and with genial intuition Adolphe Monod, himself somewhat of an invalid, has divined how this could happen. A weak servant of Christ sometimes appeals to the sympathies of an audience more by his weakness than anyone could by strength; the women, especially, in a congregation will do far more for an invalid pastor than for one in health; and so it comes to pass that such a one can say, 'When I am weak, then am I strong' (2 Co 12[10]).

The idea, not infrequently encountered in recent works on St. Paul, that his liability to see visions and dream dreams was connected with his bodily weakness or some psychical derangement, seems a strange perversion of the facts. His own estimate of it at least was very different. To him it appeared a mark of superiority so distinguished that he had to beware of being puffed up through possessing it; and there can be no question that it rendered to him extraordinary assistance and encouragement at critical moments of his experience. It was akin to the official endowment of the OT prophets, and, if it is to be traced to any natural peculiarity, this must be sought in the psychology of prophecy.

(*b*) *The Hebrew and the Hellenist.*—To St. Paul, the Jew, very ample justice has been done, as the OT, from every portion of which he drew ideas and impulses, has always been known to his interpreters. But the same justice has not been done to the Gentile in him. He may almost without impropriety be called a Gentile; to the Greeks, he says himself, he became a Greek; and it is possible that he may have done so more than he was himself aware.

This at least is being asserted by scholarship at the present time; and the very latest speculations on Paulinism are in this direction. By the school which takes its name from the History of Religion, and whose leading aim it is to trace out every kind of connexion that can be discovered between Christianity and other contemporary religions, it is contended that, in the world of St. Paul's time and in the countries where his missionary labours were carried on, there was taking place an extraordinary religious ferment, the West acting on the East, and the East still more powerfully on the West. The atmosphere was full of notions and aspirations, these being connected not with the hereditary classical religion, with which scholarship has long been familiar, but with imported and illegitimate cults, with which scholarship is only now becoming acquainted. As a person of religious sensitiveness and as a Semite, St. Paul could not escape; and not a few ideas of the later Paulinism are derived from this source. Indeed, if the form in which Christianity first presented itself to his mind was due to Judaism, the last was due to Hellenism.

There may be more in these suggestions than conservative scholars are yet disposed to allow. The scene of St. Paul's activity was the synagogue; and in the synagogues, wherever he went, he encountered two elements—a Jewish and a Gentile. To us the former is easily intelligible: we are aware both of the difficulty felt by Jews in accepting the Christian message and of the arguments by which they could be led to believe that Jesus was the Christ. But it was among the Gentiles that the missionary obtained his most numerous successes, and not infrequently he turned away from the Jews altogether and devoted himself exclusively to the Gentiles. It has not been sufficiently considered how there happened to be so many of such proselytes or how they were so open to the influences brought by St. Paul. Some of them had accepted the Jewish religion in its entirety, but probably the majority had only contracted a habit of attendance at the synagogue. Even this, however, betokens that they were persons in whom the religious instinct was strong, and the religious cravings of many may have sought satisfaction elsewhere before coming to the synagogue. If the story could be fully told, it is not unlikely that to many of them some other religion had rendered the same service as the Law did to Jews, being a 'schoolmaster' to bring them to Christ.

Now, what is alleged is that in these Oriental cults there were elements bearing a striking resemblance to certain features of Paulinism. The worshippers sought escape from the world through absorption in the deity in a manner bearing some likeness to union with Christ in the Pauline theology; and mystical rites were practised having a certain analogy with the Christian sacraments.

All this may amount to no more than the fact that in all religions, the Christian included, there are certain common aspirations as well as certain forms of ritual. There is no clear statement anywhere in St. Paul's writings implying that he looked upon heathens as having been led to Christ through their own religions in the same way as Jews had been led to Him through theirs. His tone is, on the contrary, one of disparagement and condemnation, and he speaks of their previous religious condition as something from which they needed to be delivered. The nearest approach to a more sympathetic view of heathenism is in the speech on Mars' Hill, in which there is an indication of an education of the human race, as well as of the Jews, for Christianity. It is contended, indeed, that, in the Epistles of the Imprisonment, he has paid to the cults in question the compliment of adopting their phraseology on a large scale ('fullness,' 'mystery,' 'perfect,' 'gnosis,' 'revelation,' 'new man,' 'God-saviour,' etc.) without referring to them by name. But Kennedy, in *St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions*, has proved (especially in chs. iv. and v.) that both the words and ideas to which a heathen origin is attributed go back to the OT and the LXX; and, when they can be found there, it is useless to go further afield. The evidence that the notions attributed to the worshippers of Mithra, Osiris, and Dionysus were actually held by them is frequently very slender; and there is great need for the publication of a *corpus* of the texts relied on as a whole, in order that it may be seen how far we are dealing with serious facts. Too often the writers of this school create, though unintentionally, the impression, not that these cults were providential preparations for Christ, but that Christianity is no better than one of them, as fantastic and as futile.

It is certain, at all events, that both the sacraments were practised in the Church before St. Paul became a Christian; and both can vindicate their institution by the Founder of Christianity Himself, who, besides, imitated them from parallel rites in the older dispensation; and St. Paul's doctrine of union with Christ can claim the same authoritative derivation. The mysticism of St. Paul is almost identical with that of St. John; and in St. John it is put into the mouth of Jesus Himself. Everyone remembers the parable of the Vine and the Branches. Because St. John wrote later than St. Paul, the Johannine theology is usually treated as a development from the Pauline. But the dependence was the opposite way. Whatever may have been the origin of the Gospel of St. John, the tradition contained in it is much older than the composition of the book; and, if it has in any considerable degree preserved the deeds and the words of our Lord, the knowledge of these must have been in possession of the Church at the period when St. Paul was first ascertaining the contents of the Evangel. He may have obtained the report from the lips of St. John himself, with whom he was at that time in contact; but what St. John knew was the common property of the Church long before it was committed to writing. This is the true origin of the most distinctive part of St. Paul's theology, which never in him reaches the same elevation as in the writings of St. John. Though, for instance, as has been mentioned above, St. Paul invented a whole series of images to set forth the intimacy and vitality of the connexion with Christ, he never rose to the height of sublimity reached by Jesus, when, in the intercessory prayer of Jn 17, He compared the union between Himself and His disciples to that of Father and Son in the Holy Trinity.

The weakness of the school which is attempting at present to interpret Christianity as if it had consisted originally of scraps picked up here, there, and everywhere, is that it conceives Christianity as an amalgam of ideas and fancies, fortuitously collected and ingeniously pieced together, instead of perceiving it to be a series of experiences derived from a single centre and capable of repetition throughout all the generations of mankind. This centre was Christ. Whatever fullness of personality there may have been in St. Paul in his natural state, he became completely himself only when Christ took possession of his being. 'If any man is in Christ, he is a new creature: the old things are passed away; behold, they are become new' (2 Co 5^{17}). From the moment of his conversion it was his continual aspiration to be able to say: 'I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me: and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself up for me' (Gal 2^{20}). Christ had for him a supreme objective value, because He had redeemed him from the curse and bondage of sin. At the moment when Christ first revealed Himself to him, his ethical life had come to an *impasse*, and he was convicted on the spot of being in absolute antagonism to God. But Christ reconciled him; and, although he was never afterwards without the consciousness of being a sinful man, lost if left to himself, he knew that his ransom had been paid on the Cross. But Christ had for him an equally important subjective value. He was in him 'the hope of glory.' He was the atmosphere which he breathed; He was to him what the sunshine is to the bird. The world might be unkind and fortune fickle, but in Christ he had an unfailing source of exhilaration and a resource in all emergencies. This relationship to Christ determined his relationship to God, as well as to his fellow-Christians and his fellow-men. These experiences have been reproduced in countless instances from century to century; and, the deeper anyone's experience of them is, the more facile and joyous will be the appreciation of the thinker in whose mind they first took their full and natural shape. Should they ever cease to be known as the actual experiences of men, the question about their origin will hardly be worth discussing.

There has of late been much writing on the relation between St. Paul and Jesus. Was the gospel of Jesus faithfully and fruitfully continued in the teaching of the Apostle? or did St. Paul distort the original gospel, replacing it with a system of his own? It has even been contended that St. Paul was the true founder of Christianity; only this was something quite different from that intended by Jesus. Now, if Jesus and St. Paul were simply Jews of genius, whose specialty lay in religion, speculations of this kind would not be out of place. Indeed, the wonder would be that St. Paul, with his assertive and towering personality, did not consciously enter into competition with his rival. But nothing can be more certain than that to St. Paul himself the question whether he or Jesus was the originator of the new religion would have appeared both blasphemous and ludicrous. His favourite designation for himself was the 'slave' of Jesus Christ. He was only a 'vessel,' to carry the name of Christ from nation to nation; and the vessel was an 'earthen' one, in order that the excellency of the power might be Another's and not his own. It cannot be denied that there was a vast difference between Jesus' mode of both conceiving and stating the truth and St. Paul's; but the latter's modes of expression can generally be translated back, without difficulty, into those of Jesus, and the two views of the world do not exhibit serious discrepancies, when it is taken into account that the one speaker is conscious of being the Saviour and the other of having been saved.

(*c*) *The apostle.*—The sense of having received from on high a vocation or mission was strong in the leading men of the race to which St. Paul belonged. Thus, Jeremiah records his own call in these words, spoken to him by Jahweh: 'Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee, and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee; I have appointed thee a prophet unto the nations' (Jer 1^{5}). Anyone thus addressed naturally felt all his powers consecrated to a task, and this so steeled his whole nature that Jahweh could add, as we read in the same chapter: 'I have made thee this day a defenced city, and an iron pillar, and brasen walls, against the whole land, . . . against the princes thereof, against the priests thereof, and against the people of the land. And they shall fight against thee; but they shall not prevail against thee: for I am with thee, saith the Lord, to deliver thee' (v.$^{18f.}$). In Jesus this sense was particularly strong: He knew Himself to be the Messiah; hence the name 'Son of man,' by which He called Himself, as well as the other Messianic titles He accepted from others. In St. Paul there was the same sense of being chosen by God; and from this was derived not a little of his strength. He even reverts to that old conception of Jeremiah, intimating that God had separated him from his mother's womb, to be a preacher of the gospel of His Son (Gal 1^{15}). To himself it seemed that he had been born at a juncture in the world's history at which there was a special work to be done for God and man, and that he had been endowed with the gifts required for the purpose; consequently, all his faculties and opportunities must be devoted to this object. This made him feel himself to be a debtor to all unacquainted with the gospel (Ro 1^{14}). His peculiar responsibility was, however, to the Gentiles, to whose evangelization he had been specially appointed. To this consciousness he gives very frequent expression (*e.g.* Ac 9^{15} 13^{47} 15^{7} 22^{21}, Ro 11^{13} 15^{16}, Eph 3^{8}, 1 Ti 2^{7}, 2 Ti 1^{11}). Even with the older apostles he appears to have made an arrangement by which it was agreed that he should go to the uncircumcision, while they went to the circumcision (Gal 2$^{7-9}$); and this acknowledgment by the Church doubtless deepened his sense of obligation, though it was only the recognition of an anterior conviction of his own and of a call from a higher quarter, in the same way as ordination by an ecclesiastical authority to a particular charge may rekindle the sense of duty, though the call to lay the whole life on the altar has come from a higher source.

In this consciousness of a mission to his age, and of a special mission to the Gentile world, we must recognize one of the driving forces of St. Paul's life. He frequently speaks of the task as a stewardship: 'and it is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful' (1 Co 4^{2}). This was what kept alive in him the spirit of missionary enterprise, it being his constant ambition to penetrate into new provinces and not to build on another man's foundation (Ro 15^{20}); this was what made him able to face novel audiences, to stand before courts or kings, and to encounter raging mobs; this was what made all afflictions 'light,' though among these were perils of rivers, perils of robbers, perils in the city, perils in the wilderness, perils in the sea, besides labour and travail, hunger and thirst, cold and nakedness (2 Co 11$^{26.\,27}$); this was what made him equal to the most difficult achievement of all in a man of his temperament—to rejoice that the gospel was preached by his enemies, for strife and contention, to those who might not otherwise have heard it at all (Ph 1^{18}).

This loyalty to his calling evoked, however, tenderer things from the deep recesses of his nature. There is a passage in the beginning of 2 Cor. where he blesses 'the Father of all mercies and God of all comforts' for the comfort he has himself received, because this will enable him to comfort those who are in any sorrow; and he goes on to express his willingness to endure any afflictions as long as these give him a deeper sympathy with the suffering children of men. All experiences were to him subordinate to the over-mastering purpose of his life, and he could welcome anything whatever out of which new efficiency could be extracted. In short, he loved his work, doing it not only from a sense of duty, but because he loved his Saviour and loved his fellow-men; and so he could speak of himself not only as a 'steward' but as a 'nurse' and a 'father' (1 Th 2^{7}, 1 Co 4^{15}).

(*d*) *The Christian.*—All this must have had an influence on character. Every power was exercised to the full, and his own development went on amidst manifold relations with his fellow-creatures. Holiness has been sought behind the walls of the cloister through macerations and prayer; but it comes unsought to those who go out of themselves, to seek and to save the lost children of Adam. This is a secret which has been recaptured in our own time, when many of the holiest men and women are those who are going about continually doing good, finding the romance of existence in the reclamation and the welfare of others. Though such efforts involve sacrifice and self-denial, there is a rich reward in the gratitude of those benefited; and selfishness, the worst of all evils, is eradicated from the soul.

Such universal benevolence is, it must be confessed, not infrequently accompanied by shallowness, the spirit of Martha being so much indulged that there is no time for cultivating the attitude of Mary. From this danger, however, St. Paul was secured by his intense preoccupation with the truth of the gospel, of which he was not only the custodian and propagandist, but the apologist, defending it against all comers. One part of his vocation, to which he gives frequent expression, was to be a revealer of truth which had been hidden in the Divine mind from eternity, and not made known to even the greatest prophets of the OT, because it was reserved for the epoch of the Son of God. This is what St. Paul calls the 'mystery'—the word being used not in the sense of something hidden or obscured, but something once hidden but now revealed—and, as he contemplates it in its novelty and greatness, he bursts out into the exclamation, 'O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgements, and his ways past tracing out!' (Ro 11^{33}). Thus with the restless activity of the evangelist he combined the habits of the seer and sage.

The sage's labour has its dangers too, the thinker being apt to be lost in the clouds of his own speculation. But from this peril St. Paul was saved by his intense desire to see moral results in those for whom he was labouring. Nearly every Epistle of his is composed half of theological and half of ethical matter. And the one is closely connected with the other. However mystical he becomes, when showing how the Christian has died with Christ, risen with Him, and sat down with Him in the heavenly places, each of these has its moral equivalent in the daily life of the Christian, and the smallest of duties is enforced by the sublimest of principles. This union of ideal and actual is the heart of St. Paul's thinking—'If we live by the Spirit, by the Spirit let us also walk' (Gal 5^{25}).

We know too well that it is possible for a religious teacher to give utterance to the noblest of sentiments and yet not rise in practice above the levels of selfishness; but it is difficult to read the innumerable passages in which St. Paul entreats and encourages his converts to follow after holiness without believing that he was for ever following after it himself; and, although he did not claim to have already attained or to be already perfect, he could, when occasion required, challenge his converts to bear witness to his walk and conversation in their midst—'Ye are witnesses, and God also, how holily and righteously and unblameably we behaved ourselves toward you' (1 Th 2^{10})—and he could call upon them to be imitators of him, as he also was of Christ (1 Co 11^{1}). As the years increased, and the effects of abuse and imprisonment began to tell on his bodily frame, his heart began to solicit the peace and perfection of a better world—'Our citizenship is in heaven, from whence also we wait for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ' (Ph 3^{20})—or at least to be divided between such yearnings and the attraction of his work—'I am in a strait betwixt the two, having the desire to depart and be with Christ; for it is very far better: yet to abide in the flesh is more needful for your sake' (1^{23}). At last, in a passage of his final Epistle, which even the most negative of critics have been fain to vindicate in some way for him, we see the spirit poised in the very attitude of flight: 'I am already being offered, and the time of my departure is come. I have fought the good fight, I have finished the course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give to me at that day: and not only to me, but also to all them that have loved his appearing' (2 Ti 4^{6-8}).

LITERATURE.—In English theology no department has been cultivated more creditably than the Life of St. Paul. The great work of **Conybeare-Howson**, which appeared in 1853, was epoch-making, and is still far from superseded. **T. Lewin's**, which appeared about the same time, is built on similar lines and is rich in illustrations from antiquities. **F. W. Farrar's** (1879) embodied the results of these predecessors with a fuller exposition of the thinking. From the pen of **W. M. Ramsay** has come a whole library of works on St. Paul—*The Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, 1890, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, 1893, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, 1895, *Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, 1899, *Pauline and other Studies in Early Christian History*, 1906, *The Cities of St. Paul*, 1907, *Luke the Physician*, 1908, *The Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day*, 1913, *The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the NT*, 1915, by which a deep impression has been made, in favour of positive views, not only in the English-speaking countries but on the continent of Europe. Of smaller books may be mentioned **J. Iverach's** in the *Men of the Bible* series, and **A. E. Garvie's** in the *Century Bible Handbooks* (1910); several valuable American works may also be named, such as those by **G. H. Gilbert** (1899), **O. Cone** (1898), **A. T. Robertson** (1909), and **B. W. Bacon** (1905). Of the German works a history has been written by **A. Schweitzer** (*Geschichte der paulin. Forschung von der Reformation bis auf die Gegenwart*, 1911; books in English are omitted, because the author does not know the language); but it cannot be claimed that these are of the same calibre as those in English, except on the side of criticism. **F. C. Baur's** great work, *Paulus der Apostel*, 1845, raised profound critical questions, which have been agitating the scholarship of Germany ever since, but it was no gift to the German people, bringing a great religious character home to their intelligence and affection, as Conybeare and Howson's *Life* was to the English-speaking world. That of **A. Hausrath** (1865) exhibited fine qualities of style. The two volumes of **C. Clemen** (*Paulus. Sein Leben und Wirken*, 1904) have been sufficiently characterized above. Smaller books of note have recently appeared by **H. Weinel** (Eng. tr., 1906), **W. Wrede** (Eng. tr., 1906), **E. Vischer** (1910), but that of **A. Deissmann** (Eng. tr., 1912) stands out by itself on account of the breath of the open air felt everywhere in its pages and the author's enthusiasm for the subject. The Germans themselves seem to find most satisfaction in the life of St. Paul contained in *The Apostolic Age* of **C. v. Weizsäcker** (Eng. tr., 1894–95) (see the remarks in **P. Wernle's** *Einführung in das theologische Studium*, 1908), who was a fine spirit but too subject to the critical tendencies of the time in which he lived. Of the works in French, that of **Adolphe Monod** has already been characterized; that of **E. Renan** (Eng. tr., 1869) has qualities of its own which cannot be neglected; and that of **C. Fouard** (Eng. tr., 1894) is highly spoken of.

A few more notes may be added under each of the divisions of the whole subject adopted above.

(1) SOURCES.—Here commentaries on the Acts and on the Epistles, severally or collectively, might be mentioned, but these will be found elsewhere in this Dictionary. A few works, however, on special points may be mentioned:—**F. H. Chase**, *The Credibility of the Book of the Acts of the Apostles*, 1902; **G. Hönnicke**, *Die Chronologie des Lebens des Apostels Paulus*, 1903; **D. Round**, *The Date of St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, 1906; **J. D. James**, *The Genuineness and Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles*, 1906 (on the same subject as an Essay by G. G. Findlay in Appendix to **A. Sabatier's** *The Apostle Paul*, Eng. tr., 1891); **Dykes Shaw**, *The Pauline Epistles*, 1903. It will be found useful to read over both Acts and Epistles in unconventional translations—*The Twentieth Century New Testament* (^{2}1904), **J. Moffatt**, *The New Testament: A New Translation* (^{3}1914), and especially **R. F. Weymouth**, *The New Testament in Modern Speech*, 1903 (^{3}1912).

(2) LIFE.—On the world into which St. Paul was born the works on NT Times are important, such as those of **A. Hausrath** (Eng. tr., 1895), **E. Schürer** (*HJP*, 1885–90), and **O. Holtzmann** (Eng. tr., 1904), as well as the handbooks by **R. Waddy Moss** (1903), **L. A. Muirhead** (^{2}1905), and **W. Fairweather** (1895). See also *The Background of the Gospels*, 1908, of the last mentioned. On St. Paul's conversion: **G. L. Lyttelton**, *Observations on the Conversion, etc. of Paul*, 1766, new ed., 1879; **E. Moske**, *Die Bekehrung des heiligen Paulus*, 1907. On St. Paul in Athens: works by **W. Lindsay Alexander** (1865), **C. Shakespeare** (1878), **E. Curtius**, 'Paulus in Athen,' in *SBAW*, 1893. See also **J. Smith**, *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*^{4}, 1880; **R. Steinmetz**, *Die zweite römische Gefangenschaft des Apostels Paulus*, 1897.

(3) BELIEFS.—**O. Pfleiderer's** *Paulinism* (Eng. tr., 1877) long did good service, but it may be said now to have been superseded by such works as **A. B. Bruce**, *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, 1894; **G. B. Stevens**, *The Pauline Theology*, 1892; **G. H. Gilbert**, *The First Interpreters of Jesus*, 1901; and **W. P. DuBose**, *The Gospel according to St. Paul*, 1907. It has, however, been hinted above that the best expositions of Paulinism are to be found in the works on NT Theology, which are numerous and excellent, such as those of **B. Weiss** (Eng. tr., 1882–83), **W. Beyschlag** (Eng. tr., 1895), **H. J. Holtzmann** (^{2}1911), **P. Feine** (^{2}1911), **A. Schlatter** (1909–10), **H. Weinel** (^{2}1913), **E. W. E. Reuss** (Eng. tr., 1872–74), **J. Bovon** (^{2}1902–05), **G. B. Stevens** (1899), to which add **A. Titius**, *Die neutest. Lehre von der Seligkeit*, 1895–1900. There are many monographs on special points such as the following:—On St. Paul's views of Sin, works by **E. Ménégoz** (1882) and **P. Wernle** (1897); on his Psychology, works by **W. P. Dickson** (*St. Paul's Use of the Terms Flesh and Spirit*, 1883) and **T. Simon** (1897); on his Christology, works by **M. Brückner** (1903), **H. Schmidt** (1867), **D. Somerville** (*St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, 1897); on his Ethics, works by **H. L. Ernesti** (1875), **A. Juncker** (1904), **A. B. D. Alexander** (1910); on his Pastoral Teaching, works by **W. E. Chadwick** (1907) (who has also a volume on his Social Teaching, 1906) and **G. Pahncke** (1906); on his Eschatology, works by **R. Kabisch** (1893), **E. Teichmann** (1896), **H. A. A. Kennedy** (1904). **W. M. Macgregor's** *Christian Freedom*,

1914, is a treatise on the theology of the Epistle to the Galatians. On the Style of St. Paul see, besides the works referred to in the text, **J. S. Howson**, *The Metaphors of St. Paul*, new ed., 1883; **R. R. Resker**, *St. Paul's Illustrations*, 1908; **J. Weiss**, *Beiträge zur paulinischen Rhetorik*, 1897.

(4) Personality.—There is a good chapter on the personality of St. Paul in **A. E. Garvie's** *Studies of Paul and his Gospel*, 1911. The question of the relation of St. Paul to contemporary religions and religious movements was brought into prominence by **E. Hatch**, *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches* (*BL*), 1881 (Germ. tr. A. Harnack, 1883), and later by **F. Cumont**, *Les Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, 1906, but especially by **R. Reitzenstein**, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, 1910. A very sympathetic statement of the results will be found in **B. W. Bacon**, *The Story of St. Paul*, 1905, and a criticism, not sympathetic but searching, in **H. A. A. Kennedy**, *St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions*, 1913. See also **S. J. Case**, *The Evolution of Early Christianity*, 1914. On the question formulated by **W. H. Johnston**, art. 'Was Paul the Founder of Christianity?' in *Princeton Theological Review*, v. [1907] 398 ff., see **A. Meyer**, *Wer hat das Christentum begründet, Jesus oder Paulus?*, 1907; **P. Feine**, *Jesus Christus und Paulus*, 1902; **M. Goguel**, *L'Apôtre Paul et Jésus Christ*, 1904; **J. Kaftan**, *Jesus und Paulus*, 1906; **A. Jülicher**, *Paulus und Jesus*, 1907; **W. Walther**, *Pauli Christentum Jesu Evangelium*, 1908; **J. Weiss**, *Paulus und Jesus*, 1909. On the relation of the teaching of St. Paul to that of Jesus there is an important work by **A. Resch**, 'Der Paulinismus und die Logia Jesu' in *TU*, new ser. xii. [1904]; see also **R. J. Drummond**, *The Relation of the Apostolic Teaching to the Teaching of Christ*, 1901.

JAMES STALKER.

PAULUS.—See SERGIUS PAULUS.

PEACE.—The etymology of the Greek word *εἰρήνη* is variously given as from *εἴρειν* (=Lat. *serere*), 'to fasten together,' or from *εἴρειν* (cf. Lat. *sermo*), 'to speak.' Besides the noun the following forms of the root occur in the writings of the Apostolic Age: *εἰρηνεύειν*, 'to keep the peace' (never transitive, 'to reconcile') (Mk 9[50], Ro 12[18], 2 Co 13[11], 1 Th 5[13]); *εἰρηνοποιός*, 'peacemaker' (Mt 5[9]), on which see below; *εἰρηνοποιεῖν*, 'to make peace' (Col 1[20]), *εἰρηνικός*, 'peaceable' (Ja 3[17]); for the meaning in He 12[11] see below.

The noun *εἰρήνη* occurs in all the NT writings except John, but the preponderant and most characteristic use is in the Pauline Epistles. It derives its peculiar significance from the OT שָׁלוֹם and cognate forms. In extra-biblical Greek *εἰρήνη* is strictly limited to its ordinary political and military significance, meaning simply the cessation or absence of war. It does not even cover the idea of 'treaty,' 'truce,' for which *σπονδαί* is used. The LXX puts *εἰρήνη* for six other words besides שָׁלוֹם (cf. שָׁקֵט in 1 Ch 4[40]). It is of prime importance to notice that in Hebrew and the cognate languages שָׁלוֹם is not a word formed for or originally associated with the cessation of hostilities. The root שׁלם covers a wide range of ideas, many of which have nothing to do with war and peace. The use of the word with a political or military reference is a later development. From this it must be explained that 'peace' in the OT has frequently a positive content, and that it is applied in many connexions to which it could scarcely have been transferred from its military use. Thus the idea of 'health' is not a metaphor transferring the notion of political soundness to the bodily organism. Nor is the meaning of 'prosperity' the product of the experience that political peace is indispensable to economic welfare. The root שׁלם denotes originally 'wholeness,' 'integrity.' This is applied to inorganic things, *e.g.* unhewn stones (Dt 27[6]), also metaphorically to such things as labour (1 K 7[51]), wages (Ru 2[12]), and spiritually to disposition (Is 38[3]) and sin (Gn 15[16]). Further, it is used of artificially produced objects in the sense of being unbroken, uninjured (Dt 25[15], Pr 11[1]). In relation to organic processes it stands for health (Gn 29[6]), and this, in part at least, gives rise to the employment of the word in the formula of salutation, although the wider sense of security of one's actions and interests in general enters likewise into this usage (Gn 41[16]). The Piël species of the verb has two main significations—the religious one of performing a ritual obligation (Dt 23[22]), and the forensic one of recompensing, *sensu malo* of punishment (Jer 25[14]) or of trade-exchange (Ps 37[21]). In both respects the transaction is viewed as an integrating process, the payment rounding off, rendering complete the votive state or the compensatory relationship. In dependence on the ritual usage the name שְׁלָמִים for one class of sacrifice will probably have to be explained, for these offerings were either votive offerings or sacrifices for thanksgiving in general. The Hiphil and Hophal forms of the verb are largely denominatives from the noun in its specialized meaning 'peace,' but they also signify 'to give execution to a plan or purpose'—again the idea of integration (Dt 20[12], Job 5[23] 23[14], Is 44[26. 28]). The political notion of peace itself goes back to the same idea, inasmuch as two parties become a unit in their relations towards outsiders or in mutual intercourse. Peace is not always the sequel of war; it may be in the form of alliance, the preventative of war (1 S 7[14]).

From the foregoing it appears that there was a wide, only partly political or military, basis in the secular usage for the positive religious application of the word. The peace which God gives or maintains for His people is 'integrity,' 'soundness,' 'prosperity' in the widest sense (Is 45[7], Jer 29[7]). Even when 'peace' occurs in antithesis to war the associations are not purely negative. The positive blessings consequent upon the cessation of war are included (Jer 4[10], Zec 8[10ff.]). Peace as a religious *bonum* applies to the sphere of nature as well as of politics, and the former as well as the latter plays an important part in eschatological prophecy (Hos 2[20ff.], Is 2[1-4] [=Mic 4[1-5]] 9[5. 6], Mic 5[5. 10-15], Zec 9[9. 10]). The idea of peace in relation to God Himself, in distinction from peace in other relations, given or guaranteed by God, seems to occur in the OT only in Ps 85[8] (but cf. Is 48[22] 57[21]).

In the NT *εἰρήνη* has a two-fold religious application. On the one hand the military-political usage is transferred to the religious sphere. This is done in two directions: firstly, with reference to God; and secondly, as between believers mutually. Peace is the antithesis to the warfare that exists between God and the sinner. As this warfare ('enmity') is an objective state and not a mere figure for hostile disposition towards God on man's part, so the peace is an objectively established and maintained footing, on which God and the believer associate together. St. Paul has with doctrinal precision correlated the ideas of 'enmity' (Ro 5[10] 11[28], Col 1[21]), 'reconciliation' (Ro 5[10. 11] 11[15], 2 Co 5[18. 19. 20], Col 1[21]), and 'peace' (Ro 5[1] 8[6] 14[17]). Although the subjective, emotional experience of an inner state of peace is inseparable from this *εἰρήνη πρὸς θεόν*, yet the word itself does not in these contexts express it, but stands simply for the state of justification. This remains true, even if the correct reading in Ro 5[1] is the subjunctive *εἰρήνην ἔχωμεν*, 'let us have peace,' for this cannot, any more than the *καταλλάγητε τῷ θεῷ* of 2 Co 5[19], relate to the cultivation of a peaceful disposition towards God; it must refer in both cases to the subjective appropriation through faith of the objective peace which God establishes in Christ. It is doubtful whether any Pauline passage has *εἰρήνη* in the purely subjective sense either of disposition or of experience (cf. Ro 15[13] with 14[17]). In Ph 4[7], Col 3[15] peace is represented as guarding the hearts and thoughts and ruling in the hearts. This must be understood of objective peace personified, and the result ascribed to this influence exercised by peace covers far more than a feeling of tranquillity. As applied to the fellowship between believers mutually, peace is a social conception, including the elements of harmony and organic co-operation (Ro 14^{19}, 1 Co 7^{15} 14^{33}, Gal 5^{22}, Eph 4^{3} [‘the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace’], He 12^{14}, Ja 3^{18}, 1 P 3^{11}, 2 P 3^{14}). In regard to Eph 2^{14-22} there is a difference of opinion among exegetes as to whether the reference of the peace embodied in Christ is to Jewish and Gentile believers mutually considered, or fundamentally to God, so as to include only as a corollary peace between the two component parts of the body of the Church. E. Haupt (*Die Gefangenschaftsbriefe*^{7}, in Meyer's *Kommentar über das NT*, 1897, pp. 78–99) has advocated the former view, but the other interpretation seems more in keeping with the trend of the passage and the expressions used. By being reconciled to God, each for their own part, Gentiles and Jews have now become reconciled together. In vv.$^{14.\ 15}$ peace denotes the fellowship between Jews and Gentiles, but in v.^{17} (Is 57^{19}) the peace proclaimed by the gospel is the peace with God, and the same idea is implied in v.^{16}.

The other branch of the NT idea of religious peace ramifies from the main OT stem. It denotes the spiritualized, Christian form of ‘prosperity,’ ‘security,’ ‘soundness,’ ‘salvation,’ associated with the word from its very earliest use. No doubt this was coloured, to the mind of St. Paul at least, by the consciousness of the peace of reconciliation existing with God, but its content is too rich and too positive to be exhausted by it. In this sense we find the word in the salutations at the beginning or close of the Epistles, usually associated with *χάρις* (Ro 1^{7}, 1 Co 1^{3}, 2 Co 1^{2} 13^{11}, Gal 1^{3} 6^{16}, Eph 1^{2} 6^{23} [‘peace and love with faith’], Ph 1^{2}, Col 1^{2}, 1 Th 1^{1}, 2 Th 1^{2} 3^{16}, 1 Ti 1^{2}, 2 Ti 1^{2}, Tit 1^{4}, Philem ^{3}, 1 P 1^{2} 5^{14}, 2 P 1^{2}, 2 Jn ^{3}, 3 Jn ^{14}, Rev 1^{4}). This goes back in the last analysis to the use of the word in ordinary social salutation, which in the OT already refers not exclusively to friendly intercourse, but also to positive well-being, including health and general security. In a profound spiritualization of this conception the formula had already been addressed by Christ to the disciples after the Resurrection (Lk 24^{36}, Jn $20^{19.\ 21.\ 26}$; cf. also Mt 10^{13}, Lk 2^{29} 7^{50} 8^{48} $10^{5.\ 6}$, Ac 15^{33} 16^{36}, 1 Co 16^{11}). The rich, positive content becomes apparent in such passages as the following: Lk 1^{79} (opposite ‘darkness’ and ‘shadow of death’) 2^{14} (=the complete Messianic salvation, because ‘peace on earth’ is parallel to ‘glory in the highest,’ which has Messianic significance, and because the men who receive the peace are characterized as objects of the Divine *εὐδοκία*; cf. also 19^{42}), Jn 14^{27} 16^{33}, Ac 9^{31} 10^{36} (=the object of the gospel-proclamation), Ro 2^{10} (associated with *δόξα* and *τιμή* as the eschatological reward for working good) 14^{17} $15^{13.\ 33}$ 16^{20} (the result of the conquest of Satan), Gal 6^{16} (‘mercy and peace’), Eph 2^{17} (content of the gospel-message) 6^{15} (‘the gospel of peace’), Ph 4^{7}, Col 3^{15}, 1 Th 5^{3} (the opposite of eschatological peril=*ἀσφαλεία*), He 7^{2} (Christ, like Melchizedek, King of Peace) 12^{11} (the fruit of righteousness consisting in peace; cf. Is 32^{17} and Ja 3^{18}). The general soteriological reference is also favoured by the fact that God is called ‘the God of peace’ (Ro 15^{33} 16^{20}, 1 Co 14^{33}, 2 Co 13^{11}, Ph 4^{9}, He 13^{20}), as conversely the peace is also called ‘the peace of God’ (Ph 4^{7}). In the light of this wider, positive conception it becomes probable that the *εἰρηνοποιοί* of Mt 5^{9} are not merely promoters of peace in the sense of reconcilers between man and man, but those who actively procure and produce peace (=salvation) for others.

It will be noticed that the prophetic picture of political peace among the nations is not reproduced in the NT. No doubt this is largely due to the elevation of its eschatology to a higher, transcendental plane. Pre-Christian Judaism, while making considerable use of the idea of peace, remains at bottom particularistic, whilst Christianity is thoroughly universalistic, although the programme of political peace is not explicitly enunciated in its writings.

The NT conception of peace offers no real point of contact with the Stoic *ἀπάθεια* and the Epicurean *ἀταραξία* (cf. 1 Co 7^{15}, Ph 4^{7}, Col $3^{1.\ 15}$). It is not psychologically conceived as in these systems, but soteriologically. The peace of the NT is not independence of outside conditions in the citadel of man's subjectivity, but the fruit of an objective real salvation with God.

LITERATURE.—Cremer-Kögel, *Bibl.-theol. Wörterbuch der neutest. Gräzitat*^{10}, 1912 ff., pp. 414–418; W. Caspari, ‘Vorstellung und Wort “Friede” im AT’ in *Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie*, xiv. 4 [1910]; A. Titius, *Die neutest. Lehre von der Seligkeit*, pt. ii.: ‘Der Paulinismus,’ 1900, pp. 90, 91; J. H. Thom, *Laws of Life after the Mind of Christ*, 2nd ser., 1901, pp. 9, 159, 172; R. C. Moberly, *Christ our Life*, 1902, p. 1; R. W. Church, *The Message of Peace*, 1895, p. 7; C. G. Montefiore, *Truth in Religion*, 1906, p. 147; W. M. Macgregor, *Jesus Christ the Son of God*, 1907, pp. 77, 165; H. W. Clark, *Meanings and Methods of the Spiritual Life*^{2}, 1906, p. 82.

GEERHARDUS VOS.

PEARL (*μαργαρίτης*, Lat. *margarita* or *-um*).—In ancient as in modern times women adorned themselves with pearls (1 Ti 2^{9}); the ‘woman arrayed in scarlet and purple’ was decked with them (Rev 17^{4} 18^{16}); and they are included in the merchandise of the apocalyptic Babylon—Imperial Rome (18^{12}). The pearl itself is a *lusus naturæ*.

> ‘The cause of pearl-formation is in most cases, perhaps in all, the dead body of a minute parasite within the tissues of a mollusc, around which nacreous deposit is secreted . . . so that, as a French writer has said, the ornament associated in all ages with beauty and riches is nothing but the brilliant sarcophagus of a worm’ (*EBr*^{11} xxi. 26, 27).

The ancient world obtained its pearls chiefly from the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf. For fine specimens fabulous prices were paid. The single pearl which Cleopatra is said to have dissolved and swallowed was valued at £80,000. The twelve gates of the New Jerusalem are figured as twelve pearls, each gate one pearl (Rev 21^{21}).

JAMES STRAHAN.

PEN.—See WRITING.

PENNY.—‘Penny’ (*δηνάριον*) is mentioned twice in Rev 6^{6}. The RV gives marginal reference to Mt 18^{28}, where a note states that the coin (which was of silver) was worth about 8½d. The American Revisers' note renders *δηνάριον* by ‘shilling,’ which more nearly represents the actual value. During the reign of Nero the *denarius* suffered depreciation, and its value was as above stated. In the time of Christ it was worth 9·6 pence, or roughly 9½d. (see *DCG*, art. ‘Money’). For its purchasing power, with special reference to Rev 6^{6}, see *HDB*, art. ‘Money,’ § 11. The *denarius*, or the *denarius-drachm*, probably underlies the ‘pieces of silver’ mentioned in Ac 19^{19} (see *EBi*, art. ‘Stater,’ with reference to Vulg.). At the higher value the total price of the books burned is about £2000.

W. CRUICKSHANK.

PENTECOST.—So far as canonical Scripture is concerned, it is only in the NT that we meet with this name, and that in three places—Ac 2^{1} 20^{16}, 1 Co 16^{8}. We also find it in To 2^{1}: ‘in the feast of Pentecost, which is the holy feast of the seven weeks’; and in 2 Mac $12^{31f.}$: ‘the feast of weeks being close at hand. But after the feast called Pentecost . . .’ In the last two instances the explanatory language reminds us that the term was comparatively new and came into use among the Greek-speaking Jews. Among Christian writers, Tertullian (*c.* A.D. 200) apparently is the first to use it as the name of a Christian festival (*de Idol.*

14). He simply took it over from the Greek as already used in the LXX and NT.

1. The name 'Pentecost' (*ἡ πεντηκοστή*).—It is hardly necessary to add *sc. ἑορτή* or *ἡμέρα*, as the word had already hardened into a proper name. It was so used by St. Paul in 1 Co 16[8] (*ἕως τῆς πεντηκοστῆς*). It is therefore an unnecessary refinement to translate it in the NT, with R. F. Weymouth, 'the Harvest Festival' (*The NT in Modern Speech*^{3}, London, 1909, *ad loc.*), or, still more cumbrously, with *The 20th Century NT*^{2}, London, 1904, 'the Festival at the close of the Harvest.' Pentecost was the feast of the fiftieth day. It is a colourless name, and, unlike 'Passover *or* Unleavened Bread' and 'Tabernacles *or* Booths,' it reveals nothing as to the nature of the festival itself. This is the case also with the Hebrew name, 'feast of weeks (*ḥag shābu'ôth*),' generally given to this festival (Ex 34[22], Dt 16[10]). It is true, the feast is also termed 'the feast of harvest' (Ex 23[16]), and, further, Ex 34[22] adds 'of the firstfruits of wheat harvest'; whilst, again, Nu 28[26] calls it 'the day of firstfruits.' At a very much later date the Jews gave to this festival the name of *ḥag ha'aẓereth* or *'aẓarta'* (Aram.), a term which in earlier times was applied to the concluding festivities of Passover and Tabernacles (Lv 23[36], Nu 29[35], etc.; in EVV 'a solemn assembly'). Apparently it applied to Pentecost as the feast which marked the *conclusion* of the harvest. The Gr. *ἀσαρθά* (a transliteration) betrayed Josephus into the error of supposing that this term itself *meant* Pentecost (*Ant.* III. x. 6). But the far more common name was the Feast of Weeks, and later still, the Feast of Pentecost. Under the latter name it still denotes both the Jewish and the Christian festival.

2. Origin.—The name 'Pentecost' takes its origin from the very ancient custom of carefully counting the days from the second day of the Feast of Maẓẓôth according to the specific injunction of Lv 23[15f.], where the fifty days also are expressly mentioned. Although there has been much dispute as to the exact meaning of 'the morrow after the sabbath,' it is generally agreed to treat the 16th Nisan as the day when the wave-sheaf of early barley was offered and as the day when they began to 'count the omer.' So Jos. *Ant.* III. x. 5: 'on the second day of unleavened bread, which is the sixteenth day of the month.' The term 'omer' = (*a*) sheaf, and (*b*) a measure of about 5$\frac{1}{10}$ pints (dry), though the identity of the term in the two senses is uncertain. This, in turn, has given rise to the question whether 'counting the omer' refers to the sheaf or the measure. In the time of the Second Temple, it would seem that the meal rather than the corn-sheaf was the offering. Josephus (*Ant.* III. x. 5) is explicit on this point. Yet Lv 23 seems equally clear in intending a sheaf.

Be that as it may, in the Dispersion of Israel both the sheaf and the measure have long since ceased to have any significance; but the counting of the omer goes on still from Passover to Pentecost to the very eve of the feast ('This is the forty-ninth day, making seven weeks of the Omer),' and secures the regular observance of the feast. Every evening at prayers in the synagogue the counting duly takes place, with the addition of the formula: 'Blessed art Thou, O Lord, King of the universe, who hast sanctified us by Thy commandments, and hast given us command concerning the counting of the Omer.' The brief ceremony closes with Ps 67 and a prayer that 'the temple may be speedily rebuilt in our days,' and, with still the backward look, 'there we will serve Thee with awe, as in the days of old, and as in ancient years.'

Thus is retained a relic of a long-past day. When the Jews were a people settled in their own land, an agricultural people, it was a comparatively simple matter to keep the festival as the procession of the seasons went on year by year. The Feast of Maẓẓôth marked the opening of harvest with the early barley crop; the Feast of Weeks marked its close with the ingathering of the wheat; the Feast of Booths crowned the cycle with the gathering of the vintage and the 'fruits of the land' (Lv 23[39]) in general. The climatic conditions of Palestine made those seasons timely and appropriate. The counting of the omer was a quaint expedient for enabling the farmers to appear at the central sanctuary at the appointed time for the Feast of Weeks. The primitive proclamation of new moon, which the authorities announced by messengers, who went through the land as soon as the faint sickle was seen in the sky, could not be relied upon in this instance. Those who dwelt in the borders of the little land would be belated. But all could count from 'the morrow after the sabbath' from the second day of Maẓẓôth, when the ceremony of waving the omer (of barley) took place. And all could arrange to appear on the appointed day at the end of seven weeks. But all this has long since become antiquated. The counting of the omer is entirely useless. Still the feast is celebrated in the synagogue for one day or two, but all that links it to the festival of the Pentateuch is the counting of the omer (though no omer has been 'waved'), and such dim recollections of a harvest festival in Palestine as can be secured by dressing the synagogue with flowers.

Because the tokens of the actual observance of this feast are few and far between, some have argued a late origin for it. But the *argumentum e silentio* is always risky. What is settled and customary may go on for generations without remark. The Law at any rate was very explicit: 'Three times in a year shall all thy males appear before the Lord thy God in the place which he shall choose; in the feast of unleavened bread, and in the feast of weeks, and in the feast of tabernacles' (Dt 16[16]). As an intermediary festival, however, and one lasting originally only for one day, there was an inevitable tendency to make the Feast of Weeks less conspicuous than the other two. Passover marked the beginning of harvest; Tabernacles celebrated the very crown and consummation of the year, when *all* the fruits of the earth had at length been gathered in; but Pentecost was a brief pause of joy and thankfulness for the close of harvest proper and the gathered store of 'bread that strengtheneth man's heart.'

This is seen especially in the dearth of commemorative matter associated with Pentecost. In connexion with Passover, *e.g.*, in the course of time there gathered a considerable number of historical associations, not only with the Exodus, but with all sorts of other great happenings in Jewish history, with or without foundation. Afterwards, however, and at a late date, Pentecost was supplied with one notable historical association, and it became the festival at which the giving of the Law on Sinai was commemorated. The special lessons of the synagogue for Pentecost are all designed to glorify the Law. Once the connexion was made, Talmudic authorities had, by the use of ingenious methods of calculation, no difficulty in proving that this indeed was the very time when this august event took place (Ex 19, 20). This association persists after Pentecost becomes a Christian festival, and provokes the contrast which Keble makes the basis of his hymn for Whitsunday in the *Christian Year* (London, 1904, p. 120). But see also long before this Jerome (*Ep.* lxxviii., 'ad Fabiolam' [*PL* xxii.]).

In the few instances wherein we have historical reference to the Feast of Pentecost there is one noticeable thing: stress is laid on its being a time when crowds were gathered together at Jerusalem. Apparently in the 1st cent. A.D. the festival was well kept as a *ḥag* in accord with the ancient legislation. Josephus refers to it more than once (*BJ* II. iii. 1, VI. v. 3; *Ant.* III. x. 6, XIII. viii. 4, XIV. xiii. 4). In those days of growing distress and oncoming doom, indeed, he says that the adversaries of the Jews deliberately chose such times when crowds were gathered at Jerusalem to work them some mischief. 'The enemy waited for the coming of the multitude out of the country to Pentecost, a feast of ours so called: and when the day was come, many ten thousands of the people were gathered together,' etc. (*Ant.* XIV. xiii. 4).

3. The reference in Ac 2.—Time notes are few and far between in Acts, so that all the more precious is this clear note of the day when so momentous and auspicious an event took place. At any rate, there is complete agreement with the repeated testimony of Josephus as to the crowds of people who were at Jerusalem for the festival. With naïve hyperbole the author records the fact that there were at Jerusalem 'devout men from every nation under heaven' (v.[5]). Not that all these were necessarily visitors who had come up expressly for the feast. It reflects for one thing the cosmopolitan character of the resident population of the city. Not a few devout Jews who were of the Diaspora found their way at last to Jerusalem to spend the remainder of their days in the vicinity of the Temple with all its privileges, and at length be buried in the land of their fathers. Perhaps also some were not without wistful hopes that the Messiah would appear. At all events, *κατοικοῦντες* (v.[5]) suggests a more permanent residence than a mere sojourn. It is equally clear, however (v.[9], *οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν Μεσοποταμίαν*, and v.[10], *οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες Ῥωμαῖοι*) that there was also a crowd of genuine visitors who had come to keep the festival.

The author even ventures upon an enumeration of the several provinces and regions whence they had come (vv.[9-11]). It does not seem clear that he had any principle to go on in this enumeration, save that roughly he begins in what must have been to him the Far East ('Parthians and Medes') and ends with the West ('sojourners from Rome'), and then adds, a little inconsequently, 'Cretans and Arabians.' It seems a little odd that 'Judæa' should be named between 'Mesopotamia' and 'Cappadocia,' and gives rise to a question as to whether there has not been some misplacement or error in the name itself. If 'Jews and proselytes' (v.[10]) is 'a summarizing touch' and the two types are mentioned as being 'found in all the regions just enumerated' (J. V. Bartlet, *The Century Bible*, 'Acts,' Edinburgh, 1901, *ad loc.*), it would be superfluous to mention that there were Jews in 'Judæa.' J. A. Bengel (*Gnomon Novi Test.*, *ad loc.*) says that (for Judæa) '*Armeniam* legit Augustinus: eaque inter Mesopotamiam Cappadociamque jacet,' and rather inconclusively adds: 'sed vetustam sane Armeniorum linguam sub alia quadam gente hic nominata innui existimare licet.' It does not appear what authority Augustine had for this, but it witnesses to early uncertainty.

It does not follow that St. Luke is to be understood as giving a careful specification of the regions represented, and it is of little moment whether we consider the list as 'an enumeration, not of languages but of provinces' (*Speaker's Commentary*, 'St. John and the Acts,' London, 1880, p. 363), or with Bartlet (*loc. cit.*) say with equal assurance, 'the list is one of languages rather than geographical areas.' For a comparison with Talmudic parallels see E. von Dobschütz, 'Zu der Völkerliste Ac 2[9-11],' in *ZWT* x. [1902] 407–410.

Much has been said at one time and another as to the particular day of the week on which the Feast of Pentecost *sensu eminenti* fell. Did it really so happen that that day was 'the first day of the week'? This depends on what day the 16th Nisan fell that year: and it is mixed up with the obscurity attending the day of our Lord's death (see art. PASSOVER). It is after all a matter of inconsiderable importance. But we have the strong tradition that Jesus rose again on the first day of the week: and more than that, we have the undeniable fact that Sunday became the Christian weekly holy day on that very ground. That of itself makes Pentecost to fall on Sunday seven weeks later. We know as a matter of fact that the Christian Church in the course of time established this commemoration on the Lord's Day as most fitting, whatever the actual day may have been, and we need not ask for more. In older Judaism Pentecost fell, like Passover, on all the days of the week as the case might be. A later usage has so far modified this as to avoid the observance of Pentecost on the third, fifth, or seventh days.

4. Nature of the event.—Much more important is the question as to what was the nature of the event which makes this day for ever memorable to the Christian. We must carefully discriminate between the wonder-element of the story, the strange and symbolic accompaniments, and the extraordinary change which most certainly marked the behaviour of the apostles as well as that of the first believers in general. It is, indeed, not impossible that so memorable an event should have been signalized actually by such phenomena as 'a sound as of the rushing of a mighty wind' and 'tongues parting asunder, like as of fire,' and that all should have begun 'to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance' (Ac 2[2-4]). At the same time, it is impossible not to see a close parallel to the circumstances which had heralded the giving of the Law from Sinai, which, as we have seen, was commemorated at Pentecost. In the course of time Jewish midrash and legend had considerably heightened these conditions (Ex 19[16ff.]; cf. He 12[18ff.]) and had added such particulars as that at Sinai all nations had heard God's voice in their own language and that that voice could be heard as well by those farthest away as by those nearest the mount (see Midrash on Ps 68[11], and Philo, *de Decalogo*). The resemblance is close and could not well have been accidental. But whatever may be said as to the manner of the narrative, however much the writer may have drawn upon legendary matter in the setting of his story, the main thing is to remember that the underlying and undeniable experience is that which is of supreme importance. As C. von Weizsäcker says (*Apostolic Age*, Eng. tr. i.[2] [London, 1897] 50 f.), the gift of prophecy 'finds expression, though in a peculiar form, in the narrative of the Pentecost miracle, which he has placed in the forefront of his history. The import of this event is revealed in the speech of Peter (ii. 14 ff.). It was the fulfilment of Joel's prophecy of the universal outpouring of the Spirit of God. . . . Now this is certainly the historical part of the narrative. The members of the Church felt the presence of the new spirit so strongly, . . . that they were confident of the fulfilment of Joel's words in their own time.' (On this and the whole subject of the *glossolalia* see art. TONGUES, GIFT OF.)

5. Pentecostal outpouring of the Holy Spirit.—Altogether too narrow and parochial a view has often been taken as to the Pentecostal outpouring of the Holy Spirit. A literalism which proceeds on the assumption that we have exhaustive information as to these events, and that all things actually occurred as they are described, has found itself again and again in sore straits when it has come to explaining precisely what happened. Thus, on the strength of an editorial note in the Fourth Gospel (Jn 7^{39})—*οὔπω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα*—coupled with some of our Lord's utterances reported in the same Gospel (*e.g.* 16^{7}), it has yielded but a grudging acknowledgment of the Spirit's presence and power in the world prior to this event. But we should gladly see in every gracious movement of thought and every outflowering of beauty, virtue, and goodness whensoever and wheresoever displayed, whether before the Incarnation or subsequent thereto, the working and manifestation of the same Spirit of love and light and power. That is quite compatible with giving full weight to Pentecost as ushering in a special manifestation of God's Spirit and an era which was to be peculiarly characterized by the activities and energies of that Spirit in revealing and deepening what is Christ's (*ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήμψεται κτλ.*, Jn 16^{14}).

Among the Fathers, when they proceeded to explain the coming of the Holy Spirit as a new thing and in special connexion with Pentecost, there was a strong disposition to lay stress on the miraculous gifts and give them the chief place, an exegesis which later found too wide a vogue. 'Visibilia illa dona, quæ initio nascentis ecclesiæ excellenter viguerunt'—so runs even Beza's note. Moreover, they too often limited the Spirit's dower to the apostles and their successors, a line of interpretation which at once went in flat opposition to the plain sense of Scripture and helped the development of a sacerdotal and sacramental view of 'Orders.' We meet with similar limitations still: 'The Holy Ghost came upon the Apostles on the Day of Pentecost' (T. B. Strong, *A Manual of Theology*^{2}, London, 1903, p. 325). But the whole assembly of believers, if anything is clear, shared in the enduement of power which Pentecost witnessed, as they waited 'all together in one place.' (For ample quotations in support, see J. C. Hare, *Mission of the Comforter*^{4}, London, 1877, Note H.)

Too much, indeed, may be made of such expressions as 'coming,' or 'descent,' of the Holy Spirit, as characterizing this day. It helps the perilous parcelling out of time and distinction of 'dispensations'—the dispensations of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit—which has found favour with many. This has little to commend it, is artificial, and can only be taken as generally signifying the progressive development of religion among men. Nor was Pentecost 'the birthday of the Christian Church,' as it is often called. 'Birthday' is an awkward term to use in such a connexion, and can be accepted only as a rough mode of indicating the beginning of the Christian community. But there was a church of a sort already existing (see Ac 1). The movement, in truth, did not lend itself easily to dates, and refused to be subjected to the precision and exactitude which mark the inauguration of merely human societies and institutions. This holy gift was bestowed on a church already in existence. 'Pentecost was a day of power, a day on which the Spirit of God manifested himself through the disciples as a power for the conversion of others' (A. C. McGiffert, *A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, Edinburgh, 1897, p. 50).

6. Significance of Pentecost to the primitive Church.—The after course of events makes it clear that Pentecost was a turning-point of great significance in the career of the little community. The chief sign was power to give clear and bold testimony to the truth about Jesus Christ—a rich gift of prophetic grace. 'As they waited and prayed, and pondered the sayings of the Master, and searched the OT Scriptures, the Truth flashed upon them—the Truth that was the Spirit's teaching therein, blending with the words and memory of the Master. Suddenly the darkness of their souls was illumined by the inshining of this light from heaven, their hearts were filled with joy, and in the new exultant confidence that came to them, they were "clothed with power from on high"' (W. L. Walker, *The Spirit and the Incarnation*, Edinburgh, 1899, p. 67). Looking back from his then standpoint, the historian could not adequately account for the actually existing and widespread Church, save through some Divine enthusiasm kindled in men's hearts by God indwelling and working in them with power and love. What could symbolize that 'Breath of God' more fittingly than the wind? What could more appropriately suggest the penetrative purifying power and grace than tongues 'like as of fire' (*ὡσεὶ πυρός*)? *The* miracle of Pentecost was that the little community should be transformed by the enduement of energy, illumination, and power, which is simply spoken of in the words: 'And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit.' That was a work of grace which was repeatedly experienced in the Apostolic Church (Ac 4^{31}), and has been witnessed since again and again. It is the mysterious outburst of a Power which never wholly leaves the world, however lifeless it may at times appear. As A. B. Bruce remarks, the Christian 'believes in the Holy Ghost, and in His incessant struggle for the birth of a better world. He sees in the great crises of history His action as a mighty *wind*; in quiet times he traces His blessed presence and influence as a still, noiseless, yet vital *air*, the breath of human souls' (*Apologetics*, Edinburgh, 1892, p. 69).

7. Pentecost as a Christian festival.—There is no sign whatever in the NT that the Church observed this season as a festival, or, as in the case of Passover, superimposed Christian associations on an ancient Hebrew feast. Epiphanius (4th cent.) interprets Ac 20^{16} as showing that St. Paul observed the feast, and either deliberately or loosely read into the text the verb *ποιήσῃ* (*Ἔσπευδεν, ὅπως ποιήσῃ τὴν Πεντηκοστὴν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ*, quoted in J. Bingham, *Antiquities*, XX. vi. 6). (Truly it is a substantially different thing to hasten to Jerusalem to *keep* Pentecost from hurrying to be at Jerusalem *at* Pentecost.) St. Paul had little enough to do with keeping festivals. Pentecost here appears as a mere note of time. Bengel's note *ad loc.* is to the point: 'in festo, magni conventus: magna lucrifaciendi occasio.'

The 2nd cent. passes (a period fraught with all sorts of problems for the Church historians), and in Tertullian we find Pentecost definitely referred to as a Christian feast, familiar and established (*de Idol.* 14): 'Non Dominicum diem, non Pentecosten, etiam si nossent, nobiscum communicassent; timerent enim ne Christiani viderentur.' A few sentences later he speaks again of Pentecost not as one day but as a period—'excerpe singulas solennitates nationum, et in ordinem exsere Pentecosten implere non poterunt' (cf. also *de Corona*, 3). And from the time when the scheme of distinctive Christian festivals came to be developed it would appear that the whole fifty days elapsing between Easter and Pentecost were called by the latter name (Lat. *Quinquagesima*) and were regarded as a time of joy and happy commemoration (see R. Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, IV. xiii. 7—'which fifty days were called Pentecost, though most commonly the last day of them which is Whitsunday be so called').

So anciently among the Jews the 'days of the Omer,' as the period between Passover and Weeks was called, being a time of harvest operations, was a time of joy. It is food for thought, indeed, that the principal feasts of the Christian Church should be moulded on a system so parallel with that of the Jews. How strange, if indeed we have here a primitive reference to nature and the great yearly crises of springtime and harvest, in such climatic conditions as those of Palestine, that these should gather new associations sacred for the Jew, and again in turn gather very different associations rendering them sacred in Christian eyes!

Ultimately Pentecost was limited to the fiftieth day from Easter Day, though, still later, festivities tended to prolong themselves over the week following; hence 'Whitsun*tide*,' suggesting an extended festivity rather than one day. As connected especially with that effusion of the Holy Spirit which marked the beginnings of the Church's history, the festival was pre-eminently from the first a favourite time for baptisms (Tertullian, *de Bapt.* 19).

As in Passover, the Christian Church for the most part took over the name of the festival from the Jews. It was Pentecost for both. But just as Easter replaced Pascha in English and kindred languages, so Whitsunday replaced Pentecost in England through Norse influence. Before the Norman Conquest the season was always known in England as 'Pentecoste.' The meaning of Whitsunday has been the subject of much controversy, but has been generally explained by a reference to the white garments of the newly-baptized. W. W. Skeat gives it decidedly as White Sunday, with this explanation (see *An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*, Oxford, 1910, *s.v.*).

LITERATURE.—Besides the works quoted in the course of the article there may be mentioned **G. T. Purves**, art. 'Pentecost' in *HDB*; **I. Benzinger**, art. 'Pentecost' in *EBi*; art. 'Festivals and Fasts [Christian], [Hebrew], [Jewish],' in *ERE*; **O. Zöckler**, art. 'Pfingsten' in *PRE*^{3}; **J. L. Magnus**, art. 'Pentecost' in *JE*; **A. Edersheim**, *The Temple: its Ministry and Services as they were at the Time of Jesus Christ*, London, n.d.; **E. von Dobschütz**, *Ostern und Pfingsten*, Leipzig, 1903; **M. Friedländer**, *The Jewish Religion*, London, 1891.

J. S. CLEMENS.

PEOPLE (λαός and ὁ λαός).—λαός (without art.) designates 'Israel' in Jude^{5} (cf. Sir 46^{7}, Wis 18^{13}), 'Gentile believers' in St. James's speech at the Council (Ac 15^{14}); the fact that St. Luke himself does not use λαός of Christians is justly regarded as a proof of the early date of Acts (Harnack, *Acts of the Apostles*, Eng. tr., London, 1909, p. 51). λαοὶ Ἰσραήλ in the prayer of the Church (Ac 4^{27}) is an interesting addition to those 'gathered together against the Lord and against his Christ' (Ps 2^{2}). In Ro $9^{25.\,26}$ St. Paul applies the promises of Israel's restoration in Hos 1^{10} 2^{23} to the calling of the Gentiles ('God, in reversing His sentence on Israel, embraces in the arms of His mercy all who were not His people, and says of them all, that they should be *My people* and *beloved*' [E. B. Pusey, *Minor Prophets*, London, 1886, p. 22]; cf. Ro $11^{25.\,26.\,32}$). In 1 P 2^{10} Hosea's prophecy is applied to the Gentile Christians of Asia Minor: they, before receiving the gospel, belonged to the most diverse races, and were not a people at all; now they are become 'a people of God,' even a λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν (v.^{9}; cf. Is 43^{21}, Mal 3^{17} LXX). In Tit 2^{14}, Christians are called a λαὸς περιούσιος—the LXX rendering of עַם סְגֻלָּה in Ex 19^{5}, Dt 7^{6} (see S. R. Driver's notes, *Cambridge Bible for Schools*, 'Exod.', Cambridge, 1911, p. 171, *ICC*, 'Deut.'^{2}, Edinburgh, 1896, p. 100). The occurrence of λαός (without art.) in Lk 1^{17}, Ac 18^{10} also deserves attention. ὁ λαός is the usual designation for the Jewish people in the religious or political sense (Mt 2^{4} 4^{23}, Jn 11^{50} 18^{14}, Ac 3^{23} 21^{28} $26^{17.\,23}$, He 7^{11}, 2 P 2^{1}). In Mt 1^{21} (τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ = τὸν Ἰσραήλ in Ps 129^{8} LXX) the apologetic purpose of this Gospel reveals itself as in 1^{1}—'Jesus the Messiah, who fulfils the promises to the house of David and the seed of Abraham.' ὁ λαὸς αὐτοῦ also designates Israel in Lk 1^{68} 7^{16}, Ro 11^{1} 15^{10}, St. Paul having in mind in Ro 11^{1} a phrase that appears in 1 S 12^{22}, Ps 93^{14} 94^{4} LXX. Israel's title, ὁ λαὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, is extended in He 4^{9} 11^{25} to the NT Church: 'it was a point with the Author to identify Christian Hebrews with "the people of God"' (A. B. Davidson, *Epistle to the Hebrews*, Edinburgh, n.d., p. 95).[*]

In the foregoing survey we see the designation passing over from the OT to the NT Church. The process was gradual. The idea would not occur to the members of the Christian community at Jerusalem, who continued to attend the Temple and the synagogues, that their kinsmen according to the flesh had lost their right to be called the λαὸς θεοῦ. On the contrary, they were willing to admit that the people and their rulers had acted κατὰ ἄγνοιαν in putting Jesus to death, and they looked for their repentance and conversion, which should bring in the promised καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως and χρόνοι ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων at the speedy return of their Lord (Ac $3^{17\text{-}26}$). But as time went on, and Jewish hardness and unbelief remained unchanged, they must have recalled such sayings of Jesus as those about the vineyard of the wicked husbandmen being given to others, and the supper that should not be tasted by the first-bidden guests (Mk 12^{9}, Lk 14^{24}). It is remarkable that while Jesus Himself occasionally referred to the Jews as ὁ λαὸς οὗτος, He never once spoke of them as the λαὸς θεοῦ (cf. *DCG* ii. 334). Jn 8^{39} reports His having denied that His opponents were true 'children of Abraham,' which reminds us of St. Paul's demonstration in Ro 3–4, Gal 3–4 that they who have the right to call Abraham their father are those only who believe God's promise of salvation as he did (cf. Ro 9^{7}). Another correspondence between this Gospel and St. Paul appears in our Lord's greeting Nathanael as ἀληθῶς Ἰσραηλείτης (Jn 1^{47}), and the Apostle's distinguishing an Israel κατὰ σάρκα (1 Co 10^{18}) from an Israel τοῦ θεοῦ (Gal 6^{16}; which *may* refer to the Jewish believers of St. Paul's circle, but more probably designates all Christians). In discriminating between circumcision as an external rite and the circumcision of the heart (Ro 2^{29}; cf. Ph 3^{3}) St. Paul follows the OT (*e.g.* Dt 10^{16}, Jer 9^{26}). It is true that in Ro $11^{17\text{ff.}}$ the Jews still remain the λαός, and the Gentiles are 'ingrafted' into the people to whom the promises belong, as the wild olive branch into the good olive tree—a comparison which Harnack thinks 'must have been very unpleasing to Gentile Christians' (*Date of Acts*, p. 48, note 2). But in 1 Co 12^{13} (cf. Gal 3^{28}, Ro 10^{12}) Jews and Gentiles are 'one body,' having received the same Spirit; and this fundamental idea is fully developed in St. Paul's later Epistles (Col 3^{11}, Eph 2^{14} $3^{6\text{f.}}$, Ph $3^{3\text{f.}}$).[†] St. Peter, without explicitly designating his readers ὁ λαός, applies to them all Israel's characteristics (1 P $2^{5.\,9}$), and says that it has now devolved upon them to rise to the high ideal set forth in the Law ($1^{15\text{f.}}$); with this we may compare St. Paul's warning to the Jewish and other Christians of Corinth (1 Co $10^{1\text{f.}}$) not to dally with idolatry, lest they should 'perish in the way' as their fathers did before reaching the promised land, notwithstanding their having had means of grace which corresponded with the two sacraments instituted by Christ.

Although we Gentile Christians are fully warranted in believing that the title of 'the people of God' is included in the 'all things' that are 'ours' (1 Co 3^{21}), yet we are forbidden by St. Paul's words in Ro $11^{1.\,2}$ 'to limit God's "*people whom he fore-*

---

[*] In Acts δῆμος denotes 'the people of a heathen city and more particularly when gathered together in the popular assembly (*e.g.* at Cæsarea, Ac 12^{22}; at Thessalonica, Ac 17^{5}; at Ephesus, Ac $19^{30.\,33}$)' (J. B. Lightfoot, *On a Fresh Revision of the English NT*, London, 1871, p. 80).

[†] Cf. P. Gardner, *The Ephesian Gospel*, London, 1915, p. 36.

knew" to a spiritual Israel, foreknown and predestined to be saved through their reception of the gospel' (E. H. Gifford, *Speaker's Commentary*, 'Romans,' London, 1881, p. 191). We believe that God accepts the הִנֵּנִי 'Here am I' of those who are called to rule over Jewish congregations (see 'New Chief Rabbi's Message,' *Scotsman*, Feb. 21, 1913).

Literature.—Much valuable information may be found in the works of Zahn and Harnack, both of whom have given special attention to the subject of this article. See T. Zahn, *Introduction to the NT*, Eng. tr., Edinburgh, 1909, i. 81, note 9, ii. 142 f., 253 f., 545; **A. Harnack**, *Expansion of Christianity*, Eng. tr., do., 1904–05, i. 60, 67, note 1, 80, note 2, 300, 315, 343 f., *The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels*, Eng. tr., London and N.Y., 1911, pp. 42, 45, 48, 56, 58, 63, 112. Of great interest is the statement of Harnack (*Expansion*, p. 344 ff.) that the designation of Christians as 'the third race' was 'perfectly common on the lips of the heathen in Carthage about the year A.D. 200.' He quotes Tertullian (*ad Nat.* i. 8.), who says, 'Plane, *tertium genus* dicimur.' The Greeks, Romans, and all other nations were 'the first race,' the Jews 'the second,' the Christians (with their spiritual God, their lack of images and sacrifices, and their contempt for the heathen deities) 'the third' (cf. p. 352). James Donald.

PERDITION.—The word *ἀπώλεια* is rendered both 'destruction' and 'perdition' in the NT (AV and RV). It is not always easy to say with positiveness which translation is preferable. Jesus came 'to seek and to save that which was lost' (*τὸ ἀπολωλός*, Lk 19^{10}), those who were still alive, not destroyed. Judas is called *ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας* (Jn 17^{12}), 'son of perdition,' and the same phrase is used of *ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀνομίας*, 'the man of sin,' in 2 Th 2^{3}, which is variously interpreted of the Roman Emperor, the Roman Empire, or a false Messiah (cf. Rev 13). The notion here is not the ruin wrought by 'the son of perdition' so much as that coming to him. In Ph 3^{19} the RV translates *ὧν τὸ τέλος ἀπώλεια*, 'whose end is perdition,' not 'destruction' as the AV, because *τέλος* is a future and final punishment. And yet in 2 P 3^{7} the RV has displaced 'perdition' of the AV by 'destruction.' So the RV has 'destruction' in the other passages in 2 Pet. (2^{1bis} 3^{16}). In 1 Ti 6^{9} *εἰς ὄλεθρον καὶ ἀπώλειαν* the RV distinguishes between the two and gives 'destruction and perdition,' but no consistent principle of distinction exists in the translation of *ἀπώλεια* in the NT. The advocates of annihilation and conditional immortality appeal to the etymology of the word *ἀπόλλυμι*. The advocates of probation after death likewise argue that there is nothing in *ἀπώλεια* to mean interminable punishment. The contrast, however, is sharply drawn in Ph 1^{28} and He 10^{39} between those who are saved and those who fall into perdition; cf. also Rev $17^{8.\,11}$, where it describes the state of eternal misery, the lot of those excluded from the Kingdom of God. The word is common in the LXX and appears in Aristotle, *Nic. Eth.* IV. i. 5, Polybius, VI. lix. 5, etc. Even when translated 'destruction' in the RV the word may still have the notion of eternal misery and not mere annihilation (see Destruction). But it must be admitted that the term *ἀπώλεια* does not decide the question whether 'perdition' is interminable or limited (see Fire, vol. i. p. 409 f.). We may well leave the problem of a second probation to God, after remarking that it has very slender support in the NT outside of the possible interpretation of 1 P $3^{19f.}$. The Christian preacher is on safe ground when he warns the sinner not to risk the vague chance of that alternative. The problem of eternal life or death is settled by the issues of this life. See, further, Destruction, Eschatology, and Fire. A. T. Robertson.

PERFECT, PERFECTION.—In the apostolic writings 'perfect' is the EV rendering of three different Greek words, namely, *ἀκριβής*, *ἄρτιος*, and *τέλειος* (the only exception is Rev 3^{2} [AV], where the RV rightly renders *πληρόω*: 'I have found no works of thine *fulfilled* before my God').

1. 1 Th 5^{2} is the only passage in which the RV retains 'perfectly' as the rendering of *ἀκριβῶς*. When St. Paul says 'ye know perfectly' he uses an oxymoron, for he is insisting on the *accuracy* of the information given to the Thessalonian Church as regards the uncertainty of the day and the hour of Christ's coming. The true meaning of *ἀκριβής* and cognate words is well brought out in the RV by such translations as 'accurate,' 'careful,' and 'exact' (cf. Mt $2^{7ff.}$, Lk 1^{3}, Ac $18^{25f.}$ 22^{3} $23^{15.\,20}$ 24^{22} 26^{5}, Eph 5^{15}).

2. In 2 Ti 3^{17} the RV substitutes 'complete' for the AV 'perfect' as the rendering of *ἄρτιος*. The repetition of the same word brings out the connexion between *ἄρτιος* and *ἐξηρτισμένος*: 'that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work.' In early Christian writings *ἄρτιος* is found opposed to 'lame' and to 'mutilated'; it is explained by Calvin 'in quo nihil est mutilum.' When perfection, in this sense, is predicated of the natural man, it is implied that no essential element of human nature is lacking. Similarly, St. Paul's ideal of the man of God includes his possession of every gift of grace necessary for the discharge of the duties of the Christian calling. 'If we ask ourselves under what special aspects completeness is contemplated in *ἄρτιος*, it would be safe to answer that it is not as the presence only of all the parts which are necessary for that completeness, but involves further the adaptation and aptitude of these parts for the ends which they were designed to serve' (R. C. Trench, *Synonyms of the NT*^{11}, London, 1890, p. 78). From the same root (*ἄρτιος*) is derived, with a strengthening prefix, the causative verb *καταρτίζειν*, which in the RV is rendered (*a*) 'restore' in Gal 6^{1}, 1 P 5^{10} RVm; (*b*) 'make perfect' in 1 Th 3^{10}, He 13^{21}; (*c*) 'perfect' in 1 Co 1^{10}, 2 Co 13^{11}, 1 P 5^{10}. The cognate nouns are translated 'perfecting' in 2 Co 13^{9}, Eph 4^{12}.

(*a*) When there has been deterioration or fracture, wear or tear, the idea of 'perfecting' includes that of *repairing*. Hence in Mt 4^{21} *καταρτίζειν* is used of mending nets, and in Gal 6^{1} it has the ethical significance of restoration to the right way. It denotes 're-adjustment,' and 'indicates the correction of an offender with a view to his restoration' (F. Rendall, in *EGT*, 'Galatians,' London, 1903, p. 188 f.). The word has probably the same significance in 1 Co 1^{10}. St. Paul deplores the existence of splits or schisms in the Church at Corinth; he therefore desires that its members may be 'well and surely adjusted' (*coagmentati*, Bengel); cf. G. G. Findlay (in *EGT*, '1 Corinthians,' London, 1900, p. 763), who quotes, with approval, Alford's note: 'the exact word for the healing or repairing of the breaches caused by the *σχίσματα*.' According to this interpretation, the Apostle is anxious for the restoration of the Church to complete harmony. T. C. Edwards (*1 Corinthians*^{2}, London, 1885, p. 17) blends this meaning with that of the perfecting of individual Christians: 'Their dissensions were beginning to tell injuriously on their spiritual condition. There were not only *σχίσματα* in the Church, but personal *ὑστερήματα*. "Let them, therefore, be fully equipped in grace, that so they may be reconciled to one another."' But even if the two meanings are not mutually exclusive, the primary appeal is for reconciliation, in order that the personal perfecting in grace of the members of the Church may not be hindered.

(*b*) and (*c*). The idea of 'completeness,' understood as implying the complete equipment of the individual believer and the harmonious co-operation of the members of the community, is dominant in the passages enumerated above. For the

Thessalonians' 'faith to God-ward' (1 Th 1^8) St. Paul gives thanks, yet he is solicitous for the perfecting of that which is lacking in their faith (3^{10}). In the same spirit the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews prays (13^{21}): 'Now the God of peace . . . make you perfect in every good thing to do his will.' Westcott's note (*Hebrews*, London, 1889, p. 449) on this verse applies to all the NT passages in which this aspect of perfection is described: 'The word . . . includes the thoughts of the harmonious combination of different powers and of the supply of that which is defective.'

3. In the NT 'perfect' is most frequently the rendering of τέλειος. Much misunderstanding would be prevented if due weight were always given to the root-meaning of this Greek adjective. It is derived from the substantive τέλος, which 'does not, as is commonly supposed, primarily denote the end, termination, with reference to time, but the goal reached, the completion or conclusion at which anything arrives, either as issue or ending, and thus including the termination of what went before; or as *result, acme, consummation*. . . . "It never" (according to Passow) "denotes merely an *end* as to *time*, a termination in and for itself; for this, τελευτή is always used"' (H. Cremer, *Bibl.-Theol. Lex. of NT Greek*, Edinburgh, 1880, p. 541).

In three important passages the RV renders τέλειος 'full-grown,' twice in the text (Eph 4^{13}, He 5^{14}), and once in the margin (1 Co 2^6). Mature Christians are contrasted with babes in Christ, as in 1 Co 14^{20}, where, however, τέλειοι is translated 'men': 'howbeit in malice be ye babes, but in mind be men.' The significance of this antithesis is clearly stated by Westcott in his note on He 5^{14}: 'A man is said to be τέλειος who has reached the full maturity of his powers, the full possession of his rights, his τέλος, his "end." This maturity, completeness, perfection, may be regarded generally or in some particular aspect. As compared with the child, the full-grown man is τέλειος physically, intellectually, socially (cf. 1 Co $13^{10f.}$, Gal 4^3); as compared with the fresh uninstructed convert, the disciplined and experienced Christian is τέλειος (1 Co 2^6 14^{20}, Eph 4^{13}, Ph 3^{15}, Col 1^{28} 4^{12}, Ja 1^4).'

The maturity of the Christian character is evidenced by the complete and harmonious development of moral virtues and spiritual graces; each must have its full fruition. The *faith* of Abraham attained its end in his actions, which were at once the proof of its energy and the means of its perfecting (Ja 2^{22}). In order that faith may abide the test, the Christian has need of *patience*; so long as he fails in endurance he lacks what is essential to his perfecting (Ja $1^{3f.}$). Moreover, as often as he stumbles in word he makes it manifest that he has not yet reached the goal; *self-control* is a sign of maturity and of the putting away of childish things (Ja 3^2). In He 6^1 (cf. 5^{14}) the forward movement towards perfection is conceived as advance in the *knowledge* of Christ.

Much more than the maturity of a single grace is implied in St. John's teaching concerning the perfecting of *love*. Perfect love is the best definition of Christian perfection; and how love is perfected is plainly taught in the First Epistle of St. John (2^5 $4^{12.\ 17.\ 18}$). 'In the phraseology of this Epistle, "perfected" love signifies, not love in a superlative degree, but love that is consummated in action. Bearing fruit in actual obedience, Love has been perfected: it has fulfilled its mission, has reached its goal. . . . The conception common to "keeping His word" and "loving one another" is the embodiment of Love in actual conduct. . . . The idea is that, not of qualitative, but of effective perfection; and τετελείωται might be translated more unambiguously by "fulfilled" or "accomplished" than by "perfected." That is τετελειωμένον which has reached its τέλος, has achieved its end, has run its full course. And the end of God's Love to us is attained in our loving one another' (R. Law, *The Tests of Life*, Edinburgh, 1909, pp. 212 f., 286 f.).

In Ph 3^{15} St. Paul includes himself among the τέλειοι: 'Let us therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded'; but in v.^{12} he says: 'not that I have already obtained, or am already made perfect' (τετελείωμαι). It is improbable that τέλειοι is a reminiscence of the technical term used in the mysteries to denote the initiated (cf. H. A. A. Kennedy in *EGT*, 'Philippians,' London, 1903, p. 457). The difference between the two words, notwithstanding their derivation from the same root, must be taken into account. 'In v.^{12} the Apostle is speaking of *absolute* perfection, such as would relieve him of the necessity of further striving. In v.^{15} he is speaking of *relative* perfection' (M. R. Vincent, *ICC*, 'Philippians and Philemon,' Edinburgh, 1897, p. 112). Here, as elsewhere, the apostolic teaching in regard to Christian perfection unfolds the implications of our Lord's great saying: 'Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect' (Mt 5^{48}). The context shows that the perfection which Christ exhorts His disciples to strive after is not the absolute perfection of God, but the perfected sonship which manifests itself in love for enemies and prayer for persecutors, and generally in such actions as are becoming in those who are sons of the Father in heaven, who 'maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust' (Mt 5^{45}).

The high tone of the apostolic teaching is sustained by Clement of Rome, who says (*Ep. ad Cor.* 49 f.): 'In love were all the elect of God made perfect. . . . How great and marvellous a thing is love, and there is no declaring its perfection. . . . They that by God's grace were perfected in love dwell in the abode of the pious.'

LITERATURE.—In addition to the works referred to in the art. see **W. B. Pope**, *A Compendium of Christian Theology*^{2}, iii. [London, 1880] 56 ff.; **O. A. Curtis**, *The Christian Faith*, do., 1905, p. 373 ff.; **W. A. Brown**, *Christian Theology in Outline*, Edinburgh, 1907, p. 411 ff.; **L. Lemme**, 'Vollkommenheit' in *PRE*^{3} xx. [Leipzig, 1908] 733 ff.; **J. A. Beet**, 'Christian Perfection,' in *Exp*, 5th ser., v. [1897] 30 ff., 134 ff., 211 ff.

J. G. TASKER.

PERGA (Πέργη).—Perga was an ancient important city of Pamphylia, on the plateau between the rivers Catarrhactes and Cestrus. Reckoned by Ptolemy among the inland cities of the country (Παμφυλίας μεσόγειοι [V. v. 7]), it had a river-harbour 5 miles eastward on the navigable Cestrus, about 8 miles from the sea (Strabo, XIV. iv. 2). It differed essentially from its rival Attalia, 12 miles to the S.W., in being a centre not of Hellenic culture, but of native Anatolian feeling. It was celebrated for the worship of the Queen of Perga, who came to be identified with the Greek Artemis, but who was really, like the Artemis of the Ephesians, a nature-goddess. On coins she is figured sometimes as a fair Diana of the chase, sometimes as a rude cultus-image. Her temple, the Artemisium, stood on the Acropolis, overlooking the city and expressing its faith. Perga was occupied by Alexander on his march eastward. A much-frequented northward route led over the Taurus into Phrygia and the Menander Valley.

Paul and Barnabas were twice at Perga in their first missionary tour. In their outward journey they landed at the river-harbour and went up to the city (Ac 13^{13}). Ramsay thinks that they intended to begin a missionary campaign there, but altered their plans on account of a serious illness—perhaps malarial fever—which compelled St. Paul to leave the enervating atmosphere of Pamphylia and seek health in the Phrygian uplands (*St. Paul*, p. 89 ff.). Conybeare and Howson suggest that, in any case, 'if St. Paul was at Perga in May, he would find the inhabitants deserting its hot and silent streets,' moving to their summer quarters 'in the direction of his own intended journey. He would be under no temptation to stay' (*St. Paul*, i. 199 f.). Before the apostles left Perga, a painful incident occurred. 'John departed from them and returned to Jerusalem' (13^{13}), either because he was displeased (as Ramsay surmises) at the sudden change in the plan of campaign, or simply because the snows of Taurus sent a chill to his heart and made him long for his Judæan home. At any rate 'he withdrew from them from Pamphylia,' without good cause, St. Paul then and afterwards maintained, 'and went not with them to the work' (15^{38}; see MARK [JOHN]). On the return journey Paul and Barnabas attempted some missionary work in Perga (14^{25}), but apparently it was brief and without marked results. Long the 'metropolis' of Western Pamphylia, Perga was overshadowed in the Byzantine period by Attalia. Under the name of Murtana it has extensive ruins, but the site of the ancient temple has not yet been discovered.

LITERATURE.—Conybeare-Howson, *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, new ed., 1877, i. 193 ff.; W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, 1895, p. 89 ff., *Hist. Geography of Asia Minor*, 1890, p. 415 f.; C. Lanckoronski, *Villes de la Pamphylie et de la Pisidie*, i. [1890]; Murray's *Handbook to Asia Minor*, 1895.

JAMES STRAHAN.

PERGAMUS, PERGAMUM (ἡ Πέργαμος or τὸ Πέργαμον; Rev 1^{11} and 2^{12} leave the gender uncertain; Dio Cassius, Pausanias, and Ptolemy have the fem. form, most authors and inscriptions the neut.; the AV chose the former, the RV the latter).—Pergamus was for over a century (241–133 B.C.) a royal city, and for two more centuries the official capital of a great and wealthy Roman province. Built on a huge conical hill, which dominated the broad and fertile valley of the river Caicus and afforded an extensive view of the Ægean Sea (15 miles distant), it was an ideal citadel in days of ancient Mysian warfare. Its historical importance began when the adventurer Philetærus, the agent of Lysimachus, made it the capital of an independent State (283 B.C.), which was raised into a kingdom by Attalus I., the conqueror of the Asiatic Gauls (241–197). For assisting the Romans in their struggle with Antiochus the Great, Attalus' son Eumenes II. was rewarded with the magnificent gift of all the Seleucid dominions north of the Taurus. The Attalids made their capital one of the most beautiful of Greek cities, adorning the Acropolis with stately public buildings, which they filled with treasures of art. The library contained 200,000 volumes, and 'parchment' is derived from Pergamus. When Attalus III. (138–133 B.C.) bequeathed his realm to the Romans, the greater part of it was formed into the province of Asia, of which Pergamus was the capital. The city could never be a centre of international commerce like Ephesus or Smyrna, for it was traversed only by inland byways of traffic, but its brilliant history gave it an indisputable claim to the primacy among Asian cities, and it was not till the time of Hadrian (A.D. 117–138) that Ephesus became officially what it had long been in reality—the administrative centre of the province.

It was probably towards the end of the reign of Domitian (A.D. 81–96) that Pergamus was described as the place 'where Satan's throne is,' 'where Satan dwelleth' (Rev 2^{13}). The words express a prophetic horror of some malignant enemy of Christ and His Church. Who is thus regarded as sitting in visible might and majesty on Satan's throne, by merit raised to that bad eminence? Christianity in Pergamus was confronted by three distinct types of pagan religion—the popular Asiatic, the cultured Greek, and the official Roman. The first was the worship of Dionysus and Asclepius, which may be traced back to the primitive Anatolian cult of the bull and the serpent. Asclepius 'the Saviour' had a great vogue at Pergamus under the Empire; his priests were supposed to be in possession of precious medical secrets, and his temple and curative establishment were thronged with invalids who came from far and near with expectations of miraculous healing. His symbol, the serpent, which may be seen beautifully engraved on many Pergamenian coins, was naturally a repulsive object to Jews and Christians, who associated it with the legend of Eden, and some interpreters have imagined that his temple outside the city was viewed by St. John as Satan's throne. But the sight of a multitude of sick folk—reproducing Bethesda and anticipating Lourdes—was more likely to excite feelings of pity than of wrath. The second type was the Hellenic worship of Zeus and Athene, assiduously fostered by all the Pergamenian kings, who wished to have their kingdom regarded as the bulwark of civilization against the hordes of barbarians. On a broad ledge of the city-hill, 800 ft. above the plain, in front of the temple of Athene, stood the great altar of Zeus, 40 ft. high, on a base adorned with reliefs of the gods in conflict with the giants; and some have supposed that as the Christians gazed at the smoke of sacrifice ascending from this altar, they exclaimed in horror, 'This is Satan's seat.' But the worship of the Olympic gods had, for all intelligent minds, long been a bankrupt concern, on which the prophet would not waste his invective. At any rate, neither of these types of paganism would arouse his *sæva indignatio* like the third. This was the worship of Rome and the Emperor, of which Pergamus, as the capital of the province, was the recognized centre. As early as 29 B.C. (Tac. *Ann.* iv. 37), Pergamus possessed a temple dedicated to Divus Augustus by the Provincial Synod known as the Commune of Asia (κοινὸν Ἀσίας). The city thus became the first Neokoros or Temple-Warden of the Emperor in the province. It was not till A.D. 26 (*Ann.* iv. 56) that Smyrna also gained the coveted honour of the Neokorate. In the reign of Trajan Pergamus became 'twice Neokoros,' and Caracalla (A.D. 198–217) made her 'thrice Neokoros,' which meant that she had now three temples consecrated to the worship of the Emperor, each with its numerous priesthood and pompous ritual. Now this cultus, which was the proud distinction of the city, became, by a refinement of ingenuity which might well be characterized as Satanic, an insidious temptation and a cruel dilemma to the Church. Emperor-worship, so hateful to every monotheist, was in the time of Domitian made a test of loyalty to the State. The refusal to utter the formula κύριος καῖσαρ, or to offer a pinch of incense to the Emperor's image, rendered the most peaceful and law-abiding citizen liable to be regarded as a traitor or rebel worthy of death. But to the Christian, the apotheosis and worship of Cæsar meant disloyalty to Christ and forfeiture of His eternal Kingdom. The issue was too clear to be evaded, and the Christians of Pergamus came through the ordeal in triumph. Antipas, Christ's faithful 'witness' (Rev 2^{13})—already the word μάρτυς begins to have the deeper tragic meaning—is probably named not as the only victim (as A. C. McGiffert suggests [*Apostolic Age*, 1897, p. 635]), but rather as the first of many brave confessors, both in the city and in other parts of the province, who proved the strength and genuineness of their faith by preferring death to dishonour.

There were, however, so-called Christians in Pergamus, as in Ephesus, who thought that a reasonable compromise might be effected. Their line of argument, though nowhere clearly stated, is not difficult to imagine. Nobody needed to take the idea of a divine Emperor too seriously. ‘For myself,’ said Tiberius, when it was proposed to erect a temple to him and his mother, ‘I solemnly assure you that I am a mortal man, and that I am confined to the functions of human nature, and I would have posterity remember it’ (Tac. *Ann.* iv. 38). May not loyal citizens, then, feel themselves absolved—even in the reign of Domitian, who takes his deity very seriously—from too great literalism in the interpretation of Cæsar-worship? It is a political far more than a religious affair, being indeed a mere glorification of Imperialism. One may offer the grain of incense, or utter the prescribed ‘Cæsar is Lord,’ with a degree of mental reserve; and if the Church, avoiding a stiff nonconformity, will liberalize herself so far as to demonstrate her loyalty, she will advance under the protection, instead of being thwarted by the hostility, of the powers that be, which are ordained of God.

But to the prophet of the Revelation—a passionate hater (2[6]) as well as lover—this doctrine is detestable, and against its time-serving exponents he declares open war (v.[16]). He calls them Nicolaitans, *i.e.* Balaamites (νικο-λαος being the rough Greek equivalent to the Heb. בלע־עם), for their compromise is a new and more subtly dangerous form of the notorious teaching and practice of Balaam. If the Church comes to terms with idolatry, if she yields to demands of a blasphemous Cæsarism, she will be unfaithful to her Lord, dishonoured and defiled. In the Imperial temple of Pergamus no Christian must ever bow down and worship. Conformity is here deadly sin. The Imperial power, as wielded by Domitian and inextricably bound up with his worship, is so far from being ‘ordained by God’ (a phrase used by St. Paul a generation before [Ro 13[1]]), that it is without hesitation denounced as Satanic, and thereafter branded, all through the Revelation, as the power of the Beast. The Church of Pergamus must learn to say with her Lord, ‘Get thee behind me, Satan!’ Let her realize that the weapons of His warfare are other and mightier than those of Cæsar. With the sword (ῥομφαία) of His mouth He comes to make war not only against persecuting foes without but against treacherous friends within His Church (v.[16]). Pergamus must, at all costs, hold fast His name, and not deny His faith. Only thus can she keep her soul alive.

The site of the ancient city has been thoroughly excavated, and the sculptures found, especially the reliefs in the frieze of the *Gigantomachia* (now in the Berlin Museum), are among the treasures of Hellenistic art. The other remains—palaces, temples, theatres, thermæ, etc.—all tell of a vanished *gloria mundi*. The modern Bergama has little interest.

LITERATURE.—Strabo, XIII. iv. 1-3; M. Fränkel, *Die Inschriften von Pergamon* (*Alterthümer von Pergamon*, viii.), 1890; W. M. Ramsay, *The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia*, 1904; Murray's *Handbook to Asia Minor*, 1895.

JAMES STRAHAN.

PERSECUTION.—1. Introduction.—‘For so persecuted they the *prophets* which were before you’ (Mt 5[12]). ‘If they persecuted *me*, they will also persecute *you*’ (Jn 15[20]). Jesus Christ traced the red trail of the martyr's blood throughout the history of Israel, which He sums up in the words—‘from the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zachariah’ (Gn 4[8], 2 Ch 24[20. 21], Lk 11[51]). He Himself was in the succession of martyrs, for the trail is deeply marked in connexion with His life. But the trail does not cease at the tragedy of the Cross. It is obvious that our Lord often warned His disciples in regard to the attitude of Jerusalem and Rome to those who would remain faithful to Him and His teaching. He could see the blood-stained track in connexion with the history of the Church. We must consider our subject in the light of this three-fold reference, so that we may see to what degree, and in what sense, the term ‘persecution’ is applicable to the attitude of the nation through its rulers (1) to her religious teachers, (2) to Christ, and (3) to His followers. When we deal with Jesus Christ and His followers we shall find Jerusalem allying herself with Rome in her effort to crush the New Teacher and His teaching, and finally Rome taking matters into her own hands, and devoting her whole energy to the extermination of what one of her historians described as a pestilent superstition.*

If we define ‘persecution’ provisionally as the infliction of suffering, whether it be temporary discomfort or death, upon individuals for holding or advocating religious views, and adopting or propagating religious practices, which are obnoxious to the community, or to those in authority, we shall have a definition sufficiently broad and comprehensive to cover the cases in connexion with which the term has been used. It may not be necessary for the persecuted persons to be active in the propagation of their tenets, although the strong conviction, which has generally inspired men to endure persecution rather than abandon their views, produces the missionary spirit. Those who inflict punishment on religious offenders may not admit the charge of persecution, as, according to them, the whole life of the individual is subject to the control of the State, and any and every activity comes under the law of the land. In the strict sense of the term, the infliction of suffering on account of religious opinions is persecution, if the adoption of such views on the part of individuals is not incompatible with loyalty to the throne or the secular power, and with the due discharge of their duties as citizens of the realm. From the point of view of the State, such punishment deserves to be described as persecution if the secular authorities admit the contention that there is a sphere within which the secular authority has no jurisdiction, and if nevertheless it punish those who use their freedom within this sphere. But the advocates of punishment in the case of religious recusancy deny the existence of such a sphere in the life of the individual, and therefore they do not plead guilty to the charge of persecution. In short, the whole problem is concerned with the assertion on the part of the individual, and the denial on the part of the State, that there is a sphere within which the subject is free, and must be permitted to follow the promptings of his conscience. When we consider, in its historical aspects, the relationship between the individual and the State, and when we trace the struggle on the part of the former to secure that measure of freedom which individuality presupposes, it becomes clear that there is a region which the individual claims as his own peculiar territory. For the annexation of this territory, and afterwards for the defence of it, Hebrew prophet and Christian martyr have laid down their lives, and the struggle has been continued throughout the centuries in many lands. It is being increasingly recognized that the individual has demonstrated the justice of his claim to the sole possession of this territory. Within this limited sphere he is free. To change the figure, whilst the individual admits the right of the State to enter the Outer Court and even the Holy Place, there is a Holy of Holies which is reserved for himself. There he deals not with the State, or with his fellow-citizens, but with God. As we follow the struggle for religious freedom, whether the struggle be with the secular authority or with a Church which has taken the place of the State, and exercises its functions, it is plain that the conflict is waged around this territory—the freedom of the religious man. Whether they are Hebrew prophets or Christian martyrs—Albigenses, Pilgrim Fathers, or Huguenots—the struggle is at bottom of the same nature, and for the same ideal. It will not be denied that various motives have been operative, both in the case of those who persecute, and of those who submit to persecution; for it is seldom that human motives are unmixed. Nevertheless the passion for religious freedom has been a genuine and powerful factor in all the truculent conflicts between the State or the Church on the one hand, and individuals or communities on the other who have refused to conform. It may be said that no other motive would have been potent enough to create that 'sheer obstinacy' of which Marcus Aurelius had occasion to complain in the case of the Christians of his time. But kings have been loath to acknowledge the right of subjects to decide for themselves how they are to worship, or what they are to believe. States have persecuted because they have refused to recognize the existence of a sphere in which men are free, and men have endured persecution because they have grasped, more or less clearly, the truth that freedom belongs to the very essence of the religious attitude, and determines its moral worth. They have endured great affliction, and taken joyfully the spoiling of their possessions, seeing they had *themselves* for a better possession. This better spiritual possession was conditioned by their retaining their religious freedom (He $10^{32.34}$).

---

* Tacitus, *Ann.* xv. 44.

2. Persecution in the OT.—In Mt 5^{12} Jesus Christ warns His disciples of the troublous times which await them at the hands of the representatives of Judaism, and reminds them that their experience will be a repetition of the bitter experience of the nation's religious teachers whom God had raised up from time to time, and whose writings indicate their growing insight into the nature of God and religion. To Jerusalem our Lord gave the hard but not unjust name of 'prophet-killer' (Mt 23^{35}, Lk 13^{34}). Stephen re-echoed his Master's interpretation of the nation's attitude when he asked 'which of the prophets did not your fathers persecute?' (Ac 7^{52}). Jesus charged His contemporaries with raising sepulchres to the prophets whom their ancestors had put to death (Lk 11^{47}). He did not mean that they erected expiatory monuments to the nation's martyrs. The sepulchres they built indicated their approval of the misdeeds of their forefathers. In the parable of the Vineyard He gave a similar account of the nation's attitude to her God-sent teachers (Mk $12^{3\mathrm{ff}.}$).

But it is obvious that the prophets were not simply men who suffered for their religious opinions. They were aggressive religious and social reformers. In their teaching they came into collision with the existing order of things in social life and religious custom. In the period which succeeded the settlement of the Israelites in Canaan the people adopted the gods and the religious observances of the original inhabitants of the land. The prophets of this early age advocated the sole worship of Jahweh. Moses impressed upon Israel the two-fold truth—Jahweh is Israel's God, and Israel is Jahweh's people. The burden of early prophecy was 'Israel for Jahweh' and 'Jahweh for Israel.' They were patriots rather than religious teachers. Patriotism and religion were identical. They opposed the popular tendency to worship the gods, and imitate the religion, of Canaan, as it indicated disloyalty to Jahweh. They were not fully aware of any profound difference between Jahweh and other gods, except that Jahweh was the God of Israel, and, as such, interested in the welfare of Israel and entitled to their undivided homage.

When we come to Elijah, we find ourselves on the confines of a new age. Henceforth the prophets denounced the existing order of things—religious and social. They ethicized theology and religion, and in their capacity as religious teachers they became inevitably social reformers, for the whole basis and structure of society were religious. The message they delivered became increasingly unpalatable, especially to those who were responsible for the existing State. The true prophets parted company with the false prophets because they would not 'fall in' and preach what was popular. In the time of Elijah the antagonism between the prophet and the throne—or between religious conviction and the secular authority—issues in open conflict. Elijah is more than a passive resister; he carries the conflict into the enemy's territory, and fights the throne with its own weapons. We have seen that Elijah, like his predecessors, advocated the sole worship of Jahweh. Ahab had married the daughter of the king of Tyre, and proceeded to strengthen the alliance between Israel and Tyre by introducing the worship of Melkarth, the presiding deity of Tyre. The example of the throne was a potent influence in the life of Israel. It was easy to persuade the people that the alliance with Tyre was not complete unless the Tyrian Baal shared with Jahweh the homage of Israel. The people were halting between two opinions. They were not conscious of any inconsistency or duplicity. If gods could help, the more gods they worshipped the better. There was safety in numbers. Elijah stemmed the tide and a strong party refused to follow the example of the throne. The conflict between Elijah and Ahab was not simply whether one god or another should be worshipped—Jahweh of Israel or Melkarth of Tyre. It was a clashing of two incompatible theologies. It is probable that Ahab would have recommended the worship of both deities. The tendency of the age was in the direction of religious syncretism. But from Elijah's standpoint it was a matter of impossibility to practise this religious dualism. We can trace in Elijah's attitude the germ of that exclusiveness which is inevitable when the terms 'right' and 'wrong' or 'true' and 'false' are introduced into religion. The line of cleavage is sharply drawn in the story of the prophet's life. Right is exclusive; truth is intolerant. It was absolutely necessary that the stand should be made and the protest raised. To Elijah 'Baal and Yahweh represented, so to speak, a contrast of principles, of profound and ultimate practical convictions; both could not be right, nor could they exist side by side. For him there existed no plurality of Divine Powers, operating with equal authority in different spheres, but everywhere One Holy and Mighty Being, who revealed Himself, not in the life of nature, but in those laws by which alone human society is held together, in the ethical demands of the spirit' (J. Wellhausen, *Isr. und jüd. Gesch.*^{3}, Berlin, 1897, p. 74, quoted in *Century Bible*, '1 and 2 Kings,' Edinburgh, n.d., p. 222). We must not be surprised or disappointed that Elijah believed in the use of force. Centuries must pass before the idea is fully understood that religion is voluntary, and that coercion is alien to its very nature. Elijah delighted in violent measures. He was at home in an environment of earthquake, storm, and fire. He met the king on his own ground, and prosecuted the struggle with his own weapons. Moral suasion would have made no appeal to the mind of the age, and it was only poetic justice that the prophet was able to turn the tables on his adversaries. It is not always easy to decide whether Elijah or Ahab is the persecutor, for both believed in violence as the only means to the end which they had in view. But we find in the story of the life and work of Elijah a religious conviction that is daring enough to stand up to the secular authority and defy its directions. Ahab's policy may seem to suggest breadth of mind, whilst Elijah's attitude betokens theological narrowness; but in this case the narrow way was the way of life, whilst the broad way was also the way of death.

But Elijah came into still closer grips with Ahab. He denounced the throne on moral grounds. He spoke in the name of Jahweh, and therefore in the name of righteousness. The prophet's predecessors identified the cult of Jahweh with patriotism. Elijah identified the worship of Jahweh with social morality. This was the new note which prophecy struck, and it occurs as a refrain in the teaching of all his successors. Elijah had the courage to denounce Ahab for his treatment of Naboth, and the prophet did so, not as a statesman or economist, but as a theologian. The religion of Jahweh issues in social righteousness. Ahab might worship Baal and steal his subject's private property. As a worshipper of Jahweh he could only 'do justly.' Jahweh's will was everlasting right. The problem raised by the king's seizure of Naboth's estate was not social or economical, but religious, for it fell within the scope of the religion of Jahweh. Ahab's conduct was not larceny, but sacrilege. It was not the violation of a social law as such that roused the anger of the prophet, but his defiance of the will of God. For Jahweh requires of His worshippers that they do justly (Mic 6[8]). When the prophet condemned the king's effort to legitimize the worship of the Tyrian Baal, or his unsocial conduct, he spoke in the name of God, and in the interest of religion. He was prepared to employ force himself, as he was ready to endure persecution rather than cease from condemning what he believed to be wrong or false, *i.e.* contrary to the Divine will, or from advocating what he believed to be right and true. We shall search in vain for a parallel fact in the whole Semitic world. In other lands the prophets were obliging courtiers and fell in with the royal wishes. We should traverse the Semitic world in vain for an attitude like that of Micaiah-ben-Imlah—'what the Lord saith unto me, that will I speak' (1 K 22[14])—when the king had given peremptory orders that he should fall in with his fellow-prophets. The latter received their reward in royal bounties, but Micaiah's message secured for him the bread-and-water diet of the jail (22[27]).

Elijah was the Wycliffe of Hebrew prophetism; the principles which emerge in connexion with the story of his life were clearly grasped by Amos and his successors, and fearlessly applied to the criticism of the religious and social situation of Israel and Judah. The prophets loved their nation and their country. There never were truer patriots than Hosea and Jeremiah. But they were not patriots of the common type. They would not preach smooth things. That was the privilege of the court-prophets whose message was inspired from the throne. The false prophet was concerned with the question 'What does the king want?' The true prophet was concerned with the question 'What does Jahweh your God require?' The latter was sure of his ground and of the Divine approval, as the former was of his reward and of the royal favour. The prophets thus came into collision with current theology, for they declared that Jahweh was not simply the God of Israel, but the God of righteousness, and they came up against popular religion, for they identified religion with the practice of social justice. Their patriotism was sincere and unmistakable, but they placed social righteousness above the mere continuity or safety of the realm or the mere practice of ceremonial religion. Their theology played havoc with the current belief that Jahweh was simply the God of Israel, as well as with the prevalent view that religion was ritual. If Jahweh was a moral governor, and if, further, the national life was totally at variance with the requirements of ethical religion, the expected 'day of Jahweh' would be *darkness* and not *light*—disaster, not deliverance (Am 5[18]). The power that worked for righteousness in national and international affairs would wreck any society which ignored or violated the fundamental principle of moral government, for the will of Jahweh must prevail. Their theology made the prophets preachers of judgment and destruction. The doom which they announced might be staved off by national repentance and reform, but Jeremiah, who had witnessed a religious reformation carried out by the throne, was forced to the conclusion that repentance of the true kind was beyond the reach of Judah. The nation's illness was incurable (Jer 30[12-15]). It was inevitable that the prophet should come into collision with the State. The prophet would not be cajoled, threatened, or silenced; his consciousness of the urgency of his message was such that silence, or even any modification of the truth as he perceived it, would be moral treachery. The prophet is necessarily insistent, uncompromising, intolerant, exclusive. To him the line of demarcation between the true and false—the right and wrong—is clear, and it must be recognized and enforced. The retort of the nation's official leaders to this fearless exposition of the demands of true religion was persecution.

3. Persecution of the Jews by the Seleucid kings.—It is universally admitted that the Exile introduced a new epoch in the history of the Jew. But it is easy to exaggerate the nature of the cleavage. There are no absolute beginnings in the history of nations. The student has no difficulty in discovering ample evidence of continuity in social organization and religious praxis. Nevertheless the post-Exilic period was a new age in the history of the nation. The religious leaders of the new age believed that the Exile was the judgment announced by their pre-Exilic predecessors. The nation had completed her period of servitude and made ample compensation for all her sins. Her iniquity was pardoned (Is 40[2]). According to the teaching of the prophets the Israel of God would be a nation which organized its whole life—social and religious—in accordance with the Divine will. Such a people would constitute a kingdom of God. It was the belief of the post-Exilic community that its national life was organized on the lines laid down in the Book of the Law. Judah had become once more the people of Jahweh; in possession of a Bible which embodied the will of God, and controlled her whole life, she stood over against the Gentile world, with its idols and superstitions. God was known and worshipped only in Judah. Pure religion was the sole possession of the Jew.

The rest of the world was without God and without religion, for the gods of the nations were idols, and their religions were superstitions. The post-Exilic Jew was conscious of his superiority among the nations of the Semitic world, and his tendency was to stand aloof in contemptuous isolation. In post-Exilic literature we can trace the universalism of Deutero-Isaiah and the particularism of Ezekiel and Ezra. The Jew owed no less to the universalism of the former than to the particularism of the latter his sense of superiority to the rest of the world. In both Judah occupied a central and unique position. According to Deutero-Isaiah it was the mission of Israel to convert the nations of the world and make the religion of Judah the religion of the nations. According to Ezekiel the Jew would come to his inheritance through the annihilation of the heathen. The one believed in the incorporation, and the other in the destruction, of the nations. The Jew found a solid foundation for his religious exclusivism in Deutero-Isaiah as well as in Ezekiel. To the former Jahweh alone was God, and Israel was His servant and His missionary to the ends of the earth. No God but Jahweh—no religion but the religion of Judah: a people that held that view dwelt alone in the ancient world with its easy-going polytheism and its indolent syncretism.

The result was that every conqueror found in Judah an attitude which he discovered nowhere else throughout the Semitic world, and he could no more understand the significance of it than the Roman Emperor at a later date could understand the attitude of the Christian believer. Other nations were prepared to fall in with the wishes of the conqueror. They were willing conformists, but Judah was an implacable nonconformist. 'You are the only people,' said Agrippa, in his effort to dissuade the Jews from rebelling against Rome, 'who think it a disgrace to be servants of those to whom all the world hath submitted.' Judah would not submit, and the reasons for her recusancy were not so much political as religious. Judah's nationalism was rooted in her religion. The cause of Judah was the cause of Jahweh. The Kingdom of God was identified with the kingdom of Judah. It is interesting to note that the nation's religious teachers in the past arraigned Israel on the ground of her eagerness to imitate neighbouring nations by adopting their gods and religious customs. It was during the exile in Babylon that the Jew thoroughly mastered the prophetic doctrine of the uniqueness of Jahweh and of His religion. Conscious of the nature of the possession which he had in his religion, he cultivated national self-confidence and self-reliance, which ultimately degenerated into national pride and exclusiveness. In exile the Jew learnt how to resist the pressure of a hostile environment, and the lesson stood him in good stead throughout the post-Exilic period, for the position of Judah in the Semitic world was precisely the position of the exiles in Babylon. The Book of Daniel, which purports to describe the situation of the Jew in exile, could not be otherwise than a powerful appeal to Judah in the 2nd cent. B.C. to imitate the heroes of the Exile and remain loyal to her ancestral faith and religion. But a nation like this was a disturbing element and a standing menace to the unity of the Empire to which it belonged. Most nations are conquered when their army is defeated, their territory annexed, and their independence taken from them. Nation after nation in the Semitic world succumbed to the domination of the Macedonian conqueror. But neither Assyria nor Babylon, nor Persia, nor Macedon nor Rome conquered Judah, for a nation is conquered only when her soul is subjugated. Judah retained her unconquerable soul. Antiochus Epiphanes, the most powerful representative of the Seleucid dynasty, made an effort to complete the subjugation of Judah by conquering her soul, but in his campaign he came across a stronghold in the nation's conscience—or her religious self-consciousness—which defied all his assaults. The invader possessed no arms to carry the campaign to a successful issue. Antiochus was an extremely able ruler. It was his programme to unify his Empire by universalizing Hellenism. Greek civilization was to be the tie that would bind together the different parts of his heterogeneous Empire. It was a magnificent scheme, well conceived and vigorously carried out, and the Emperor met with little or no opposition until he reached Judah. He did not persecute on religious grounds. The Emperor had no deep-rooted objection to the religion of Judah—except its exclusiveness. He approached the problem as a ruler, and his policy was the unification of his Empire by exterminating national religions. But Judah's resistance was religious and not political. Mattathias of Modin raised the standard of revolt, and the rising, in its initial stages, was inspired by loyalty to the ancestral religion. It ultimately resolved itself into an attempt to secure the political independence of Judah, for the simple reason that full religious liberty is a precarious possession without political independence. But it was the desecration of the Temple, and the attempt to force loyal Jews to sacrifice to heathen deities that roused the ire of the nation, and moved the Maccabæan family to defend the national religion. It is extremely probable that many Psalms date from this period, and the fierce nature of the struggle carried on by the Maccabees in defence of their 'nation, religion, and laws' is reflected in those passionate hymns which still throb with the intense feeling which the conflict roused in the breasts of the *Ḥasidim*, or 'loyalists,' who supported Judas Maccabæus in his campaign.

In regard to persecution on the part of the Church of Rome, Lecky writes: 'If men believe with an intense and realising faith that their own view of a disputed question is true beyond all possibility of mistake . . . these men will, sooner or later, persecute to the full extent of their power.'* This 'intense faith,' which accounts for the will to persecute on the part of the Church, also explains the willingness on the part of religious persons to be persecuted rather than abandon their faith. Antiochus Epiphanes was not actuated by any such intense faith in Greek culture. He was concerned solely with his dream of a homogeneous Empire, but Judaism was inspired by this 'intense faith,' with the result that the Jew, as afterwards the Christian believer, constituted a problem to the rulers of the ancient world. Seleucid rulers found in Judaism, as Roman procurators and proconsuls found in Christianity, an obstinacy which baffled all their efforts to secure universal uniformity. It was not an inheritance in the case of the Christian Church from the Jewish synagogue, but the outcome of the 'intense faith' which inspired Jew and Christian to endure torture, not accepting deliverance (He 11^{35}).

4. Persecution of Jesus by the Jews.—Irenæus called Jesus Christ the 'Master of Martyrdom.' The martyrs followed in His footsteps. In each martyr Origen saw the Lord Himself condemned. The true *imitatio Christi* was martyrdom. John calls Jesus Christ 'the faithful witness' (Rev 1^{5}), and Paul adds that He 'witnessed the good confession' (1 Ti 6^{13}). Our Lord warned His disciples that the persecution which He endured would also be their lot (Jn 15^{18}). It becomes, therefore, necessary to examine the opposition which culminated in the tragedy of the Cross, and the reasons which actuated Jerusalem and Rome in their combined resolve to compass His death. According to the Gospels, Jesus Christ was conscious of a growing premonition as to the issue of the conflict between Himself on the one hand and the Pharisees and Sadducees on the other, the representatives of the democracy and the aristocracy of Judæa. The Pharisees were the nationalist party, and carried on the traditions of the *Ḥasidim*, or 'loyalists,' who supported Judas

---

* Lecky, *Rationalism in Europe*, vol. ii. p. 1.

Maccabæus in his struggle for religious liberty in the 2nd cent., whilst the Sadducees were the priestly caste, and were willing to put up with Roman domination as long as they were left in undisturbed possession of priestly prerogatives, and especially of the revenues of the Temple. Jesus Christ could not miss their growing hostility to Him and His teaching, and the ominous closing of the ranks on the part of these prominent parties which otherwise had very little in common. The Pharisees were profoundly religious. Their religion consisted in rigid observance of the 'Law,' and of the 'traditions of the fathers.' To the religious zeal of the Puritan they added intense patriotism. But their religion was soulless formalism. They were not lacking in religious self-confidence. The Pharisaic Paul contended that in the light of the Pharisaic ideal he was blameless (Ph 3). They made a fetish of the Law. It had come from God, and contained a complete and final system of religious praxis. They were rigorously and exclusively Jewish in their outlook. There was nothing good outside Judaism. They were immovably opposed to anything and everything foreign. Among them the Messianic hope flourished. From their midst emanated the apocalyptic literature of the nation, with its dream of a glorious triumph for Judah. The dream of a world-wide kingdom troubled the long sleep of Jewish oppression, and occasionally the sleep was disturbed by a violent effort to realize the national ambition and shake off the yoke which weighed like an incubus upon the nation's soul. But the Pharisees did not fall in with the policy of the 'zealots' or 'Cananæans' or the followers of Judas of Galilee (Ac 5[37]). They shared the zealots' hatred of everything alien or non-Jewish, but they recognized the futility of rebellion. They were too well aware of the irresistible might of Rome. It was their mission to keep the national life Jewish, and religion 'pure and undefiled,' and God would appear on their behalf in the fullness of time and bring in the 'Messianic age.' It is evident that the Pharisees were keenly interested in Jesus Christ and in the claim which was being made that He was the Messiah. They would welcome any reliable evidence that the Kingdom of Heaven was at hand, and that the hope of the nation was nearing fulfilment. The Pharisees generally mingled with the crowd which followed Jesus, and they were not always present as captious critics. Their astonishment that Jesus ate with 'publicans and sinners' proves that they expected different conduct from one who was going to realize the Messianic ideal, and bring in the Messianic age (Mk 2[15]). They were on the same quest when they asked for a sign—some unmistakable evidence that He was the Divinely-appointed Saviour of the nation. Nicodemus was a Pharisee, and displays the Pharisee's interest in Jesus Christ and His claim to be the Messiah (Jn 3). But it was soon obvious to the Pharisees that Jesus could not be the Messiah whom they expected. He displayed no respect for the Pharisaic ideal, in either its political or its religious aspects. He contradicted the Messianic expectation as it was held among the Pharisees—viz. a great national hero who could and would bring in the Messianic age as it was understood by them. He also opposed Pharisaism as a religious system. He undermined their whole philosophy of religion. He was especially severe on their emphasis on trivial rules, and their neglect of the weightier matters of the law (Mt 23[23]). It was evident to the Pharisees that, if this teaching prevailed, the national hope was doomed, for the teaching of Jesus implied that the outstanding institutions of Judaism were not essential. They could all be scrapped as obsolete and useless. Towards the end of His life Jesus Christ makes no effort to conceal His contempt for Pharisaism. He condemns the Pharisee on religious, not on political, grounds. It was as obvious to the Pharisee as to Jesus that their respective teaching was mutually antagonistic. There was no hope for Pharisaic religion if the teaching of Jesus prevailed. Paul discovered in his own way at a later stage that Pharisaism and Christianity were incompatible.

It was only towards the end of His life that the Sadducees became prominent in controversy with Jesus. They possessed neither the piety nor the patriotism of the Pharisees. They were interested in the continuance of the Temple and its worship, as the Pharisees were concerned with the continuance of the Synagogue and its service. They were interested in religion only in so far as it involved the continued existence of the Temple where they found their living. They were immovably conservative, for they were anxious that the existing order of things should remain undisturbed. They were supreme in the Sanhedrin, and they were favourable to Rome as long as they were secure in the enjoyment of the Temple revenue. As friends of Rome, they were naturally afraid of the growing popularity of Jesus. They knew the Jewish temperament, and they knew the disposition of Rome. They were anxious that the religious and political situation should remain undisturbed, that they might continue to enjoy the privileges which Roman rule extended to them. After the raising of Lazarus and the impression which it made upon the people, the high priests and Pharisees were thrown into consternation, for they feared that the disturbance would attract the notice of the Roman representative, who would take away their place and their nation (Jn 11[48]). Jesus' clearing of the Temple roused the anger of the Sadducees, for it interfered with vested interests. It was this act that moved them to compass His death (Mk 11[15. 18]). The only restraint was their fear of the people.

The charge of blasphemy was often on the lips of His Pharisaic adversaries, and from the Jewish point of view the indictment was perfectly intelligible. To the Pharisees, who rejected the Messianic claims of Jesus, His utterances and His deeds were often blasphemous (Mk 2[7], Jn 5[16. 18]), just as to His disciples who acknowledged Him to be the Messiah the attitude of the Jews was equally blasphemous (Mk 15[29], Ac 13[65] 18[6] 19[37]). Any disparaging speech in reference to Jahweh was blasphemy, or any act which was disparaging to His dignity, *e.g.* Sennacherib's sneer that Jahweh was no better than the numerous gods of the nations which the Assyrian army had conquered (2 K 19[16]). The worship of Jahweh with the rites of the Baalim was blasphemy, for it degraded Jahweh to the level of Baal (Ezk 20[27]). Any irreverent allusion to any institution connected with Jahweh came under the same condemnation, *e.g.* Jesus' alleged reference to the Temple (Mk 14[58], Ac 6[13]). His violation of the sacredness of the Sabbath was of the same nature (Nu 15[32], Jn 10[33. 36]). When Jesus arrogated to Himself the right to forgive sins, He encroached upon the prerogatives of Deity, and He was guilty of blasphemy (Mk 2[7], Mt 9[3]). John adds that His assumption of Divinity was provocative of violent opposition. The high priest, at the trial of Jesus, put to Him the question, 'Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed,' or 'the Son of God?' (Mk 14[61], Mt 26[63]). It was a definite challenge whether He was the Messiah or not. The answer was equally clear and emphatic, and the charge of blasphemy was at once raised. The alternatives were clear—Jesus was the Messiah, or else He was a blasphemer, and as such worthy of death (Lv 24^{16}). This was the technical charge against Jesus, but it is obvious that His whole teaching was antagonistic to and subversive of the religious formalism and narrow nationalism of the Pharisee no less than the scepticism and worldliness of the Sadducee. But the Sanhedrin could not inflict capital punishment without the confirmation of the Roman governor. It was therefore necessary to put in an indictment of a different character in order to make sure of the verdict. The prosecutors held that according to Jewish law (Lv 24^{16}) Jesus was guilty of death, for He made Himself 'Son of God' (Jn 19^{7}). It would not be difficult to make out that His claims to be the 'Messiah' or 'King of the Jews' constituted not only blasphemy but high treason, and the Roman Emperor was exceedingly sensitive on the question of *læsa majestas* or high treason. The main object of the prosecution was to bring home the charge of high treason as the only indictment that would move Pilate to confirm the verdict of the Sanhedrin. Luke sums up the three points in the indictment. (1) Perverting the nation. This was a charge of seditious agitation. His adversaries knew what they were about when they suggested that He was trying to work up a revolt in Palestine. (2) Forbidding the payment of tribute to Cæsar. Jesus Christ had recently discriminated between duty to God and obligations to Cæsar, and His words suggested the existence of a sphere to which the authority of Cæsar did not extend. (3) Making Himself to be Messiah, king. The Jewish leaders raised the cry of blasphemy over the claim. It was the political aspect of the claim which they emphasized before Pilate. The insinuation of the mob, that Pilate would not uphold the authority of Cæsar if he released Jesus, stung the Roman governor to the quick and materially helped to get his confirmation of the findings of the Sanhedrin. It is obvious that, as far as Pilate was concerned, everything depended upon the significance of the Messianic claim made by Jesus, and accepted by His accusers for their own purpose, at His trial. In their desperate efforts to secure an adverse verdict the Jews were prepared to trample underfoot the national expectation of a Messiah—'We have no king but Cæsar.' They knew what charge would carry weight before the proconsul. It is obvious that Pilate was moved by the charge. The Jewish world at the time was full of unrest, and insurrections were not uncommon. The Jews repeated the charge, in their opposition to Paul at Thessalonica. They knew that would get a hearing from the representative of Cæsar (Ac 17^{7}). It is obvious that the Jews were actuated in their opposition to Jesus Christ by motives which were partly nationalistic and partly religious, whilst Pilate, the Imperial representative, was concerned mainly with the political aspects of the situation.

5. Persecution of the Christians by the Jews.—We have already referred to the fact that Jesus Christ prepared His disciples for persecution. He seemed to have a clear premonition as to the issue of His own life. He was equally certain that fidelity to His teaching would evoke the deep and implacable hostility of Judaism and of the Roman Empire. Their contention that the Crucified Jesus was the Messiah and a Saviour for all nations would offend Jewish nationalism, and the ethical ideal of the gospel would evoke the scorn and the hatred of the Græco-Roman world. Jerusalem and Rome would work together in opposition to His disciples, as they had done in opposition to Him, and for the same reasons. The unexpected manner in which references to persecution as the inevitable lot of His faithful followers occur in His speeches proves that it was ever on His mind. He met every situation that arose in the history of the early Church. Fidelity to Him and His teaching would be supremely difficult, but it would not miss its reward. He pronounced a beatitude on those who would suffer persecution for righteousness' sake—*i.e.* upon those who would bring upon their own heads the hostility of the world *on account of their adherence to His teaching*. Their endurance of persecution for this reason entitled them to membership in the Kingdom of God. Through their endurance of the hostility of the world without flinching or denying their faith, they would win their souls, and thereby prove their claim to be citizens of the kingdom of heaven (Lk 21^{19}). The vivid and constant sense of their belonging to another kingdom—real and abiding—would alone enable them to endure the hatred of the world; no other motive would be sufficiently strong. Persecution was the crucible which tested the faith of the disciple—its genuineness and its strength. Persecution would be the form in which the antagonism of the world—Jewish and pagan—would manifest itself. It would be a tribute to the reality of their faith. The believers would be sheep in the midst of wolves. But theirs was a life which wolves could not harm. 'Let not the lambs fear the wolves when they are dead' are words which are ascribed to Christ in an ancient homily (J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, pt. i., London, 1890, vol. ii. p. 219). Sanhedrins and synagogues—the political and religious institutions—of Judah would be arrayed against the disciples. They would be dragged before kings like Herod Agrippa (Ac 26) or Emperors like Nero (2 Ti 4^{6}) and Roman governors like Felix and Festus (Ac 24^{24} 25^{6}). Peter reminds his readers that they must be careful that persecution is due to their Christian faith and Christian conduct (1 P 4^{16}). Among the rewards of fidelity to Jesus Christ are 'houses . . . with persecutions' (Mk 10^{30}). We are not surprised when we read of the persecutions that many lapsed from the faith—the good seed was choked (Mt 13^{21}). But the true believer will face all the trials and sufferings of life (Ro 8, 1 Co 4^{12}, 2 Co 4^{9} 12^{10}).

Jesus' forecast of the future was fulfilled to the letter, and His disciples had not long to wait. The representatives of Rome did not appear on the scene for some time; the opposition came from the Jews. The earliest Christians were Jews, and the earliest form of apostolic Christianity was essentially Jewish. Its early exponents were only dimly aware of the full content of the claim which they made when they contended that Jesus was the Christ. It required many minds to bring out the full meaning of the teaching of the Master. The author of 'Acts' rendered a service in this connexion which comes next only to the Gospels and Paul's Epistles. It is clear that the burden of the apostolic preaching was the fulfilment of the Messianic hope in Jesus. *Jesus is the Christ.* The disciples never abandoned their belief that Jesus was the Messiah — viz. the Messiah of Jewish belief. 'We hoped that it was he which should redeem Israel' are the pathetic words in which two disciples express their poignant disappointment (Lk 24^{21}). 'Dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?' is the question put to Jesus Christ after His resurrection (Ac 1^{6}). The Crucifixion laid their Jewish hope in ruins. The Resurrection, however, brought about a renewal of their faith, but it had changed its content. The apostolic gospel was simply the claim that Jesus, who had been crucified and buried, but who had risen and ascended to heaven, was the Messiah. It is noteworthy that the Sadducees, and not the Pharisees, began the opposition to Peter and his fellow-disciples. It was the claim that 'Jesus was the

Messiah' that evoked their antagonism. As the movement seemed to spread at an alarming rate, the Sadducees feared a popular rising. They were satisfied with things as they were, and they were exceedingly anxious not to give any offence to Rome. They opposed the apostolic preaching, as they had opposed the claim of Jesus to be the Messiah, for they knew how similar movements had ended. The Pharisees took no part, at first, in the opposition to the new movement. This seeming indifference is quite intelligible. We have already pointed out that the Pharisees were greatly interested in Jesus and in the claim which was made by His followers that He was the Messiah. They were equally interested in the apostolic contention that the Resurrection demonstrated the truth of His Messiahship. The 'rising from the dead' had put the whole matter in a new light. The disciples themselves had temporarily relinquished their view that Jesus was the expected deliverer, but the Resurrection enabled them to recover their faith in a transfigured form. We are not surprised that many Pharisees were among the early disciples (Ac 15[5]). Gamaliel, a prominent Pharisee, counselled caution in dealing with the new movement. He suggested that they should wait developments and accept the verdict of Providence. It was a Pharisaic belief that history judged all movements. Gamaliel was willing to keep an open mind, and in this attitude he represented the more enlightened Pharisaism of the day. When they considered the question in the light of the Resurrection, there seemed nothing in the doctrine that Jesus was the Messiah which was inconsistent with the Messianic hope as it prevailed among the Pharisees. But they had not long to wait before they saw the significance of the new movement, and their interest was converted into determined and relentless opposition when they understood its true inwardness. The historian of Acts puts into the mouth of Stephen one of the most epoch-making utterances in the New Testament. Stephen was a Hellenistic Jew, and his early training had fitted him to grasp the universality of the gospel. Christianity was the true completion of the religion of Israel, and, therefore, the supersession of Judaism. It was the fulfilment of the hope of Israel. The religious teachers of the nation had tried to bring out the true nature of religion, but the nation, in the person of its official leaders, had offered continued resistance to the Holy Ghost, with the result that the religion of the prophets had degenerated into Judaism. In the light of Stephen's conception of the gospel, Jewish institutions were temporary; they had no abiding significance. They were not essential to the spiritual and universal gospel of Christianity. This speech contradicted Pharisaism at every point. Stephen was charged with speaking 'words against this holy place, and the law' (6[13]). He spoke 'blasphemous words against Moses and against God' (v.[11]). These accusations were inevitable from the Pharisaic point of view, for to the orthodox Pharisee the Law was a complete and final system. The charge of blasphemy had been brought against Jesus Christ, and the repetition of the indictment in the case of Stephen shows that the disciple had understood the mind of the Master. Henceforth the opposition of Judaism to the Christian Church is uncompromising and unbroken, and the martyrdom of Stephen was followed by the death of other prominent members of the Church. But the scattering of the Church meant the spreading of the gospel. There seems little doubt that refugees played no small part in the earliest missionary activities of the Church. It is hardly possible to exaggerate the opposition which Judaism was able to offer to the young churches which came into existence in different towns and villages in Asia Minor and in Europe, for throughout the Roman Empire there were large Jewish settlements. In connexion with the repeated outbreaks of persecution in various centres, the unbelieving Jew was the dark figure that stood in the background. There is truth in Tertullian's statement * that Jewish synagogues were the chief sources of persecution. The historian of Acts saw in Judaism the real opponent of Christianity. To him there was no other rival religion, for the heathen world was irreligious. Its numerous religions were not worthy of the name. To the strict Pharisee it was also equally clear that the real opponent of Judaism was Christianity. Judaism could hold its own against heathen religions, but Christianity was a powerful rival, for it deprived Judaism of everything except its nationalism. The Jew repeated, in the case of the Christian missionary, the charge which had been brought against Jesus. He knew that it carried weight with the representative of Rome. In Thessalonica they urged 'certain vile fellows of the rabble' to lead the opposition. The charge of high treason was insinuated in the words 'These all act contrary to the decrees of Cæsar, saying that there is another king, one Jesus' (Ac 17[7]). It was this charge that finally decided Pilate to speak the fateful word and hand over Jesus to His persecutors. Generally throughout the Acts, Rome, in the person of its proconsuls, is represented as taking on the whole a favourable view of Christianity. The brunt of the opposition came from the representatives of Judaism. But much depended on the temperament and character of the Roman governor as well as on the manner in which the prosecutors conducted the charge. The Jews in Corinth were not quite so alive to the possibilities of the situation as their compatriots at Thessalonica. The Corinthian Jews indicted Paul for urging men to worship contrary to the Law. Gallio replied that he was not concerned about their religious controversies. He would interfere only in case of crime or political misdemeanour (Ac 18[14. 15]). It is possible that the historian lays stress on the favourable attitude of Rome to the early Christians in order to impress on his Roman readers that there was no real incompatibility between the Christian religion and the interests of the Empire. The Christian Church felt the force of Jewish persecution in a peculiarly violent manner in the first half of the 2nd cent. when they refused to join in the revolt of Bar Cochba—the 'Son of the Star' (Nu 24[17]), who headed a Messianic movement. The Christians refused to admit his claim, and were exposed to the vengeance of both Rome and the would-be Messiah. To the Romans they were Jews, whilst to the insurrectionists they were renegades.

The Church of Pentecost consisted entirely of Jews who accepted the apostolic doctrine that Jesus — Crucified and Risen — was the Messiah. Apart from that confession, they remained Jews and retained their Judaism in its entirety; and we must not read too much into that elementary creed. Even Peter and John, not to mention their converts, had not fully understood the teaching of Jesus. But it is an astonishing fact that within half a century the leading minds of the Church had set forth the content of the Christian religion, in Gospel and Epistle. When the Jew perceived the universal character of the gospel, he became its relentless opponent. He was too much of a nationalist to accept a gospel that placed all nations on an equality, whilst his reverence for the Law would not permit him to believe that it could be superseded. His nationalism and conservatism made him a bitter persecutor of 'the Way.' There were two alternatives for the Jew—*conversion* or *persecution.*

---

* *Scorp.* 10.

He had a profound reverence for the Torah. It was complete and final. The orthodox Jew believed that the world would be saved by being Judaized, as the Christian preacher believed it would be saved by being evangelized. Judaism was not one religion among many—it was *the* religion. The Jew claimed for Judaism what the Christian apologist claimed for Christianity—finality and absoluteness. The Jew had to embrace Christianity or oppose it by every means at his disposal. Both Judaism and Christianity were exclusive religions. The Jew who refused to be converted must have possessed that 'intense faith' in which Lecky has discovered the origin of persecution. The Christian religion also produced a faith which counted it all joy to suffer for righteousness' sake. It was this exclusiveness and sense of superiority which made Judah the best hated nation in the ancient world; but for the same reason the Christian Church won the bitter hatred of the Græco-Roman world with its indolent syncretism and low ethical ideals. It has been maintained that persecution in the strict sense of the term originated within Judaism, and in this doctrine of exclusiveness, inasmuch as the Jew persecuted Christians solely for their religious views—*i.e.* for heresy, and for no other reason. But there was a close intermingling of religious and political motives, and in Judah especially nationalism and religion were closely associated.

6. The attitude of Rome to Christianity.—The representatives of Rome paid little or no attention to the 'new and magical superstition' which had sprung up in Judah. To them Christianity was simply a Jewish movement. But they were alive to the possibilities of the movement and were always on the look-out for political developments in connexion with any religious agitation. Rome was familiar with 'Messianic' risings in Palestine, and the Jew never missed an opportunity of laying before the Emperor a charge of disloyalty against Christians. It was the only way to overcome the apparent apathy of Rome. Throughout Acts, Rome is represented, in the person of her proconsuls, as indifferent to the quarrels between Christian missionaries and their Jewish adversaries (Ac $18^{14.15}$ 25^{19}). The attitude of Pilate to Jesus was typical of the attitude of Roman governors to His followers. They were interested in religious doctrines in the light of their influence on individuals as subjects of the Empire. They were often guilty of gross indifference. The Jews relied on the apathy of Roman governors and frequently took matters into their own hands. It is admitted that the Empire possessed a magnificent system of law. But it is easy to indulge in exaggerated language in regard to the administration of law, especially in remote parts of the Empire. Roman governors frequently turned their blind eye to the sufferings inflicted on Christians by their Jewish or pagan persecutors.

It is obvious that for some time Rome looked upon the followers of Christ as a Jewish sect. In so far as the representative of Rome had condemned Jesus on political grounds, it would follow that His disciples would experience similar treatment at the hands of Imperial governors. It is interesting in this connexion to consider the account which the Roman historian gives of the movement. According to Tacitus, the founder of the sect, *Chrestus* by name, had been condemned by Pontius Pilate in the reign of Tiberius. His followers were vulgarly called 'Christians.' They were universally hated on account of the abominable deeds of which they were guilty, and their hatred of the human race. The execution of their leader gave a temporary check to the pestilent superstition. But it broke out afresh, and extended to Rome, where everything that is vile and scandalous accumulated.* The historian gives the ordinary Roman view. Christians were simply Christ's faction. The attitude of Pilate to the Founder of the sect should also be the attitude of Rome to His followers—an attitude of contempt mixed with hatred. In view of this fact the question arises how it came about that Rome ultimately became such an implacable enemy of the 'pestilent superstition,' which at first seemed to be beneath contempt.

In religion Rome practised ample tolerance. This does not mean that Roman Emperors favoured religious liberty or freedom of conscience. Centuries must elapse before governments will be found to admit the rights of individuals in religion, or even of States which form parts of a larger Empire, although Jesus Christ did suggest a sphere within which Cæsar could exercise no jurisdiction. But Roman Emperors would not admit that view, for the power of the State, in the person of the ruler, was absolute, and it covered all the activities of life. Nevertheless it was the policy of Rome to allow conquered States to retain their gods and their religious customs, in so far as the free exercise of their ancestral religion or their worship of their national deities did not interfere with loyalty to the Empire, and especially with their willingness to pay homage to the Emperor by sacrificing in his name. Rome's interest in religion was entirely political. It was the continuance and stability of the Empire that concerned Rome and her rulers. Religions were tolerated and encouraged in so far as they promoted tranquillity and good order. 'The various modes of worship which prevailed in the Roman world were all considered by the people as equally true; by the philosopher as equally false; and by the magistrate as equally useful.'* The toleration of local or national religions was part of Rome's method of governing her extensive dominions. 'The Jews,' wrote Celsus, 'are not to be blamed, because each man ought to live according to the custom of his country; but the Christians have forsaken their national rites for the doctrine of Christ.'†

Rome permitted the worship of national gods and the continuance of national cults. But there was no religious liberty in this apparent tolerance. The gods worshipped and the cults practised in different parts of the Empire had to receive the Imperial sanction. Cicero‡ remarks that the worship of gods which had not been recognized by law was a punishable offence. No religion had any standing until it received the Imperial imprimatur. No gods could be worshipped unless they were 'publice adsciti.' The State's approval was necessary. Christianity was not a national faith, and for a time it did not secure the Imperial sanction. In the former sense it was a unique phenomenon within the Empire. It seems that for a time Christianity enjoyed the privileges which had been extended to Judaism as a national religion. Judaism had been treated with exceptional favour, for the Jew was exempted from the worship of the Emperor. It was a concession to Jewish monotheism. But the open rupture between Judaism and Christianity which was manifest to the world by the middle of the century, and the persistent persecution of Christians by Jews, compelled Rome to inquire into the meaning of the new movement. The Empire tolerated old and national religions, but Christianity was a thing of yesterday, and belonged to no nation, but embraced all peoples. As such Christianity stood outside the law of the Empire. It created divisions in every nation, and town, and family. Judaism was the religion of the Jews, but Christianity gathered or created its own clientele. John saw 'a great multitude, which no man could number, out of every nation, and of all tribes and peoples and tongues' (Rev 7^{9}). That was the condemnation of the Christian religion in the opinion of Imperial Rome. The first edict of toleration (A.D. 311) cast in the face of the Christian religion that it had 'collected a various society from the different provinces of the Empire.' Christianity, because of its non-national or international character, was divisive and anarchical, although, when rightly understood, the gospel supplied the universal religion and formed the bond of union which made of all nations a world-wide brotherhood.

---

* Tacitus, *Ann.* xv. 44.

* E. Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. J. B. Bury, 7 vols., London, 1901–1906, i.^{4} 28.

† Origen, *c. Celsum*, v. 25.

‡ *De Legibus*, ii. 8.

What Judaism was in the pre-Christian world, Christianity was in the Roman Empire—an exclusive religion. From the very start Christianity was proclaimed as the religion of fulfilment. It was final and absolute—'and in none other is there salvation; for neither is there any other name under heaven that is given among men, wherein we must be saved' (Ac 4^{12}). Peter stated in the name of Christianity what every orthodox Jew would have claimed for Judaism. Christianity was essentially exclusive and intolerant. The apostles proclaimed one God—the Father of their Lord Jesus Christ. They preached one Saviour—the Crucified Christ. There was only one religion—and that was Christianity. When Jesus stated that He was 'the way, the truth, and the life' (Jn 14^{6}), it became impossible for His disciples to be tolerant of any other religion, for tolerance would be treachery. We have already traced the germ of this antagonism between the true and the false in the teaching of Elijah, who maintained that Jahweh and Baal were mutually exclusive, and it developed into the religion of post-Exilic Judah. Paul had stated the Christian attitude—'Though there be that are called gods, . . . to us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we unto him; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through him' (1 Co 8$^{5f.}$). The Christian who worshipped the 'God and Father of the Lord Jesus Christ' could not fall in with the prevalent syncretism which implied that every god was as good as another, and every religion a matter of nationality. The Empire had experienced the same exclusiveness in the case of Judah, and had, in the interest of tranquillity, made allowance for it by extending to the Jew privileges which were denied to every other dependent people. But Judaism could advance the plea that it was a national religion. Roman Emperors had found it necessary to legislate against aggressive missionary activity whether on the part of Jews or Christians. The Pharisees compassed sea and land to make one proselyte, whilst the Christian Church from the beginning displayed unparalleled missionary zeal, and for a considerable period there was no abatement in its enthusiasm. Marcus Aurelius published an edict against those who caused tumults by introducing new worships, whilst a succeeding Emperor prohibited Christians and Jews from making converts.

When we bear in mind the missionary zeal of the early Church, and the tremendous religious conviction which it presupposes, it seems an extraordinary thing that the charge of atheism was brought against the Christians. But it is quite intelligible from the point of view of the prevalent polytheism. The Christians refused to worship any of the gods of the Græco-Roman world. Whereas the literature of the age suggests that religion was a diminishing force in the life of the Empire, it is universally admitted that the gods were very real beings to the masses. Even among the upper classes there was more affectation than conviction in the scepticism which they aired. Despite the contemptuous references to the superstitions which prevailed in different parts of the Empire, the genuine Roman was steeped in superstition. Paul might justly have said of the Empire what he said of Athens—'I perceive that ye are somewhat religious' (Ac 17^{22}). The whole Roman world was 'unusually addicted to the worship of divinities.'* It was inevitable that heathen worshippers should call Christians 'atheists,' for they refused to recognize their gods, and their refusal implied disbelief in their existence, or at any rate in their power. Not only did Christians refuse to take part, on the occasion of great public festivals, in the cult of the gods, but their religion seemed to lack all the visible symbols of religion. The spiritual religion of the Christian was no religion to the masses in Roman towns. How could religion without temples, altars, sacrifices, possess any value? It also happened that imprudent enthusiasts showed little respect for the altars and the temples of the gods. Their conduct was sacrilege, and sacrilege and atheism were synonymous terms. Polytheism prevailed throughout the Empire, and in such a world the uncompromising monotheism of Christians was atheism, for it denied the existence of the numerous gods which were worshipped in different parts of the Empire. Paul had already said that 'the things which the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to devils and not to God' (1 Co 10^{20}). The representative of paganism in the Apology of Minucius Felix states in regard to Christians: 'They despise the temples as dead houses; they scorn the gods; they mock sacred things.'† Their Christianity required that attitude, but it gave point to the charge of atheism, for the masses believed in gods, but not in God.

But the patriotic Roman accused Christians of atheism for another reason, and here atheism implied treason to the Empire, or *lèse-majesté*. Rome tolerated the worship of various gods, but this tolerance was simply political expediency. The result was a vast heterogeneous Empire consisting of various races, with various religions held together as much by the universal dread of the Roman army as by the widespread respect for Roman justice. Another bond of union, religious in character, was necessary to secure the unity of the Empire. The 'genius of the Roman people' was an object of worship as far back as the 3rd cent. in the history of Rome. It combined religion and patriotism. When the Roman Empire was established, and the powers of the State were centred in the Emperor, the cult of 'the genius of the Roman people' became the worship of Cæsar. Cæsar-worship became the Imperial religion; '"it was the spiritual symbol of the political union,"'‡ and as such it formed a test of loyalty. Antiochus Epiphanes ruled over a similar, but smaller Empire. He endeavoured to solve the problem by stamping out national customs and universalizing Greek culture. Rome allowed national cults to remain, but demanded on the part of each conquered people the cult of the Emperor. The eastern part of the Empire welcomed this Imperial religion; towns vied with each other in erecting temples to Cæsar, and in holding religious festivals in honour of the Imperial divinity. But the Jew was exempted; the proposal of Caligula to place his statue in the Temple roused fierce opposition, and the Emperor was forced to abandon his plan. It was in connexion with these religious celebrations that outbreaks of popular persecution occurred. It may be assumed that the authorities looked on with acquiescence, for the martyrs had refused to join in the worship of the Beast (Rev 2^{13} 13$^{8.15}$). Rome required an act of idolatry as evidence of loyalty to the Empire. To that Imperial rule Christians would not conform. 'For the Christian there was but one Lord and Master, to whom he owned supreme allegiance; this he was prepared to prove by the renunciation of all things, even life itself. For the Christian the unity of the race was symbolized not by a Tiberius or a Marcus Aurelius, but by the incarnation of Jesus Christ.'[*] To the Roman representative it seemed a simple matter, but to the Christian acquiescence would have been equivalent to the renunciation of his faith. The watchword of the Zealots, 'no king but Jehovah,' was equivalent to 'no alien ruler in Judah.' It was a direct challenge—and it was intended to be such—to Roman domination. Our Lord had stated in the presence of Pilate that His Kingship and His Kingdom were not 'of this world.' Yet the ideals and therefore the interests of the two kingdoms—the kingdom of Cæsar and the Kingdom of Christ—often clashed, with the result that it was impossible to be a loyal subject of Cæsar and a faithful follower of Christ, and Rome had ingeniously devised a way of compelling Christians to submit to their Emperor or to deny their Lord. To them 'Christ was Lord,' and they would not allow any mortal man to claim the 'Lordship' which their faith attributed to Christ.

---

* *Century Bible*, 'Acts,' Edinburgh, 1901, p. 301.

† *Octavius*, 8.

‡ Workman, *Persecution in the Early Church*, p. 89.

Gatherings of Christians for prayer and worship were looked upon as secret societies, and popular imagination ran riot in surmising what transpired. It is possible that Paul's counsel, 'greet one another with an holy kiss,' had been too literally and too lavishly interpreted. In any case the practice of the 'kiss of peace' suggested diverse abominations to the vivid and impure mind of the masses. The celebration of the Lord's Supper and the holding of love-feasts were capable of various interpretations. The coarse mind of the age looked upon them as 'Thyestean feasts and Oedipodean incest.' But whilst popular imagination busied itself with the practices carried on at these gatherings of Christians, it was their secrecy that roused the suspicion of the authorities. Mutual benefit societies or clubs abounded in different parts of the Empire. But they were subject to rigid supervision, and they were permitted in accordance with laws which were rigidly enforced. They might easily degenerate into secret societies of a dangerous character. Cæcilius, who speaks in the name of paganism in the Apology of Minucius Felix, describes Christians as 'a people who skulk and shun the light of day.'[†] It was a common charge against them that they separated themselves and broke away from the rest of mankind.[‡] The Imperial authorities were suspicious of such clandestine gatherings, for they might be held with the sole object of fomenting political disaffection.

Whilst Christianity gradually roused the suspicion of the Emperors and their representatives, it evoked the contempt and the hatred of the people at large. The educated classes looked with contempt upon what Tacitus described as a 'pestilent superstition,' and this was the attitude of Rome even to many national cults which, for political reasons, it allowed conquered nations to continue, but especially to the Christian religion. The upper classes, with all their scepticism, would hold in respect the traditional religion of Rome, for everything that was characteristically Roman appealed to their patriotism, but there were many things connected with the Christian religion for which the typical Roman would entertain no feeling except contempt. The Christian ideal would not make any appeal to the Roman temperament. The stoical ideal was more to the taste of the typical Roman. The symbol of Christianity is the Cross, which stands for self-sacrifice and self-renunciation. That would make little impression in Rome, where self-assertion and self-aggrandizement were the dominant virtues. The Roman was a born ruler. He was the superman of the ancient world. The gospel of the Cross would not be likely to make a deep impression on the average Roman. His contempt for it would be greatly increased when the constitution of the churches was observed. For some time they consisted entirely of the lower classes. 'Not many mighty, not many noble,' were enrolled among the followers of the Nazarene (1 Co 1$^{26-28}$). It was not simply rhetorical exaggeration on the part of Celsus (*c.* A.D. 178) when he wrote: 'If a man be educated let him keep clear of us Christians; we want no men of wisdom, no men of sense; we account all such as evil. No; but if there be one who is inexperienced, or stupid, or untaught, let him come with good heart'; 'they are weavers, shoemakers, fullers, illiterate clowns.'[*] 'Men collected from the lowest dregs of the people; ignorant, credulous women,' is the description given in the Apology of Minucius Felix by the spokesman of paganism.[†] The upper classes would despise a superstition which seemed to attract only their slaves.

Many so-called persecutions, as we shall see, were popular outbreaks, and reveal the deep hatred which the populace felt towards Christians; and the reasons for this unpopularity are not far to seek. We can see from Acts that the preaching of the gospel interfered with 'vested interests' and provoked violent opposition. The fortune-tellers in Philippi (Ac 16^{19}) and the silversmiths in Ephesus (19^{24}) had no difficulty in creating a riot, but they were careful to conceal their true motive. In Philippi the ringleaders appealed to the patriotism of the city, whilst in Ephesus they took advantage of the superstitious propensities of the masses.

We have already suggested that Christianity involved a new principle of division. To the Roman who believed in a united Empire, Christianity was a divisive force, and as such fraught with danger to the Empire. In the case of families this was peculiarly distressful. Jesus Christ had already warned His disciples that the preaching of the gospel would produce family quarrels. Christianity would set a man at variance with his father, and the daughter with her mother (Mt 10^{35}). It was in this connexion that our Lord used the words, 'I came not to send peace, but a sword.' His forecast was literally fulfilled, and this introduction of strife into family life was undoubtedly a fruitful cause of many violent outbreaks; and the representatives of Roman law and order were not always disposed to quell such disorder, as they shared in this widespread contempt and hatred.

But what roused the hatred of all classes more than anything else was the seemingly supercilious aloofness of Christians from the life of society. Jesus Christ had said before Pilate that the Kingdom He represented was spiritual, and therefore not a rival kingdom to the Empire which the proconsul represented (Jn 18^{36}). Paul and Peter maintained that it was possible to be citizens of the Roman Empire and members of the Kingdom of Heaven. Nevertheless the two kingdoms sometimes clashed, and their ideals came into violent conflict. The consistent Christian found that it was not possible to be a citizen of the Kingdom of which Jesus was the Founder, and

---

[*] Workman, *Persecution in the Early Church*, p. 100.

[†] *Octavius*, 8.

[‡] Tert. *Apol.* 31, 42; *Ep. ad Diogn.* 5–7.

[*] Origen, *c. Celsum*, iii. 44, 55.

[†] J. H. Newman, *Grammar of Assent*, London, 1870, p. 462, quoted by W. E. Addis, *Christianity and the Roman Empire*, p. 57.

participate in all the activities and frivolities which were enjoined by the representatives of the Empire of Cæsar. Not many years had elapsed when the followers of Jesus perceived the full force of His words—'because ye are not of the world, therefore the world hateth you' (Jn 15^{19}). The Christian witnessed every day many things which were opposed to the gospel which he had embraced. He was in duty bound to stand aloof. He was exhorted to live at peace with all men—'*as much as in you lieth*' (Ro 12^{18}). The words involved a significant reminder. The modification arose, not from the weakness of human nature, but from the uncompromising nature of the gospel. There were limits beyond which compliance with the requirements of the Empire implied disloyalty to the Christian ideal. The Christian believer was permitted—and urged—to submit to all the laws of the Empire provided such submission did not involve any violation of the principles of the Kingdom. When the ideals and interests of the two Empires clashed, to doubt on the part of the Christian would be disloyalty, and to falter would be sin. The Edict of Toleration extended freedom of belief and worship, provided respect for the established laws of the Empire was preserved. The gospel permitted to the Christian community the right to discharge their duties freely as subjects of Rome provided due respect to the principles and ideals of the Kingdom was preserved. The Christian believer was primarily a citizen of the Kingdom, and only secondarily a subject of the Empire. His first concern was to seek the Kingdom of God. When the Empire transcended these limits which his gospel defined for the Christian, there was no alternative for him but that attitude which Marcus Aurelius described as 'sheer obstinacy.' The Empire of Cæsar did not understand religious conviction, or else it would not recognize its right to exist. But conscience has reasons of which political expediency knows nothing. During this dark and tragic period the Christian Church defended 'the liberty wherewith Christ had made men free.' Christianity had brought within men's reach another Kingdom than that of Rome. The Christian believer could see the 'new Jerusalem coming down from above'—near enough to earth for him to enrol himself as a member of it. It was a Kingdom of superb ideals, and it was a Kingdom that would not perish. Nineveh and Babylon had been buried in the dust of the desert. Jerusalem was in ruins. The same fate would overtake Rome. But the Christian 'looked for the city which hath the foundations, whose builder and maker is God' (He 11^{10}). Inspired by this hope the Christian stood aloof from the life of the town in which he lived. He abstained from many of the ordinary duties of citizenship. He was hated for his 'hatred of the human race,' in other words, for his rejection of the aims and ideals of Rome as embodied in society and religion.

It was only in the slow course of time that the intrinsic incompatibility of the principles of Christianity and of the ideals of the Empire became obvious. (*a*) Christian theology came into collision with the confused polytheism of the Empire; (*b*) Christianity as a personal religion conflicted with the collective or national religions of the Empire. (*c*) The lofty ethical ideal of Christianity, on its two sides of holiness and love, was antagonistic to paganism, on its two sides of worldliness and selfishness. The conflict between the two ideals grew in intensity as the truth of Christianity was unfolded in credal statement and moral character, for the ideals of the Empire were visible in the customs and practices of society. Christianity could not be itself without giving offence to the Empire. In view of this intrinsic incompatibility, it was inevitable that the Empire should attempt to put down Christianity, or that Christianity should replace the ideals of the Empire by its own; but such a substitution of ideals is impossible on a national scale, for Christianity works upon society through the individual. There was a third alternative. The Empire and Christianity might come to an understanding by effecting a compromise of ideals. It is obvious that the Christianity which was adopted by the Empire was not the pure religion and undefiled of the Gospels and Epistles. The Roman Empire did not adopt a policy of persecution from the commencement. The attitude of Rome towards Christianity was foreshadowed in the attitude of Gallio to the arraignment of the Christian evangelists by their Jewish adversaries. Rome cared for none of these things. Christianity was simply a religious controversy within Judaism, and for a considerable period no danger to the Empire was suspected. It was not of sufficient importance for historians like Tacitus (*Ann.* xv. 44) and Suetonius (*Claudius*, 25) to pay any serious attention to it. They dismissed it in a few contemptuous words as a 'pestilent' or 'magical' superstition. The desperate efforts which the Jews made to involve Christians in a charge of high treason prove that Rome would consider only the political possibilities of the new religion. But it soon became clear that Christianity was distinct from Judaism and even antagonistic to it. The violent opposition which the Jews offered to the new movement was sufficient evidence that Christianity was not an offshoot of Judaism. It was also equally evident that Christianity inherited many of the outstanding characteristics of Judaism, especially its exclusiveness and intolerance—in other words, its claim to be *the* religion. Rome had recognized this peculiar feature of Judaism, and had made allowance for it, in the interest of peace and order, and also on the ground of its being an old national religion. Rome paid great deference to ancestral faiths; in one sense the Imperial religion—apart from the worship of the Emperor—was a congeries of national cults.

Even when Christianity was seen to be an independent movement, Gentile as much as Jewish, it was for a time beneath Imperial notice. Persecutions of a kind there were from the time of Nero (A.D. 54–68), but they were not decreed by the Imperial authorities. They were isolated occurrences, and generally the outcome of popular indignation aroused by local causes; and as Roman officials generally shared the popular hatred of Christians, they were not too careful to quell outbreaks of violence on the part of enraged mobs in various towns. The words of Suetonius—'Judæos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit' [viz. Claudius]—do not refer to the expulsion of Christians from Rome on account of their Christianity. The historian makes a blundering reference to unseemly controversies among the Jews of the city with regard to the claim made by Christians that Jesus was the Messiah. They were banished not because they had embraced the gospel, but as disturbers of the peace.

7. Persecution of Christians by the Roman Empire.—The persecution of Christians in the time of Nero (A.D. 54–68) is a noteworthy example of the cruel treatment meted out to them in different parts of the Empire, with this difference, that the outbreak in Rome was due to the instigation of the Emperor, whereas similar violences elsewhere were possible through the connivance of the Imperial officials. The general hatred of Christians accounts for the readiness with which the populace accepted Nero's diabolical insinuation that the Christians were the originators of the disastrous fire which demolished portions of the city. We have already referred to the superstitious fears of the masses. Calamities were evidence of the wrath of the gods, and it was a common belief that the atheism of the Christians was one of the chief causes of misfortunes. Tertullian has summed up the popular attitude in the well-known words, 'They think the Christians to blame for every public calamity, for every loss that afflicts the people. If the Tiber rises to the walls, if the Nile does not rise over the fields, if the sky gives no rain, if the earth quakes, if there is famine or plague, immediately the shout is raised, "To the lions with the Christians!"'* The words were written at a much later period, but they were true of the popular feeling from the beginning. When it was necessary to assuage the anger of the gods, victims were selected whose death gave as much satisfaction to the persons who offered them as to the deities. It is evident that Nero when he realized the state of things turned popular attention from himself by fixing it on the Christian community. It was an astute move, for it was currently rumoured that Christians looked forward to the dissolution of the present order of things. Peter gave expression to the current belief when he wrote: 'The heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall be dissolved with fervent heat, and the earth and the works that are therein will be burned up' (2 P 3[10]). Such instances of mob law are a lurid reflexion on the administration of justice, even in the heart of the Empire. But it may be urged that Nero is too exceptional a case to use for purposes of generalization. It is this outbreak of ferocity at the instigation of the Emperor that accounts for the marked difference of tone between some of the Epistles, *e.g.* Ro 13[1], 2 Th 2[6], 1 P 2[14], and the Apocalypse, where Rome is 'the woman drunken with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus' (Rev 17[6]).

By the time of Domitian (81–96) it was becoming evident that the Christian religion was fraught with danger to the unity and solidarity of the Empire. We have already remarked on the inevitable tendency of the gospel to produce dissension even within the small circle of the family. Christianity seemed to make for disruption, not for unity. Rome believed in national religions. This was one of the pillars on which the Empire rested. It was clear that Christianity undermined one of the main pillars of the Imperial fabric. It was an act of disloyalty for a citizen of the Empire to embrace a religion that ran counter to every other religion. Domitian took steps to prevent the spread of this disruptive religion by an edict which forbade aggressive missionary activity among Roman citizens.

During the 2nd cent. the Empire was governed by a succession of rulers as famous for their broad statesmanship as for their lofty character—*e.g.*, Trajan (A.D. 98–117), Hadrian (A.D. 117–138), Antoninus Pius (A.D. 138–161) and Marcus Aurelius (A.D. 161–180). They assumed their Imperial duties with a due sense of the responsibility of their position. They shared the view that the Christian religion was inimical to the interests of the Empire. They were agreed that its adherents must be coerced into acceptance of the official religion—especially the cult of the Emperor. They were truly Roman in their assumption that the safety of the Empire was the supreme consideration. The individual must sink his personal interests or idiosyncrasies and devote himself to the service of the State; that was the highest virtue. 'Civis Romanus sum' was less an assertion of rights than a recognition of duties. The individual possessed no rights except such as the State granted. 'Conscience' had no existence, and 'conscientious objection' had no meaning in the Roman Empire.

By the end of the century the Imperial authorities came to the conclusion that the time had arrived when the policy of the Empire in reference to Christianity must be defined. The new religion was gathering strength, and it was sufficiently powerful to merit the serious attention of the throne. In connexion with the reign of Trajan (A.D. 98–117) reference must be made to the significant correspondence between the Emperor and one of his provincial governors, viz. Pliny the Younger, who was proprætor of the province of Bithynia Pontus (A.D. 110). In his communication to Trajan, Pliny refers to the numerical strength of Christians in his province. The heathen temples were deserted. It does not follow that this was the situation in other parts of the Empire. He acquitted Christians who were prepared to renounce Christ and sacrifice to the gods of the Empire. He condemned others, not on the ground of their Christianity, but of their refusal to recant and fall in with the official religion of the Empire, *i.e.* on the ground of their *obstinacy*. Such an attitude was impossible in a subject of the Roman Empire. It violated the fundamental idea of citizenship. Pliny commends Christians for their morality. They were under a pledge to abstain from every crime. Trajan in his reply approves of the proprætor's action, but lays down two conditions, viz. that Christians must not be sought out, and that anonymous accusations must be prohibited. Whereas Christians were entitled to a fair trial, yet in the light of this correspondence they were outlaws, for the condition of retaining their civic rights as subjects of the Empire, or even of their personal safety, was the denial of their religion. Their life depended on their ceasing to be Christians. Trajan made it plain that it was possible to take action against the adherents of Christianity without any special legislation, inasmuch as there were aspects of Christianity which contravened the existing laws. Popular outbreaks were still frequent, and their frequency arose from the fact that the authorities were not likely to interfere. Nevertheless Hadrian issued an edict in which he demanded for Christians the right of a fair and judicial investigation.

Antoninus Pius (138–161) and Marcus Aurelius (161–180) were men of outstanding virtues; they admired and embodied the old Roman spirit, and they endeavoured to bring the Empire back to the old paths; but they attempted the impossible, and Christianity was the most formidable obstacle to the carrying out of their policy of a united Empire. Christianity was anarchical in its emphasis on the individual. It encouraged individualism; Marcus Aurelius looked upon it as 'sheer obstinacy.' The Empire was a vast machine, and any tendency to freedom of action or independence threw the whole machine out of gear. Roman subjects were simply parts of one stupendous whole, and the efficient working of the whole would be secured through the complete subordination of the individual parts. In their official capacity these Emperors would look with complete disfavour upon a religion which set the individual even above the State. Apart from this, the gospel would make no great impression on the typical Roman temperament; it lacked the strength and robustness of Stoicism. Its adherents displayed excessive zeal and enthusiasm, and nothing was more obnoxious to the Roman who had learnt complete self-mastery.

In the 3rd cent. the situation changed, and Christianity advanced by leaps and bounds. The stigma of being the religion of the lower classes had been removed, for it was no longer true that 'not many mighty, not many noble are called.' Christianity had very largely captured the intelligence and the wealth of the Empire. The attitude of the Emperors had changed. Many of them—*e.g.* Elagabalus (A.D. 218–222), Alexander Severus (A.D. 222–235), and Philip the Arabian (A.D. 244–249)—were foreigners who had worked their way to the head of the army, and therefrom to the Imperial purple. They were able soldiers, but they were not statesmen, and they were not interested in the retention of Roman customs and institutions. Elagabalus and Alexander Severus were of Syrian origin on their mother's side, and they were naturally disposed to favour Oriental gods and customs. The syncretism of the age found a vivid illustration in the strange assortment of gods which Alexander Severus brought together in the Imperial palace—viz. images of Jesus Christ, Abraham, and Orpheus. During this period Christianity made rapid and astonishing progress. It was to all intents and purposes a *religio licita.* The statesmanship of Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius made them into stern opponents of the Christian religion, whilst the laxity of their successors was equivalent to tolerance—but it was the tolerance of indifference.

---

* *Apol.* 40.

Decius (249–251) introduced a new period as regards the relationship between the Church and the Empire. The Emperor was face to face with a formidable foe. The Empire was threatened on its northern and western frontiers by Franks and Goths. It was a matter of pressing urgency to consolidate the Empire in view of this formidable danger. The view prevailed that the nation could not offer a united front to an external foe unless it was of one way of thinking on all subjects. Rome had not yet discovered that religious freedom does not issue in political dissension. Decius was an able ruler, and he saw that the old doctrine of the absoluteness of the State must be restored. Recusancy must be for ever suppressed. Decius inaugurated the *first general persecution* of Christianity on the part of the Empire. This was a deliberate effort to stamp out Christianity, and the repressive measures were those which have been generally adopted by governments in all lands when they have attempted to suppress religious liberty and establish a state of ecclesiastical uniformity. We are not surprised to read that many failed to stand the test, inasmuch as the personnel of the Church had considerably changed during the first half of the century. Many had embraced the gospel who were complete strangers to the meaning and demand of Christian faith. But it is a marvellous fact that there were in various parts of the Empire men and women in large numbers who triumphantly stood the test and endured 'torture, not accepting deliverance.' Valerian (253–260) continued the repressive measures of Decius—but with added violence. Attendance at meetings for Christian worship became a capital offence. The meeting-places of Christians were confiscated, and all subjects of the Empire were required to conform to the Imperial demands. But Christianity had become an integral part of the life of the Empire, and the successors of Valerian came to the conclusion that they had undertaken an impossible task. The Church enjoyed peace for a considerable period, and during this period it fortified its position to such an extent that the organizers of the next general persecution undertook a still more hopeless task.

For nineteen years after his accession Diocletian (284–305) carried on the policy of his immediate predecessors. He was one of the most statesmanlike Emperors that ever occupied the Imperial throne. He was in a sense the successor of the Emperors of the 2nd cent., and attempted to carry out their policy of consolidating the Empire. In the government of the Empire he secured the services of a colleague, and in addition he appointed two assistant Emperors. In the West Maximin ruled as Augustus, and had Constantius Chlorus as his Cæsar, whilst Diocletian associated with himself Galerius as his Cæsar. Galerius was an extremely able soldier, and it was his influence that weighed with Diocletian in his decision to resume the policy of Decius. In the West there was peace, for Constantius was favourably disposed towards the Christian religion. It was the festival of the Roman god Terminus in Nicomedia, the new capital of the Empire, that marked the commencement of the persecution under Diocletian. On an occasion like this men would vie with each other in words and deeds expressive of their patriotism, and the absence of the Christian section of the population would be marked. Whilst the people were assembled together to celebrate the cult of the Emperor, the Christians would be gathered together in their own church. We are not surprised that the destruction of this church was the beginning of hostilities.

Four edicts were published, and each one possessed its distinctive features. The first edict required the instant demolition of all churches and the burning of all Bibles. Christians who refused to conform were deprived of all civil rights, and they were placed beyond the pale of the laws of the Empire. The second edict was especially directed against the officials of the Church, whilst the third offered release to the imprisoned clergy who were prepared to recant, and further torture in case of refusal. The fourth edict held out to all Christians, laymen and clergy, the choice between death and sacrifice. Although persecution was not continuous and not universal throughout the Empire, Galerius continued his policy; but on the eve of his death he attached his name, along with those of Constantine (the son of Constantius) and Licinius, to the first Edict of Toleration, published in Nicomedia in A.D. 311. The edict, in Gibbon's translation, is as follows: 'We were particularly desirous of reclaiming, into the way of reason and nature, the deluded Christians, who had renounced the religion and ceremonies instituted by their fathers, and, presumptuously despising the practice of antiquity, had invented extravagant laws and opinions, according to the dictates of their fancy, and had collected a various society from the different provinces of our empire. The edicts which we have published to enforce the worship of the gods, having exposed many of the Christians to danger and distress, many having suffered death, and many more, who still persist in their impious folly, being left destitute of *any* public exercise of religion, we are disposed to extend to those unhappy men the effects of our wonted clemency. We permit them, therefore, freely to profess their private opinions, and to assemble in their conventicles without fear or molestation, provided always that they preserve a due respect to the established laws and government.'*

It is evident that the organizers of this attempt to stamp out Christianity expected a different issue to their campaign of persecution. They were not aware of the strength of conviction which the faith of the Christians had developed. The edict hints at the Roman belief in ancestral religions. The Imperial objection to Christianity is given in the words 'a various society from the different provinces,' whilst the closing sentence about 'respect to the established laws' is a reminder of the view which States have only reluctantly abandoned—viz. that religious freedom is fraught with danger to the State. In 313 Constantine became sole Emperor of the West and issued the Edict of Milan—the Magna Carta of re-

* *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ii.^{3} 132 f.

ligious liberty. All subjects of the Empire were granted complete freedom of worship. But this universal toleration was not of long duration. The traditional doctrine in regard to the presuppositions of a united Empire reasserted itself, and Constantius adopted Christianity as the Imperial religion and at the same time reduced paganism to a *religio illicita*. The adoption of Christianity as the religion of the Empire was a great triumph for the gospel, but there are victories which are as disastrous as defeats. The Church had to pay a heavy price for promotion. The Emperor demanded and obtained from the Christian Church the homage and submission which his predecessors enjoyed in the case of paganism. The friendship of Rome was fraught with greater danger than its enmity. The Church lost its freedom and its power. The subsequent persecution of paganism was not due to the intolerance of the Church. One of the outstanding motives which actuated the Empire in its attempt to stamp out Christianity led to its efforts to suppress paganism. Imperial unity demanded ecclesiastical uniformity. During the reign of Theodosius the Great, paganism was finally abolished by a series of enactments similar to those adopted by previous Emperors in their efforts to suppress Christianity. But the abolition of paganism by Theodosius was as unreal as the establishment of Christianity by Constantius. Religious reforms which emanate from the throne are futile; they are genuine only as they originate in the heart of a people. The spirit of paganism lived on when the forms and institutions of the Christian religion had been universally adopted. Yet all ancient governments—and some modern—have acted on the assumption that ecclesiastical uniformity alone produces and guarantees national unity. In the most progressive European countries it is accepted that political unity is compatible with full religious freedom.

We have emphasized the fact that Rome persecuted for political reasons. It was the safety and stability of the Empire that weighed with her Emperors. But it is necessary to guard against a common misconception. The Empire was not an irreligious organization that opposed the spread of religion. It possessed its official religion; and it was necessary for those in authority, in spite of the prevalent scepticism, more affected than real, to provide for the belief which prevailed, that the gods existed and that they possessed unlimited power for good and evil. It was the Imperial view, strengthened by the innate conservatism of human nature in religous matters, that the existing religious situation was better adapted and even essential to the social and political needs of the Empire. Rome did not classify religions as true or false, but as conducive or inimical to the interests of the Empire.

8. Persecution of heretics by the Roman Church.—For several centuries after the adoption of Christianity as the Imperial religion the 'Holy Roman Empire' was united in its religious life. Western Europe was governed by a 'theocracy'; the Church was supreme. Uniformity of thought and worship prevailed throughout the civilized world. But it was the uniformity of death; there was as little living intellectuality as there was vital religion. 'Catholicism was then,' writes Lecky, 'perfectly in accordance with the intellectual wants of Europe. It was not a tyranny, for the intellectual latitude it permitted was fully commensurate with the wants of the people. . . . As long as a church is so powerful as to form the intellectual condition of the age, to supply the standing-point from which every question is viewed, its authority will never be disputed.'* Lecky thinks only of the intellectual situation in Europe. But the same explanation applies to the religious State; Catholicism was in accordance with the *religious* needs of the period. The Renaissance was the intellectual awakening of Europe, and the Reformation was the awakening of the conscience of Europe, and the former was due to the discovery of the literature of Greece and Rome as the latter resulted from a study of the Gospels and Epistles. For centuries Western Europe had embraced the intellectual system, and, of course, the religious customs which the Church permitted. Rome dictated to the understanding no less than to the conscience of the West. Towards the end of the 11th cent. there were signs of awakening dissatisfaction with both the religion and the creed of the Church. But the way of the innovator was hard. By the end of the century the Church had attained the zenith of its influence, and before the middle of the 13th cent. Rome had manufactured her machine for the repression of heresy in the form of the Inquisition (A.D. 1233), and the period of persecution had been already inaugurated by Innocent III. in the persecution of the Albigenses in the south of France (1220). All rulers were required to take an oath that they would exterminate from their dominions all those who were branded as heretics by the Church, and the universal dread of the papal Interdict reduced to abject submission the princes and sovereigns of Western Europe, *e.g.* King John of England. Statutes against heresy formed integral parts of the legal system of all Western States, *e.g.* 'De hæretico comburendo' in England (1400–1676). We have observed that the persecution of Christianity by the Roman Empire was mainly motived by political considerations. In ancient Empires the central authority was absolute, and there was no sphere or activity which lay outside or beyond the law of the realm. It was suspected that the enjoyment of religious freedom would bring about a desire for civil liberty and thus the solidarity of the Empire would be disturbed, and its unity imperilled. The leaven of liberty once introduced into the life of a people would gradually spread and ultimately affect the whole mass. Rome persecuted the Church because religious uniformity was essential to the unity of the Empire, and paganism was favourable, whilst Christianity was inimical to its stability and safety. When Christianity became a *religio licita* measures were adopted to keep in check, through Imperial supervision, its individualistic and anarchical tendencies. After the establishment of Christianity Rome crushed paganism as it had attempted to suppress Christianity, in order to safeguard the unity of the Empire, and according to the political creed of the age there was no reliable unity without uniformity. Rome's policy was the suppression of political insubordination. The Church, on the other hand, persecuted on religious grounds. Her policy was the repression of heresy. The Church had formulated her theological creed and had elaborated her religious cult, and neither theology nor cult was subject to revision or innovation. Lecky thus accounts for the adoption of persecution by the Church: 'If men *believe with an intense and realising faith* that their own view of a disputed question is true beyond all possibility of mistake, if they further believe that those who adopt other views will be doomed by the Almighty to an eternity of misery which, with the same moral disposition but with a different belief, they would have escaped, *these men will, sooner or later, persecute to the full extent of their power*.'* Persecutions on purely religious grounds originate in the doctrine of exclusive salvation, but it is not true that the Church of Rome persecuted *solely* on religious grounds—whether in the interest of the heretic, or to stamp out heresy. The doctrine embodied in the words 'extra ecclesiam nulla salus' does not fully account for the attitude of Rome. It must be remembered that the 'Holy Roman Empire' inherited the traditions of its pagan predecessor. It also inherited the Imperial passion for universal dominion. But the Imperialism of the Church was partly, if not chiefly, religious. In the background of the papal mind was the belief in the universality of the gospel. It was a superb scheme—one great Empire, uniform in belief and worship—and for a time the idea was practically realized. The Roman Church repressed heresy no less in the interest of Imperial solidarity than in the interest of truth. Persecutions on purely religious grounds, *i.e.* for heresy, are found in connexion with religious denominations which possess rigidly defined confessions of belief and which are independent of the secular authority.

---

* Lecky, *Rationalism in Europe*, vol. ii. p. 31.

* Lecky, *Rationalism in Europe*, vol. ii. p. 1.

9. Persecution in Protestant countries.—The doctrine that the State was supreme, as well in religious as in secular affairs, was universally accepted in Western Europe at the time of the Reformation, with the result that repressive measures with a view to securing religious uniformity were general. The supremacy of the State was the only adequate safeguard against papal interference, and in most lands the Reformation was exploited by princes or kings as a means to an end. It was currently accepted that the prince or sovereign possessed the right to determine the religion—creed and cult—of the State or province over which he ruled. The principle adopted by the various Germanic States was tersely expressed in the words 'cujus regio, ejus religio.' Each State, in the person of the central authority, determined its own religion, but there was no religious freedom for the individual. His alternatives were submission or emigration. This doctrine of the absoluteness of the State was an inheritance from the past, and it was inevitable under the circumstances which then obtained in Western Europe that it should be emphasized. From about A.D. 1200 until the middle of the 16th cent. the Pope exercised complete dominion among the nations of Western Europe. But the rise of distinct nationalities, with different interests and ideals, produced a desire for national liberty. National sentiment became a powerful force in the life of nations. The longing for political liberty on the part of nations was no less genuine than the desire on the part of individuals to enjoy intellectual and religious freedom, and civil rulers took advantage of this powerful sentiment to secure their own freedom from papal interference. The history of the Reformation in England is a case in point. In its initiation it was neither more nor less than the rejection by the monarch of the supremacy of the Pope or of his right of interference in English—and, in fact, in the king's—affairs. Henry VIII. appointed himself as sole and supreme head of the Church of England. The terrors of the Interdict were things of the past. But whereas the nation was free from papal supremacy, the individual had no freedom in his religious beliefs or exercises. When Dissent appeared, as it inevitably did in all lands where the right of private judgment and liberty of conscience had been affirmed, the secular authority met such dissidence with persecution.

It may be pointed out in passing that there are three ways in which the problem of the relationship between the Church and the State may be solved. (*a*) The State may dominate the Church, or (*b*) the Church may govern the State, or (*c*) their respective spheres and functions may be delimited and mapped out, and the two estates may be separate and independent of each other. Under the second and third regime we find persecutions for purely religious reasons.

The State may be supreme, and determine the conduct of the citizens in religious no less than in civil matters. There is no liberty of belief or worship. The religious life of the individual, as far as external acts are concerned, must follow the lines laid down by the central authority. He must fall in with the official religion, and his submission applies to creed as well as to cult. The State exercises the right to formulate its theology and to draw up its mode of worship, and to impose them on all subjects of the realm. If there are different religious bodies within the State, as in many Western countries after the Reformation, the State may recognize or establish one form of religion, with the result that we have not a State religion but a State Church, whilst other religious bodies are subject to various political disabilities until religious equality is secured. The State may grant complete religious freedom to all denominations, and religious communities may formulate their own creed and elaborate their own mode of worship in complete independence of the secular authority. This is separatism, and obtains, for instance, in the United States, and is being generally accepted, as the solution of the problem, in Great Britain.

The history of religion in Great Britain especially illustrates the gradual abandonment of the doctrine of the absoluteness of the State and of its right to decide the religion of its subjects, and of the gradual adoption of the doctrine of separatism.

After Henry VIII. established himself as head of the Church there followed a prolonged and fierce struggle between Anglicanism and Roman Catholicism for supremacy. During the reign of Edward VI. Protestantism was the State religion and Romanism was suppressed, whilst during Mary's reign Roman Catholicism enjoyed a short spell of power and the fires of Smithfield were lit. Under Elizabeth, Protestantism once more regained the upper hand and Roman Catholicism was proscribed. But throughout the protracted conflict between Protestantism and Roman Catholicism religious and political motives were strangely intermixed. The ultimate triumph of Protestantism was largely due to the fact that it was identical with patriotism, whilst Catholicism was associated with a continental Power's attempt to conquer England. During the Stuart period the conflict became a 'three-cornered fight'—for Protestantism was divided into two hostile camps, viz. Episcopalianism and Presbyterianism; but when the struggle was at its height, Roman Catholicism was out of it.

Protestantism in its struggle with Roman Catholicism allied itself with the patriotic sentiment of the nation. Episcopalianism in its conflict with Presbyterianism advocated the absoluteness of the throne, and its right to control the life of its subjects, civil and religious, whilst Presbyterianism, which had embraced the Genevan ideal of a theocratic State (see below), allied itself with a democratic movement in favour of parliamentary or constitutional government. It was not a struggle for religious freedom or for liberty of conscience, for there was nothing to choose in the matter of tolerance between Presbyterianism and Episcopalianism, and both parties would willingly, and perhaps conscientiously, have resorted to the use of force, in the form of legislation, to secure the prevalence of their own creed and mode of worship. It was Cromwell alone who prevented the establishment of Presbyterianism as the State Church.

The restoration of the monarchy carried with it the restitution of Episcopalianism, and there ensued a series of laws, perhaps without a parallel in any land in point of severity, with a view to the extirpation of religious dissidence; but towards the close of the century the Act of Toleration granted freedom of worship to the different Dissenting bodies, although many of the civil disabilities which were imposed upon Dissent by the repressive legislation of Charles II. remained and still remain. It was during this period—the second half of the 17th cent.—that many able advocates of toleration mapped out the respective spheres and functions of the State and the Church, as, *e.g.*, Milton and Locke. From the close of the Stuart period the trend of opinion has been towards separatism, the germ of which is seen in Locke's doctrine that the function of the State is to protect the material interests of the citizens, whilst the Church is charged with the cure of souls. This doctrine struck the death-knell of persecution by the State on politico-religious grounds.

It is worthy of mention that the old idea of the absoluteness of the State, and therefore of the right of coercion in religious matters, advocated by pagan Rome, and by Episcopalianism during the reign of Charles II., has been maintained by many rationalist writers, *e.g.* Hobbes. Plato had found room for religion in his ideal State, and contended that all citizens should believe in the State gods on pain of imprisonment and death. Hobbes in his *Leviathan* developed the doctrine of the absolute power of the sovereign in all departments, civil and religious. Whether religion was true or false was a matter of no great concern; the main consideration was its utility for purposes of government.

We have observed above that the Church may be supreme and the State be controlled and governed by the Church. This is the theocratic ideal of government, and it resulted quite logically from the Reformers' emphasis on the supremacy of conscience or the absoluteness of religion. Separatism was not the first choice of the Reformers; that was only the second best.

From the 12th cent. the Pope was the dominant figure in European politics. In the Interdict he possessed a weapon which brought princes and kings to the dust before his Holiness. He possessed the keys of heaven and hell. He opened and shut to whomsoever he would. But it was among the Reformers—an important section of them—that the idea of a theocratic State prevailed. Their central creed was not the freedom, but the supremacy, of conscience. Savonarola attempted to establish a theocracy in Florence—a State built on the teaching of the Bible. His ideal was a Christocratic kingdom, but according to his teaching such a kingdom presupposed a redeemed democracy.

Calvin's ideal was a theocratic State. He tried in Geneva the experiment which cost Savonarola his life in Florence. It is impossible to over-estimate the service he rendered to the Reformation. He was the theologian as well as the statesman of Protestantism, for he gave systematic expression to its theology and he organized its ecclesiastical polity. In both cases, he maintained, he was building on the Word of God. His theology was based on biblical exposition, as his form of Church government was founded on apostolic practice. But the greatest service, perhaps, which Calvin rendered to Protestantism was the new moral direction which he gave to religion. 'The Protestant movement was saved from being sunk in the quicksands of doctrinal dispute chiefly by the new moral direction given to it at Geneva. The religious instinct of Calvin discerned the crying need of human nature for social discipline. . . . The Christianity of the Middle Ages had preached the base and demoralising surrender of the individual—the surrender of his understanding to the Church, of his conscience to the priest, of his will to the prince. . . . The policy of Calvin was a vigorous effort to supply what the revolutionary movement wanted—a positive education of the individual soul. The power thus generated was too expansive to be confined to Geneva. It went forth into all countries. From every part of Protestant Europe eager hearts flocked hither to catch something of the inspiration. . . . *Calvinism saved Europe.*'* Among the eager spirits who flocked to Geneva and came under the spell of Calvin's teaching were men from our own land, and they returned with their souls aglow with the inspiration of this new moral direction which Calvin gave to religion. The Puritans were disciples of Calvin in their theology, in their Church polity, and in their insistence on vital religion; and in this moral and social interpretation of Christianity lies, perhaps, their greatest service to their country.

As in the case of Savonarola, Calvin was much more concerned with the right of the religious element to dominate the secular or political than with the right of conscience to be free from the sway of the secular authority. The leading spirits of the Reformation started with something more stable and positive than the right of private judgment or even liberty of conscience. The Reformation was a revolt from the religion of the 15th cent. in favour of the religion of the Gospels and Epistles. It was a repudiation of the authority of Lateran Councils and the affirmation of the authority of the Bible. It was a shifting of the seat of authority. There was no inconsistency between Calvin's Protestantism and his intolerance of views which did not coincide with his own. He had constructed his system of theology and his conception of the nature and function of the Church by means of careful biblical exegesis. He believed he had understood the mind of the Master. It was to him a matter of supreme urgency that the will of God as declared in His Word should prevail.

A grave wrong is committed when it is thrown in the face of Calvin and other Reformers that they preached the right of private judgment and liberty of conscience, while as a matter of fact they were guilty of brutal intolerance. The Reformation was not due to the prevalence of the right of private judgment or of liberty of conscience. The Reformers would not have gathered together a single church if they had had nothing more stable and reliable than private judgment to oppose to the authority of Rome in the person of the Pope. They appealed from Synods to the Scriptures, and their belief in the Scriptures was absolute. To the Reformers the authority of conscience was the authority of the Word of God. Many of them would have listened with disdain to the contention that conscience was free; to them conscience was master. Their creed was not so much the liberty, as the supremacy, of conscience. To them the language of conscience was not simply, 'I will not submit,' but rather, 'I must enforce.' We have observed above that the religious conviction that makes the martyr tends also to make the persecutor, unless along with this conviction there is a clear recognition of the fact that coercion is opposed to the very nature of religion. 'Intense and realising faith' finds it extremely difficult to be tolerant. The leading spirits of the Reformation possessed the prophets' conviction of the truth of their message. The prophetic attitude presupposes something more than the assent of the understanding to a proposition or dogma. It implies that some truth has seized the soul of the prophet. The conviction is more moral than intellectual; it has more to do with conscience than with reason. The prophet's creed is not a proposition which the theoretical understanding accepts, but a truth which has captured the practical understanding. The Reformers were akin to the prophets in their overpowering conviction of the truth of their message, but instead of the prophets' 'Thus saith the Lord,' the Reformers said 'Thus saith the Scripture.' What the Reformers meant by a matter of conscience was precisely this—what was taught in God's Word. Conscience is proverbially intolerant. 'Had it,' wrote Joseph Butler, 'strength, as it has right; had it power, as it has manifest authority, it would absolutely govern the world.'* Calvin was anxious to invest conscience, *i.e.* the Word of God, with strength equal to its right, power equal to its authority, so that it might govern. The Reformers were intolerant in the name of conscience; they were intractable in the name of God's Word. It may be impossible to justify the martyrdom of Servetus, but we must not look upon it as if it were a solitary occurrence in those troublous days.

---

* Mark Pattison, quoted by J. Heron, in *A Short History of Puritanism*, Edinburgh, 1908, p. 5 f.

Reformers who had come under the influence of Calvin accepted his ideal of a theocratic State or a kingdom of saints. The Pilgrim Fathers did not cross the Atlantic in order to enjoy the right of private judgment or religious liberty. They wanted freedom to believe what they deemed to be true, and to worship God in the way which they deemed right. They wanted freedom to make the Bible their sole guide and law book. They were not prepared to grant liberty of worship and liberty of thought in their own province. Their aim was the establishment of a State where their own Christianity would be the State religion. They did not believe in the separation of the Church from the State; they were anxious to found a community in which their Puritanism would be supreme. The Bible was to be the nation's law book, and to its teaching every member of the community must subscribe. The Pilgrim Fathers believed too much in their own view of Christianity to tolerate any other and conflicting views. Nothing is more flagrantly unjust than the indictment that the men of the *Mayflower* preached tolerance when they left the shores of Great Britain, and practised intolerance when they landed on Plymouth Rock. Tolerance did not come from Geneva, or from those who had come under the influence of Geneva, but from the Socinians of Italy and the Anabaptists of Holland. The founder of the first State where toleration was practised was Roger Williams, who emigrated to America in 1631 and welcomed to Providence all who were prepared to extend to all the religious liberty which they claimed for themselves.

Presbyterianism in England and Scotland was equally intolerant. The leaders of Presbyterianism were disciples of Calvin, and they had his profound belief in the authority of the Word of God. They carefully formulated their creed; they elaborated their conception of the nature of the Church; they had very clear and definite notions in regard to the place and function of religion in the national life. They accepted the Calvinistic doctrine of a theocratic State. They wanted something more than a Church that was independent of the State. Their ideal was a Church which dominated the State, and they were prepared to use every possible means—Army and Parliament—to secure the establishment of their conception of Christianity. The Presbyterianism of the 17th cent. possessed that 'intense and realising faith,' issuing in coercion and persecution, as a legitimate, because alone effectual, means of establishing the true and exterminating the false.

10. Conclusion.—We have indicated the gradual abandonment of coercion on the part of the State because the view became general that (1) religious liberty, enjoyed to the fullest extent, does not lead to disloyalty to the State, and that (2) coercion is incompatible with religious faith. The gradual disappearance of intolerance from among religious bodies has been due to the prevalence of the view that absolute certainty is difficult of attainment, and that no system or creed embodies the whole truth of Christianity. There have been cases of persecution for heresy within comparatively recent times, but the present trend is strongly and decisively towards tolerance.

It was in the 17th cent. that the cause of tolerance was advocated in many lands and by many extremely able writers, but reference may be made to Milton, the master mind of England in this period, who to a greater degree than other thinkers of his age impressed the thought of England and helped by his writings to reconcile intense religious conviction with tolerance and to create that tolerant spirit which prevails in the modern world. Truth, according to Milton, is many-sided. It is widely diffused among men. Every system contains a small part of it, mixed with error, but no system has it in its entirety. No religious body has a monopoly of the truth. It is interesting to compare this exposition of religious liberty with the defence of tolerance advanced by Themistius, the famous orator of the time of the Emperor Valens: 'Toleration is a divine law which can never be violated, as God Himself has clearly demonstrated His desire for a diversity of religions. . . . God delights in the variety of the homage which is rendered to Him; He likes the Syrians to use certain rites, the Greeks others, and the Egyptians others again. . . .'* It is to be feared that the tolerance of the 20th cent. has more affinity with that of Themistius than with that of Milton. The modern attitude suggests that every religion is as good as any other. The tolerance of the modern world springs from its feeble, anæmic faith, as the intolerance of the Reformers sprang from their 'intense and realising' faith. The words of Fox are not without a considerable element of truth: 'The only foundation for toleration is a degree of scepticism, and without it there can be none.'† But there is another 'foundation for toleration,' and to that Milton has directed attention in his *Areopagitica*.

'Liberty of conscience entire, or in the whole, is where a man, according to the dictates of his own conscience, may have the free exercise of his religion, without impediment to his preferment or employment in the State.'‡ Persecution is the denial of this 'free exercise of religion,' and in its widest sense it includes any and every impediment to the subject's preferment or employment in the State. Persecution is generally defined as the infliction of pain or death upon others *unjustly* for adhering to a religious creed or mode of worship either by way of penalty or in order to force them to renounce their principles. The insertion of the word 'unjustly' presupposes a sphere of activity in connexion with the life of the individual over which the State has no right to exercise any jurisdiction. The existence of such a sphere was hinted at in our Lord's words, 'Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's.' There is within man an inviolable adytum which the secular authority may not enter. Micaiah-ben-Imlah was clearly aware of such a sphere when he preferred obedience to the will of Jahweh to acquiescence in the caprice of the king. The author of the Book of Daniel appealed to his contemporaries, and to all generations, to take their stand on this holy ground. The apostles dealt with the same fact when they said that circumstances might arise when it was their duty 'to obey God rather than men.' In such cases conscience could not hesitate without being guilty of moral treachery. Persecution is the denial of this free exercise of religion; but we have already seen that ancient States did not recognize the existence of a sphere in the life of the individual in which the State had no jurisdiction. In the ancient world conscience had no 'rights.' The whole life of the individual was subject to the control of the State. Under these circumstances persecution in the case of religious recalcitrance was simply another name for the punishment of political offenders. Refusal to worship the gods or to observe the official religion was a crime of the deepest dye, as the provocation of the gods imperilled the safety of the State. The Jewish Law was severe on blasphemy, for the wrath of Jahweh would mean disaster to the nation. It was a political crime of a very grave character. Tacitus might scornfully write,* 'deorum injuriæ dis curæ'—it was the business of the gods to avenge any insults they might receive. But if the anger of the gods issued in national calamities, as the masses believed, it was the State's urgent business that there should be no religious shirkers or slackers within the Empire, to provoke the gods to anger, and thus bring down misfortune on the nation. Persecution or the application of force to ensure submission in religious matters was inevitable when the State claimed the right to control the whole life of its subjects, secular and religious. 'Persecution' is applicable to this attitude of the State if the individuals who claim religious freedom admit in every other respect their responsibility to the State and acknowledge their obligation to submit to all the laws of the realm. But ancient States were reluctant to admit that this 'free exercise of religion' was compatible with loyalty to the State, and there was no general recognition of the voluntary nature of religion. It is the increasing recognition of the fact that the religious attitude must be deliberate, spontaneous, uncoerced, that has accounted for the corresponding growth of the spirit of tolerance which prevails in the modern world. Until comparatively recent times it was currently accepted that coercion was a legitimate and effectual means of securing religious acquiescence. Coercion may bring about external submission, but it cannot result in living acceptance of the truth which is being pressed. In the words of the author of the earliest English book which defends liberty of conscience, 'as king and bishop cannot command the wind, so they cannot command faith.'†

---

* *Upon Human Nature*, serm. ii., in *Works*, ed. J. H. Bernard, London, 1900, vol. i. p. 48.

* Ruffini, *Religious Liberty*, p. 29 f.

† Quoted in Lecky, *Rationalism in Europe*, vol. ii. p. 11 n.

‡ J. Harrington, *A System of Politics*, ch. vi., quoted in Ruffini, p. 175 f.

We see the germ of the doctrine in some of the Fathers, many of whom denounced coercion in matters of faith and pointed out that force is inimical to conviction, which is the very life of religion. Tertullian writes: 'However, it is a fundamental human right, a privilege of nature, that every man should worship according to his own convictions: one man's religion neither harms nor helps another man. It is assuredly no part of religion to compel religion—to which free-will and not force should lead us—the sacrificial victims even being required of a willing mind. You will render no real service to your gods by compelling us to sacrifice. For they can have no desire of offerings from the unwilling, unless they are animated by a spirit of contention, which is a thing altogether undivine.'* Lactantius followed in a similar strain: 'But it is religion alone in which freedom has placed its dwelling. For it is a matter which is voluntary above all others, nor can necessity be imposed upon any, so as to worship that which he does not wish to worship. Someone may perhaps pretend, he cannot wish it.'† Many of the leading Fathers, such as Hilary of Poictiers and Chrysostom, emphasized the same truth. But Augustine overshadowed all his predecessors, and he gave his view in favour of the persecution of paganism and heresy. He developed his theory of persecution from the words 'Compelle intrare.'‡ He has been charged with flagrant inconsistency because whilst paganism was the Imperial religion he advocated toleration, whereas, after the establishment of the Christian religion, he urged coercion. It may be urged, on the other hand, that Augustine's experience during the Donatist controversy led him to change his mind in regard to the persecution of heresy. But apart from that possibility, the charge of inconsistency is not so obvious as is sometimes supposed. To Augustine Christianity was *the* religion. Paganism, in every form of it, was false. He advocated the extirpation of paganism and heresy for the same reason as he had advocated toleration for Christianity. He was superficially inconsistent, but there was deep inner consistency in his attitude. To him Christianity and paganism stood to each other as the true and false or right and wrong or good and evil, and evil must be opposed in every possible way, and good must be promoted by all possible means. Whether he advocated tolerance or coercion, his main contention was that the good should prevail, and that the evil should be repressed; inner consistency made it imperative that he should advocate toleration in favour of Christianity when paganism was in power, and coercion against paganism when Christianity had secured a footing. It is evident that Augustine had solid grounds for thinking that coercion in the early stages of the religious life was effectual. The preaching of the gospel has not always appealed to the highest ethical motives. The terrors of hell have played a prominent part in the making of saints. If Martineau's view is correct that 'the administration of any uneasiness to body or mind, in consequence of a man's belief, or with a view to change it,' is persecution, the preaching even of the 20th cent. is very largely 'persecution.' There can be no successful preaching which does not produce uneasiness of mind, for the experiences of the penitent soul must issue in great uneasiness of mind. Various motives are at work in the initial stages of the religious life. Augustine had evidence of the advantages of compulsion, and it was the universal belief of mediæval Christendom, and certainly of mediæval States, that coercion was compatible with the nature of Christianity. The few voices which had been raised on behalf of the spontaneity of religious faith were forgotten for many weary centuries until in writings of the advocates of religious liberty in the 17th and 18th centuries the truth was once more set forth with greater clearness and force. It was the prevalent view of monarchs no less than of ecclesiastical leaders that refusal to comply with the demands of the throne or the curia was 'obstinacy.' There are not wanting persons in the 20th cent. to whom passive resistance is only a form of 'pigheadedness.' Whilst the struggle for religious freedom was being waged on the Continent and in Great Britain, many exceedingly able writers published books and pamphlets on the spontaneous nature of religious faith. Persecution, wrote Milton,[*] is wholly unnecessary, 'for who knows not that Truth is strong next to the Almighty,' and even mischievous and harmful, for each individual must 'discover' the truth for himself, or else be for ever a stranger to it.

---

* *Ann.* i. 73.

† L. Busher, *Religious Peace*, London, 1614, quoted in Ruffini, p. 158.

* *Ad Scapulam*, 2.

† *Div. Inst.* 54.

‡ *De Correctione Donistarum*, 6. 24.

LITERATURE.—In addition to the general works on Ecclesiastical History the following works may be mentioned: Lactantius, *de Mortibus Persecutorum* (A.D. 314); A. J. Mason, *The Persecution of Diocletian*, Cambridge, 1876; B. Aubé, *Histoire des persécutions de l'Église jusqu'à la fin des Antonins*, Paris, 1875; F. Pollock, 'The Theory of Persecution,' in *Essays in Jurisprudence and Ethics*, London, 1882; P. Allard, *Histoire des persécutions pendant les deux premiers siècles*^{2}, Paris, 1892, *Histoire des persécutions pendant la première moitié du III^{e} siècle*^{2}, do., 1894, *Les dernières persécutions du III^{e} siècle*^{2}, do., 1898; W. E. H. Lecky, *History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe*, 2 vols., London, 1865; E. G. Hardy, *Christianity and the Roman Government*, do., 1894; W. M. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, do., 1894; W. E. Addis, *Christianity and the Roman Empire*, do., 1893; J. A. F. Gregg, *The Decian Persecution*, Edinburgh, 1897; P. J. Healy, *The Valerian Persecution*, London, 1905; H. B. Workman, *Persecution in the Early Church*, do., 1906; J. Herkless, *The Early Christian Martyrs and their Persecutions*, do., n.d.; F. Ruffini, *Religious Liberty*, tr. J. P. Heyes, do., 1912; J. B. Bury, *History of Freedom of Thought*, do., 1913.

T. LEWIS.

PERSEVERANCE.—The apostolic doctrine of perseverance is (*a*) conceived in a purely practical experiential sense, and (*b*) comprises three parts: a religious persuasion, a moral endeavour, and the entire dependence of the latter on the former.

The former consideration distinguishes it at once from subsequent theological formulæ whether of mediæval or reformed Christendom; the latter exhibits its characteristic contents. There was little special interest directed to the subject, and no controversy, till the time of St. Augustine, who, impelled by his predestinarian idea, explicitly affirmed a 'donum perseverantiæ' to the justified, a supernatural gift of grace to the elect by which they are kept indefectible.[†] The gift was solely of the Divine mercy, unconditional; it followed as a necessary sequence from personal election. All who are predestinated receive the Divine grace, are born again of the Spirit, shall certainly persevere to the end, and can never fall away either totally or finally from the state of grace. Their possession of the gift is further the source of assurance of final salvation. The 'final perseverance of the saints' is gratuitous, irresistible, inamissible, and certain.

The Augustinian positions continued throughout the Middle Ages to agitate, in the way of action and reaction, the thought of theologians. The Council of Orange[‡] dealt with current perplexity, but in a superficial manner. The constructive genius of St. Thomas Aquinas systematized the general idea of St. Augustine in consistency with numerous points of doctrine that had emerged between St. Augustine's day and his.[§] Of the Reforming divines both Luther and Calvin held to its strict statement: Calvin, like St. Augustine, treats of it particularly.[‖] The Council of Trent, ostensibly opposing the Reformed heresies, departed widely from genuine Augustinianism. While condemning Pelagianism in asserting that the justified cannot persevere without a special help of God, but with it can, it yet makes the power of perseverance to reside in the human will co-operative with Divine grace. The Divine gift, while wholly of God's grace, is neither irresistible nor indefectible: it may be lost not only partially and temporarily but totally and finally. Lost grace may be restored. Of final perseverance there never can be full assurance. The one certainty open to the saint is the obligation to the steadfast use of the whole *ensemble* of spiritual means whereby the human will is enabled to persevere unto the end and so be preserved in the state of grace. Of such means the chief are the impetrative power of prayer and the sacraments. The 'final perseverance of the saints,' while of Divine gratuity, is not irresistible nor inamissible, nor certain.[*]

Within Protestantism strict Calvinism suffered various mitigations at the hands of Calvinists themselves;[†] and direct attack from the Arminians (later, Wesleyans), who opposed the doctrine on its unconditional side,[‡] arguing that those who were once regenerated may by grieving the Spirit of God fall away and perish everlastingly. The Synod of Dort condemned Arminianism and reaffirmed 'high' Calvinism.[§]

The controversy has in modern theology lost its force. Its vitality is seen to depend on a facile confusion of the two factors entering into the experience it seeks to explain: viz. the religious and the moral. It is part of the religious consciousness to ascribe sovereignty to God and to trace the causation of everything to the eternal purpose. This is a definite experience which can be seen in every prophet. He knows that there is nothing haphazard in his life; that everything in it is caused not casual; that the cause came as a call to which his soul responds; that this, true in the smaller things of life, is equally true of the great things of the soul, in which, as it seems, the spirit of man is more a passive recipient than an active agent, for all the higher reserves of the religious life are mystical. This religious conviction is distinctive of all the supreme spiritual personalities. In their view there is no hint of a dual causality of the soul's life of grace. The religious consciousness is constituted by the sense of dependence upon God. The moral life is as truly constituted by the invincible exercise of independent force of character, and the more dependent the spiritual sense the more intense the moral independence. For grace and faith are 'lively'—vital: they have moral energy impelling to action, not repose. Thus in the actual experience of the Christian life a firm belief in the doctrine of perseverance excludes all carnal security and laxity: it is ever accompanied by a deep sense of the possibility of failure and of the absolute necessity of using the utmost effort in order to win final success. There is no perseverance without conscious determined persevering. These two constituent features are not to be separated, since they have neither independent origin nor independent exercise.[‖] It is not that the one is of God's gift, the other of man's effort and initiative. It is that the Divine grace besetting man's heart, when turned to Him, engirds and subdues every interior faculty and quality (Ph 3^{21}), implanting in each the dynamic of Divine affection unto constant, increasing ethical issue, 'working mightily unto every good word and work.' The Christian faith and ethics co-exist in inseparable unity. The steady tendency of religion is towards holiness; the grace of God in Christ is wholly regulated by the inner purpose to make good men. It is not just, therefore, to minds of the predestinarian type to charge them with ‘austerity of logic’[*] or ‘false supernaturalism,’[†] as if their doctrine were a simple immediate deduction from an absolute idea having no living reference to inner emotion. The great predestinationists were ‘the most Christian men of their generation’;[‡] their theology was the expression of its dominant conception in interpreting the relation of man to God. They are not ignorant of the sphere of man's effort: they insist upon it with impressive ‘austerity.’[§] But to them it is a sphere, concentric with, but smaller than, that of reliance upon God, in which true religion consists, and in which it does truly consist as an energy, spiritual, eternal, persistent, inspiring indefinite advance in righteousness, and delivering the growing soul from all trembling uncertainties as to resources and equipment, prospects, final goal. This is the absolute datum (not idea) set forth in the predestinarian definitions of election and perseverance: it is a datum of soul perception and persuasion induced by the soul's experience of the Power that holds it and guides and guards it, the only adequate equivalent of the profound apostolic intuition: ‘in God we live, and move, and have our being’ (Ac 17^{28}).[‖]

---

[*] *Areopagitica*, ed. Oxford, 1894, p. 52.

[†] Cf. his *de Dono perseverantiæ* and *de Correptione et gratia*.

[‡] Second Council, A.D. 529. It affirmed merely the general necessity of grace to good works. Cf. C. J. Hefele, *Councils of the Church*, Eng. tr. iv. [Edinburgh, 1895] 152–167.

[§] Cf. *Summa Theolog.*, II. i. 109–114 (ed. Migne, Paris, 1896).

[‖] Cf. *Institutes*, ch. iii. §§ 11–14.

[*] Cf. Council of Trent, sess. vi. ch. xiii. can. 16, 22 (cf. P. Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom*, New York, 1877, ii. 103, 113 f., 115); *CE*, artt. 'Grace,' 'Perseverance'; J. H. Newman, 'Perseverance in Grace' (*Discourses to Mixed Congregations*^{7}, London, 1891, p. 124).

[†] In the forms of 'Sublapsarianism' and 'Subterlapsarianism' (Amyraldism).

[‡] Cf. Remonstrants' Confession, A.D. 1610 (Schaff, iii. 545 ff.); Wesley's *Notes on the NT*, and certain *Sermons*.

[§] Cf. the Canons of Dort, adopted at the 136th session, A.D. 1618–19 (*Acta Synodi Nationalis Dordrechti habitæ ann. 1618 et 1619*, Dort, 1620; Schaff, iii. 550 ff.).

[‖] Cf. art. GRACE.

1. The religious persuasion.—The religious persuasion has deep roots; the only attainments of which it is the inspiration are so high that nothing short of the recesses of richest truth suffice for the soil of their growth—the heavenliest forces known to the apostles. These are: (1) the will of God, (2) the pattern of Christ, (3) the life of the Spirit, (4) the fellowship of faith, (5) the heavenly inheritance.

(1) *The will of God* is the strongest, as it is the most comprehensive, support of the assurance of salvation: there can be none more secure or ample. The will of God holds the primacy in ‘all creation’ (Ro 11^{36}, etc.). In the natural world it is central; all the forces of nature are but manifestations or outgoings of the force of will, and of one will—that of the Creator. His will is also central in the realm of spiritual life, wherever that is true and progressive; the higher life of humanity is simply the will of God realizing itself according to its own purpose, not only in spite of the resistance of the countless hostile wills of men, but by means of that resistance, as the will of a perfect righteousness. Because of its primacy, there is no reasonable relation to it but that of obedience: there is no hope of successful life except in conformity to it, since it must in the end be done, God having of necessity by His own being to work always towards His own end. There is no other purpose of God for men (Eph 1$^{4.11}$) but that which is embraced within His all-wise, all-righteous designs (Ro 12$^{1.2}$, Gal 1^{4}, Eph 2^{10}, Col 1$^{9.10}$, He 10^{10}, 1 P 2^{15}, 1 Ti 2^{4}). Moreover, a resolute renunciation of man's will in self-surrender to God's has for result the new nature like His, increase in strength, triumph in effort after holiness. It is the mightiest forge of personality (Ro 5$^{1-6}$ 8$^{2.18}$, Gal 5$^{22-26}$, Eph 3$^{16-19}$ 5$^{9.10.17}$, etc.), thereby evidencing that it is of God (Ph 2^{13}, 2 Ti 2^{19}) and His will (1 Ti 2^{4}, He 2^{4}, etc.). We are thus assured that His will is our sanctification (1 Th 4^{3}), a fact of indubitable certitude warranted by the *Divine promises*, which are of life (2 Ti 1^{1}, 1 Jn 2^{25}) to all men (Ac 2^{39}, 2 P 1^{4} 3^{13}) from a faithful God (He 6^{17}, 1 Th 5^{24}, 1 Co 1^{9}, 2 Th 3^{3}, He 10^{23}, 1 P 4^{19}, Tit 1^{2}) and fulfilled in Christ (Ac 13$^{32.33}$, 2 Co 1^{20}, Ro 15^{8}, Rev 5^{5}), who as the Word liveth in the saved (Ro 1^{16}, 1 Th 2^{13}, Ja 1^{18}, 1 P 1^{23}); by the *Divine power*, appearing in Christ (Ac 3$^{12.16}$, Ro 16^{25}, 1 Co 2^{5} 3^{9}, 2 Co 4^{7}), producing in believers in Him the selfsame richness of character as is in Him (Eph 1$^{19-23}$ 3^{20}, Col 1$^{11.29}$, 2 Co 5$^{17-21}$ 9^{8}, 2 P 1^{3}); and by the *Divine love* (Ro 8$^{28.38.39}$), which is invincible. God's promises are the expression of spiritual laws, the controlling forces of His power. Herein rests their reliable character. Their content furnishes everything requisite for the fullness of the sanctified life. He who has founded and begun all has also provided all for its complete advance to perfection and accomplishment. In His arrangements there can be no possible room for defect or caprice: there need be no dubiety in the expectation that what is needed for the ripening of the redeemed character is present. As a matter of fact it is present in the Son, communion with whom is the indispensable condition, as He is the sole ground, of growing personality. Accepting that condition, saints need have no fear; they are kept by the power of God through that same goodness that made the beginning. The Spirit who redeems will also sanctify (1 Co 1^{8}, 2 Co 1$^{20.21}$ 5^{5}, Ph 1^{6} 3^{21} 4^{1}, 1 Th 3$^{12.13}$ 5^{23}, 2 Th 1$^{11.12}$ 2^{17}, 2 Ti 1^{12}, 1 P 5^{10}, 1 Jn 2^{20}).

(2) *The pattern of Christ* is a second principle of perseverance. The resources and exemplar of the new life are in Him. He is the Prince of Saints[*] and their Sanctifier (Eph 5^{26}). He is made of God unto them sanctification (1 Co 1^{30}). His glory is their standard, contemplation of which is the influence of transformation and renewal (2 Co 3^{18}). The graces of His character, mental and emotional, are reproduced in them by His might (Col 1$^{9-11}$), and confirmed in them by communion with Him (2$^{6f.}$ 3$^{13.16.17}$). His fidelity they imitate (He 3$^{2.6.12.14}$). His love constrains them (2 Co 5^{14}), bringing them to all the fullness of God (Eph 3^{19}). In His might they fight the devil (6$^{10-18}$) and stand. In His patience they run the race set before them (He 12$^{1.2}$). As their Forerunner He has attained the hope of the heavenly inheritance and entered within the veil (6$^{19.20}$). By the Divine power and symmetry of His godly life they partake of the Divine nature itself (2 P 1$^{3-4}$) in all moral and spiritual excellence (vv.$^{5-8}$). All this is accomplished by faith in Him.

The important features here are, firstly, the *perfection of Christ's Person*, His completeness of character, its self-consistency. It is a living whole, in which the facts form, as it were, a co-operative brotherhood, interpervasive each of the others, each lending energy and colour to the whole, and combining in the highest cultivation of the moral and spiritual senses. As character it was made possible by His perfect love of the Father and consequent perfect union with Him. The second feature is *the steadfastness of His striving*, the devotion of Himself to the will of God to the uttermost, the absolute dependence of His heart on the Divine intimations of duty—a devotion and dependence that rendered Him always acceptable to the Father. It was a constancy never for a moment shadowed by even a thought of disaffection, fainting, or failure. It was a standing that was also a withstanding, a race that was also a continuous unceasing progress. Thirdly, we have *the justification of His confidence*. Having committed Himself to the Father, He was by the Father raised again, and exalted to His right hand in power and glory. Having given Himself to obedience, He was purified; to suffering, He was perfected. He had entered into the inheritance of life eternal. The prize was won, the goal was reached. The saint, persistent after the same manner, will achieve the same success. As Christ rested on God, the Christian rests on Christ, reposing on His Person, trusting in His companionship, relying on His Spirit, and so attains the end of his faith.

---

[*] Macaulay's phrase; cf. *Hist. of England*, ed. London, 1889, ch. i. p. 40.

[†] Cf. *CE*, art. ‘Justification.’

[‡] E. Renan's description of Calvin, *Studies of Religious History*, Eng. tr., London, 1893, p. 340.

[§] True to their feeling is the familiar saying of St. Ignatius: ‘Pray as if all depended on God's doing; act as if all depended on your doing’; cf. Wordsworth:

> ‘’Tis the most difficult of tasks to keep
> Heights which the soul is competent to gain’
> (*Excursion*, iv. 138 f.).

[‖] Cf. Morley's striking reflexions in *Oliver Cromwell*, London, 1904, ch. iii. p. 47 ff.

[*] ‘Principium sanctorum’ (ancient Catholic collect).

(3) *The life of the Spirit* is a third immediate evidence of perseverance; for the life of perseverance is just the Spirit in the soul, the life of God, and that brings with it its own self-witness. It is a life of freedom from sin (Ro 8^{1-17}, 2 Co 3^{17}), strength (Ro 8^{26}), sanctification (Ro 15^{16}, 1 P 1^{2}), new walk (Gal 5^{16}), spiritual gifts (1 Co 12^{8-11}), spiritual discernment (1 Jn 2^{20}), spiritual blessings inconceivable to the natural understanding (1 Co 2^{10-14}), faith and the moral virtues (1 Co 12^{3}, Gal 5^{22-26}, 1 P 1. 2), and the love of God (Ro 5^{5}), as well as that repentance which must daily testify to its existence in the Christian life (Ac $5^{31. 32}$) as necessary, not simply as being preparatory to regeneration but as belonging to daily renewal. By the Spirit saints are sealed as God's (Ro 8^{16}, Eph 1^{13}). He further is the earnest of the ultimate inheritance (Eph 1^{14}) in the hope of which He keeps the saved life in actual obedience and growth in grace. By the Spirit believers know for certain (*οἴδαμεν*, 1 Jn 3^{24}) that God abideth in them. The life of the Spirit is thus one under the compulsion of (*a*) a *lofty ideal*, (*b*) ever-growing *spiritual* apprehension, (*c*) *moral* discrimination, (*d*) deepening gravity and fecundity of *emotional force*, (*e*) larger and more spontaneous *obedience*. But what are these, if not the essential unmistakable notes of the holy soul?

(4) *The fellowship of faith* is a fourth conviction of perseverance. 'By this shall all men know,' said Christ, 'that ye are my disciples, that ye love one another' (Jn 13^{35}). That vindication of their standing in grace is never absent from the apostolic assurance. 'Love the brotherhood,' enjoins St. Peter (1 P 2^{17}). 'Beloved, let us love one another,' urges St. John (1 Jn 4^{7}). 'Brethren, speak not evil one of another,' pleads St. James (Ja 4^{11}); 'Have not the faith with respect of persons' (2^{1}); 'Make perfect your faith in works to the brethren' ($2^{14. 22}$). 'Let us consider one another to provoke unto love and good works; not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together,' teaches Hebrews (He $10^{24. 25}$; cf. 13^{1}). St. Paul asserts that sin against brethren is sin against Christ (1 Co 8^{12}; cf. Ro 12^{10}), that disregard of one another is division of the Body and the Spirit (1 Co $12^{7. 12. 25}$), that the household of God must in unity keep itself fitly framed together (Eph $2^{19. 22}$; cf. Ac 2^{42}). Saintly experience is not all in one mould, but all differences, however great, may serve to manifest the power and the plenitude of the sanctifying Spirit of grace, the innumerable varieties corroborating one another, and in their cumulative effect enhancing the impression made by each. 'The glorious company of the Apostles, the goodly fellowship of the prophets, the noble army of the martyrs, the milder bands of the mystics' perfect each other (cf. He 11^{40}), as each proves 'his conversation to be in heaven' (Ph 3^{20}),* and the fellowship of believers to be truly 'the fellowship with the Father and with his Son, Jesus Christ' (1 Jn 1^{3}).

(5) *The heavenly inheritance* provides a fifth support. It occupies a remarkable space on the apostolic horizon. It gives definite body to thought, purpose, and desire as the great hope (Ro 5^{2}, Eph $1^{18. 19}$ 4^{4}, Col $1^{5. 27}$, 1 Th 4^{13} 5^{8}, 2 Th 2^{13-17}, Tit 1^{2} $2^{13. 14}$, He $6^{18. 19}$ 7^{19}, 1 P $1^{3. 4. 13}$ 3^{15}, 1 Jn $3^{2. 3}$) in which the disciple rejoices, since it is life eternal (Ro 6^{23}, Eph $1^{3. 14}$, 2 Ti 4^{8}, Tit 3^{7}, He 6^{5}), the long-striven-for and appropriate culmination and consummation of this present life, according to God's will (1 Co 9^{25}, 2 Ti 4^{8}, Ja 1^{12}, 1 P 5^{4}, Rev 2^{10} 3^{11}, 'crown of life'), life eternal which stands *de facto* realized in Christ, 'which is our hope' (1 Ti 1^{1}), who is crowned with glory and honour (He $2^{9. 10}$), with many crowns (Rev 19^{12}). Through the ascension of Christ Christian hope has a limitless reach.* It reaches outwardly into eternity, inwardly into the sanctuary on high. It looks to a hidden Kingdom of Glory—'a salvation yet to be revealed'—into which it casts its anchor, keeping the soul firm and tranquil. It contemplates Him who wears its crown and sees in Him its own surety. His being there and thus renders the hope of entrance a certainty. It is a living hope (1 P 1^{3}), yielding vital stimulus to the whole nature it inhabits—sentiment, thought, will. The purpose of God, the character of Christ, the soul's growth in goodness, the varieties of saintly experience, the hope of heaven—these are the dynamics of the redeemed and regenerated life, the pledges of holy attainment. Can we wonder if those who most felt their attraction and learned their strength claimed to possess in them a five-fold cord that could not be broken, a basis of spiritual existence irremovable and unshakable, whose sufficiency was wholly of God and filled life itself with an unquenchable joy (cf. Ro 5^{2}, Ph 4^{4}, 1 Th 5^{16}, 1 P 1^{8}, He 3^{6}, Rev 12^{12}) or that any attempt to claim for man ability or sufficiency should not appear other than religious illiteracy?

2. The moral endeavour.—The principles of perseverance, in virtue of their very nature as active impulse in union with fixed conviction, are pregnant with moral life. They are the reservoirs of the highest moral life and inspiration; they reveal to the persevering soul its exalted moral ideal and the rigorous method of realizing it; the acceptance of which is the probation of faith in steadfastness; its rejection, apostasy.

(1) *The moral ideal* regulating the virtue of perseverance is not vague; it is definite. The life of perseverance is a specific culture of the positive contents of the will of God, and that throughout their whole extent. To this the saints are 'called'; it is the 'heavenly calling' of which they are partakers (1 Co 1^{9}, 1 Th 4^{7}, Gal 5^{13}, 2 P 1^{3}, 2 Th 2^{14}, He 3^{1}). Their *κλῆσις* is into a Kingdom of the Divine design, of positive order, ruled in righteousness by and according to His will, a sovereignty in fact as well as in idea, not a domain but a dominion, through its citizens growing in righteousness (Ro 5^{17} 8^{10}, Eph 5^{9} 6^{14}, 1 Ti 6^{11}, 1 Jn 2^{29}, 1 P 1^{15}, Rev 19^{8}). Its content is Christ, and the righteousness is His actual life (1 Co 1^{30}, 2 Co 5^{21}, Ph 3^{9}). Its end is 'to be found in him' (Ph 3^{9}) and 'by him to be presented blameless, unreproached, without spot' in the end (1 Co 1^{8}, 2 P 3^{14}, Col 1^{28}). There is then a Divine order of life in which the Divine aim is fulfilled, its cardinal power being God's holiness. That holiness, manifested in Christ's Person, presents man's nature in Him as it is in that order. Consequently, all moral effort of believers must be directed towards realizing His mind, imitating His example. His relation to God expresses the whole fullness of the human spirit's energy of which it is competent. Out of His strength of belief in God's holy sovereignty was born His dauntless perseverance. His path His saints pursue. They contemplate the holiness of God in Him, and 'perfect themselves in holiness in the fear of God' (2 Co 7^{1}); they 'obey the

---

* Cf. Edwin Hatch's well-known hymn, 'All Saints,' in his *Towards Fields of Light: Sacred Poems*, London, 1890.

* One indispensable test of Christian perfection which some modern theories, *e.g.* Wesley's, ignore.

truth' (1 P 1^{22}), they 'abide in the light' (1 Jn $1^{6.\ 7}$) and in the love (4^{16}).

These terms of themselves point to further features of the ideal law: it is not only righteous; it is personal, spiritual, progressive. Its excellency is that it is righteousness primarily and wholly: its highest excellency, that that righteousness is spirit not form, quality not a quantum, and of illimitable outlook—illimitable as God Himself. Its realization partakes of the process of a deepening friendship; the Divine Spirit donates itself to the responsive spirit of man, quickening its growing exercise of faculty, gradually and throughout the whole circumference of the spirit's possible activity. The stronger personality does not override but inspires. As it succeeds increasingly in transferring its own powers to man's, man is conscious of both revelation and regeneration, fresh knowledge and new character. Is it a process of conscious effort, a careful fulfilment of already known arrangements?—Scarcely. An acquaintance is not the product of certain rules, but the unconscious result of much association. The Divine life in man's heart is largely an unconscious growth.[*] The main factor is association with God in self-surrender. At least His best gifts so come, by 'waiting upon Him.' The deliberate seeking of great experiences for their own sake is unwise, and likely to be unavailing. It follows further that religious duty is a given task, a 'burden' laid on the heart,[†] which is straitened[‡] till it be accomplished. It does not come by subjective calculations but is put upon man as the objective task of doing God's will in that lot and at that moment, even as the thinker devoted to the spirit of truth learns truths, or the artist in love with beauty paints pictures.

A second consequence is that the ideal life is to be found in the moral and spiritual realm. God is a Spirit, and they that seek His life in perseverance must seek Him in the spirit. There is a constant tendency to 'seek Him' by 'searching the Almighty unto perfection' in the grandiose constructions of the speculative intellect. It is imperative to have all speculative intimidations[§] removed from the path of perseverance; like Bunyan's lions, they only frighten the pilgrim.

A third consequence is that the ideal life works itself in the orderly, not in the abnormal. The will of God is essentially law. The life of God is not above law, whether in Himself or in His manifestation. His life in the soul of man is not inconsistent with Himself. When He works in us, He works according to law; for which reason His working calls for all our effort. It is His own order of life that He transfers to man; this can be done only through the laws of man's nature of which He is Himself the author. Spiritual blessing is therefore not conferred in any scenic fashion but by power moving along the lines of normal life, and manifesting itself in its products. This is the best of all exaggerated psychological and mystical states: they have no value apart from their moral content and moral effect, they are subject to the law of righteousness.

A fourth consequence is that the ideal life is a principle for all living, not apart from living interests.[‖] Religion that is true is not a technicality; it is the Divine presence and agency in life as a whole. It is not a speciality; it is the loyal, loving effort to make the will of God triumphant in all fields of human interest and activity—the soul, the family, society, art, letters. The difference between the elect and non-elect lies not in their sphere of work: they differ in their spirit. The worldling loses himself in the life of sense-things; the believer relates his life to God's order of life and glorifies it by filling it with heroic devotion. To sum up, the life of perseverance is the life of conscience: a life of communion with God through the conscience and its steady enlightenment by His law. All exaltations of inner feeling, raptures, anomalous experiences must pale before the orderly interaction of religious thought, feeling, moral will which this education of conscience entails. Man's predestinarian days are days of conscience,[*] and aim not at 'religious experiences' but at righteousness.[†] They lay unchallengeable insistence on the truth that the changed life, the clean heart, the strengthened will, the deeper moral insight, the spirit of uprightness, are alone acceptable to God, the noblest fruits of faith, the prime factors of holiness. This ideal is laid upon men by God, not to impose a harder law, but from His consuming passion to bring them to the fullest life.

(2) Corresponding to the exalted character of the ideal itself is *the method of its fulfilment*. Its rigour is uncompromising. Its exhortation is incessant. The earnestness with which it is urged and the importance attached to it by each apostle are conspicuous in every Epistle. Remarkable are the energy of the metaphors and the extent and solemnity of the terms employed to characterize it. It is fundamentally the holding fast of a position. Its most notable description is given in Eph 6^{10-18}, an analysis of which will disclose all the parts that here follow, gathered from the other NT writings. Saints *are* saints—they occupy the position; they are in the state of grace; their whole attention, devotion, labour, is to keep it, and to stand (Ro 14^{4}, 1 Co 16^{13}, 2 Co 1^{24}, Eph 6^{13}, Ph 1^{27} 4^{1}, 1 Th 3^{8}, 1 P 5^{12}). St. John's word is 'abide in' (1 Jn 2^{24} 3^{6} $4^{12.\ 16}$, 2 Jn ^{2}); in Hebrews there are various words (2^{1} $3^{6.\ 12.\ 14}$ 4^{14} 6^{11} $10^{2.\ 23.\ 35}$); St. James' word is 'unstable,' 'wavering' ($1^{6.\ 7.\ 8}$); in Revelation it is 'hold fast' (2^{25} 3^{11}; cf. He 4^{14} 10^{23}).

This holding fast involves a two-fold strenuousness: (*a*) in fighting evil; (*b*) in reaching out to the goal (the good fight of the faith, the racing in the arena, 1 Ti 6^{12}, He 12^{1}; cf. 1 Co 9^{26}, 2 Ti 4^{7}, 2 Co 7^{5} 6^{14}, Eph 6^{12}, 1 Co 9^{26}, Ph 2^{16}, 1 P 5^{8}, etc.). The effort is an appeal to every power of the soul: to sobriety (1 Th 5^{8}, Tit $2^{2.\ 4.\ 6}$, 1 P 1^{13} 4^{7} 5^{8}, 1 Ti $2^{9.\ 15}$), to watchfulness (Col 4^{2}, 1 Co 16^{15}, 1 Th 5^{6}, 1 P 4^{7} 5^{8}, 2 Ti 4^{5}, Rev 3^{2} 16^{15}, 2 Co 6^{5}, Eph 6^{18}), to diligence (He 12^{15}, 2 P $1^{5.\ 10}$, 1 Co 15^{58}, Gal 6^{9}, Ph 3^{14}, 2 Th 3^{13}, He 6^{12}, 2 P 3^{14}), and to progress (He 6^{1}, etc.); above all to patience and steadfastness (1 Th 1^{3} 5^{14}, 2 Th 1^{4}, 1 Ti 6^{11}, 2 Ti 3^{10}, Tit 2^{2}, He 10^{36}, 2 P 1^{6}, Rev 1^{9} $2^{2.\ 19}$, 1 Co 15^{58}, He 3^{14} 6^{19}, 1 P 5^{9}, Col 2^{5}, 2 P 3^{17}). It is a steadfastness in faith, truth, hope, love, in the gospel, in all duty, but particularly under trial (Ro 5^{4} 12^{12}, Ja $1^{3.4}$ $5^{7.\ 8.\ 10}$, 1 P 1^{1-8} 2^{20}, Rev 13^{10} 14^{12}). Of so much patience and steadfastness there is need, because the life and the truth in the disciple will be, as in Christ, hated of the world, with a hatred enhanced both by the circumstances of life itself and by the potency of 'the flesh' in themselves. Their loyalty to truth will be confronted by persecution; their loyalty to faith will be confronted by the powers of the world; their loyalty to righteousness will be confronted by the malice of the devil. In meeting these, patience, firmness, persistency, exertion of mind, of heart, of will are absolute requisites. Let them maintain themselves in them; as appointed of God for the 'trial of faith.'

---

[*] Cf. Gal 1^{16}, Ph 3^{15}.

[†] The prophetic term.

[‡] Lk 12^{50}.

[§] Apostolic thought is not speculative; in this it is true to its Hebraic ancestry.

[‖] The apostles connect their exhortations to practical duties with their previously detailed principles (cf. Rom., 1 Cor., Eph., Col., 1 Peter).

[*] St. Paul is the author of 'the Christian conscience'; his doctrine, equivalent to 'the πνεῦμα in man,' is his largest contribution to Christian thought. St. Augustine and Luther made notable additions. National life and laws have been enriched most under statesmen influenced by minds like Calvin, Knox, the Pilgrim Fathers.

[†] Jonathan Edwards, *Religious Affections* (*Works*, New York, 1869, iii. 1 ff.).

Here two points should be specially noted—first, the large sense in which all these terms are used; secondly, the inwardness of trial. What is sobriety?—It applies to the whole nature—every part of which is to be awake; it really means awakeness.* What is watchfulness?—Again it applies to the whole nature; it is perceptiveness. What is patience?—It is that great-spiritedness which combines eagerness in striving with endurance in suffering. And suffering, what is it?—It at once reveals, confirms, develops faith. The spirit of the true Christian *agonistes* is slack in no element of its manifold nature; it hesitates at no sacrifice, is ready for all self-denial; it eagerly stretches and strains itself in self-discipline, above all in keeping itself disentangled, to follow after the prize of its high calling in Christ, which the persevering saint knows is within his grasp (2 Ti 4^{8}), for God can keep him to it (Ro 14^{4}).† Slackness in wrestling, on the other hand, involves a loosening of all the parts of the nature which by the grace of perseverance have been girded up, and, according as it is indulged, leads by a variety of stages of lapsing to final apostasy, the total abandonment of the position.‡

3. The maintenance of perseverance by God.—(1) The life of perseverance construed as above implies the sole maintenance of its actual activity by God Himself. It is a life whose beginning, medium, and consummation proceed from Him, as its ground, motive, and goal. It is the life for man that alone provides the proper meaning to the lower worlds of nature and history—the life for which these are propædeutic and preparatory. It is the life for humanity which alone is adequate to its natural capacities, satisfactory to its native aspirations, and provocative of its noblest heroisms. The modern mind may have moved away from the theological formulation of this persuasion: but not from the persuasion itself. It is learning eagerly the truth of the Divine Immanence in human nature as the key to the interpretation of God's relation to man. How does that idea aid us intellectually in understanding the grace of perseverance?—It unquestionably contains suggestions of real cogency in its conceptions of God and man that render the relation between them more vital than ever and acceptable to modern thought. God is self-impartation;§ man is receptivity. Man therefore cannot be himself except in entire dependence on God. The dependence, too, is irresistible and inalienable: even the evil in man's rejection of it is dependent.

(2) The religious persuasion of 'being in perseverance' is the firm assurance that we 'have tasted of the heavenly gift and the powers of the world to come' (He 6^{4,5}). The assurance of eternity in us and for all future life is not an easy assurance when we seek to present the intellectual grounds of it. It is comparatively simple when we turn to the instincts of immortality which spring from the conquest of evil in us. Nothing can rob a man of his sense of individuality, which comes upon him as he passes from a moral victory and his conscience grows. Now that growth is steadfastly maintained in the probation of faith. Every moral conquest brings fresh impulses of moral vigour and hope. Every moral conquest brings fresh revolt against the old forces. Every moral conquest brings fresh certainty of ultimate success. Such results point infallibly to the besetting power being righteous. It is an inescapable environment: even in the instance when not receptivity on man's part, but hostility, is offered, there follows hurt and loss. It is the same power which, obeyed, blesses; disobeyed, blasts.

(3) Let the idea be abandoned that the Divine indwelling is something sensuously presentable or emotionally definable, and it follows that the assurance of God's operation in us is just the inner sense of reality that comes to us in moral living. Nature and grace are not so antithetic as to be incapable of mutual penetration: the step is easy to discover the need of grace to the best nature—that at least is the predestinarian's plea. Holy love or righteousness, he argues, is the root of all life. For it all Nature is foreordained, prepared. For human life it is the one true formative force. In communion with God the springs of true life are unsealed. But holy love is of a higher nature than emotion: it denotes that quality in the nature of God that impels Him irresistibly to give Himself to His creatures. Hence in every spiritual fact attending on communion with Him, there is a momentum to moral duty. Thus here we stand. God, besetting all, moves all. His movement invites response from every single will; He waits on the start of our effort. That is not to take away from Him the initiative in salvation. Our effort is the beginning of His gift, the first stirring of 'the grace that is in us' from Him, and which can be ours in no other way. And so, after the start, throughout the whole of our moral growth, every new stirring in us is of our effort *and* of His gift and increase (Ph 2^{12}). We are never from first to last simple quietistic receivers of something infused. So indissolubly has God made us for Himself that we are the bearers (*θεοφόροι*), because incorporators, of a growing life which God quickens, as light awakes Nature and love the heart. Can such a condition be conceived of as intermittent?

LITERATURE.—Besides the works referred to in the body of the article, the reader should consult theological text-books in connexion with Grace. There are articles in Schaff-Herzog (C. A. Beckwith), *CE* (J. F. Sollier), *HDB* (G. Ferries). On modern views consult R. Eucken, *Christianity and the New Idealism*, Eng. tr., London and New York, 1909; J. R. Illingworth, *Christian Character*, London, 1904.

A. S. MARTIN.

PERSIS (Περσίς, a Greek name).—Persis is a woman saluted by St. Paul in Ro 16^{12}. She is described as 'the beloved' (*τὴν ἀγαπητήν*), by which may be meant a personal convert and disciple of the Apostle (see C. von Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age*, Eng. tr., i.^{2} [1897] 394) or one closely associated with him in his work. If so, it may be with intentional delicacy that St. Paul has so described her and not as 'my beloved,' the term which he applies to three men whom he salutes (Epænetus [v.^{5}], Ampliatus [v.^{8}], Stachys [v.^{9}]). On the other hand, 'the beloved' may indicate not personal relationship to the Apostle but the affection in which Persis was held by the whole Church to which she belonged and in which she 'laboured much in the Lord' (*ἥτις πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν ἐν κυρίῳ*). This further description completes our information with regard to Persis. It is noteworthy that the verb *κοπιᾶν*, which suggests painstaking effort, is used in Ro 16 only of women—of Mary (v.^{6}), of Tryphæna and Tryphosa (v.^{12}), and that the description of Persis includes the terms used of these, viz. *πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν* (Mary), *κοπιώσας ἐν κυρίῳ* (Tryphæna and Tryphosa). Elsewhere *κοπιᾶν* is employed to describe the Apostle's missionary labours (1 Co 15^{10}, Gal 4^{11}, Ph 2^{16}, Col 1^{29}), as well as the manual toil involved (1 Co 4^{12}, Eph 4^{28});

---

* See an admirable sermon of F. W. Farrar in *Sermons and Addresses in America*, London, 1892, p. 15.

† Cf. Calvin's saying, 'The Christian may know thirst but not drought.'

‡ Apostasy = *ἀπό* + *στάσις*.

§ Jonathan Edwards' profound idea of the Divine nature: *Dissertation on the End for which God created the World* (*Works*, 4 vols., New York, 1869, vol. ii. p. 193 ff.).

also the work of the leaders of the Church at Thessalonica (1 Th 5^{12}), of Christians like those who formed 'the household of Stephanas' (1 Co 16^{16}), and of certain elders in 1 Ti 5^{17} 'who labour in the word and in teaching.' It is therefore impossible to regard the work of Persis and of the other women as limited to practical benevolence, such as the showing of hospitality. The aorist, in contrast to the present used in the same verse of the labours of Tryphæna and Tryphosa, may point to some definite occasion of special importance in the past; or we may suppose that Persis was an aged woman whose active work was over. The sphere in which we shall picture her activities will be determined by our acceptance of the Roman or Ephesian destination of these salutations. The name Persis does not appear in inscriptions of the Imperial household.

T. B. ALLWORTHY.

PERSON OF CHRIST.—See CHRIST, CHRISTOLOGY.

PETER.—**1. Names.**—Peter is known by four different names in the NT. By far the most common designation is simply 'Peter' (20 times in Mt., 18 times in Mk., 15 times in Lk., 16 times in Jn., 52 times in Ac., twice in Gal. [$2^{7f.}$], and once in 1 Peter [1^{1}]). 'Simon,' standing alone, occurs less frequently (twice in Mt., 5 times in Mk., 10 times in Lk., once in Jn.), and 'Symeon' but once (Ac 15^{14}).* With two exceptions (Gal $2^{7f.}$), 'Cephas' is the term uniformly employed by St. Paul (1 Co 1^{12} 3^{22} 9^{5} 15^{5}, Gal 1^{18} $2^{9.11.14}$); and John once speaks of 'Cephas (which is by interpretation, Peter)' (1^{42}). 'Simon' and 'Peter' sometimes stand in conjunction with one another (3 times in Mt., once in Mk., twice in Lk., 18 times in Jn., 4 times in Acts, and once in 2 Pet. (1^{1}), where 'Symeon' rather than 'Simon' is, however, the better attested reading [אAKLP *et al.*]). Of the various names, 'Symeon' ('Simeon') and 'Cephas' are Semitic in origin, while 'Simon' and 'Peter' are Greek. 'Symeon' (Συμεών) appears frequently in the LXX as the rendering of the Heb. שִׁמְעוֹן (*Shimᵉôn*=Simeon); but, since it is applied to Peter at most only twice in the NT (Ac 15^{14}, 2 P 1^{1}), it can hardly have been his real name. In these two instances the usage, if not accidental, may have been designed to add solemnity and force to the narrative, and was made all the easier because the Greek 'Simon' (Σίμων), the name by which Peter probably had been known from childhood, was so like the Hebrew in sound. But among the Jews in Hellenistic times the Hebrew name had been largely supplanted by the Greek, and the latter was even written in Semitic characters (סִימוֹן). Some examples of Jews with the Greek name are Simon the Maccabæan, although his great-grandfather was called 'Symeon' (1 Mac 2^{3}); Simon the son of Onias (Sir 50^{1}); a certain Benjamite (2 Mac 3^{4}); and Simon Chosameus (1 Es 9^{32}). In Josephus' writings Jewish persons are very frequently called 'Simon,' less often 'Symeon.' Both names seem to have been employed, and usually with discrimination, by Jews in the Hellenistic period; but 'Simon' was the more common, and this in all probability was the Apostle's original name. In the Apostolic Age, however, he was known chiefly by his surname, 'Peter.' That this usage had been established already within the primitive Aramaic-speaking community is amply attested by St. Paul's frequent 'Cephas' (Κηφᾶς), a Græcized transliteration of the Aramaic כֵּיפָא (*Kepha'*), which when translated into Greek becomes 'Peter' (Πέτρος, 'stone').

There is some uncertainty as to the exact circumstances under which the Apostle first received this appellation. According to Mk 3^{16}, Lk 6^{14}, early in his Galilæan ministry Jesus set apart the Twelve to be His helpers and gave Simon the surname Peter (*καὶ ἐπέθηκεν ὄνομα τῷ Σίμωνι Πέτρον*) In referring to the same incident, Matthew (10^{2}) speaks of 'the so-called Peter' (*ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος*), but seemingly intends to make the Apostle's famous confession at Cæsarea Philippi the occasion for the Messiah to bestow upon him the name 'Peter' and to designate him formal head of the Church (Mt 16^{17-19}). In the Gospel of John, when Simon was first brought to Jesus, the latter exclaimed, 'Thou art to be called Cephas' (*σὺ κληθήσῃ Κηφᾶς* [1^{42}]), probably meaning from this time forth, since John does not recur to this subject and henceforth always (except in 21) uses 'Peter' either alone (16 times) or in conjunction with 'Simon' (18 times). Finally, there are intimations, though these are very vague, that the special recognition of Simon's supremacy may at one time have rested upon his early belief in Jesus' resurrection. He was generally thought to have been the first disciple to see—if not to believe in (Jn 20^{8})—the Risen Lord (1 Co 15^{5}, Mk 16^{7}, Lk 24^{34}), and, as St. Paul had attained apostleship through a similar vision, so Peter had been 'energized' for his work as an apostle (Gal 2^{8}). There is here no statement that Simon received his surname on this occasion—indeed, he is already known as 'Peter' (or 'Cephas') in this connexion—but it is possible that his initial vision, which made him the corner-stone of the new community, established, if not for the first time, at least more completely, the custom of referring to him as 'Peter.' The infrequency of the word as a proper name at that time, and the fact that 'Simon' would readily have served all ordinary needs either in Jewish or in Christian circles, make it still more evident that the designation 'Cephas' (Peter) was called forth by special circumstances, uncertain though some of the details may be at present. The usage undoubtedly originated early, probably in the lifetime of Jesus; and the significance of the appellation was at the outset, or soon became, intimately associated with Peter's prominent position within the company of early disciples.

2. Peter in the NT writings.—The earliest literature preserved from apostolic times, the letters of St. Paul, contains explicit and important information about Peter. These documents do not, to be sure, purport to give any detailed account of his career, and the data which they do preserve are usually incidental to other interests, but this very fact makes the information all the more significant. St. Paul's statements clearly represent items of general knowledge current at that early date regarding 'Cephas.' While St. Paul's references are relatively few in number, they contain implications of much importance. Peter is seen to have been the first to obtain a vision of the Risen Lord (1 Co 15^{5}); and thus from the outset he occupied a position of primacy in the community and was also first among the apostles, while St. Paul reckons himself last (1 Co 15^{9}). St. Paul vigorously resented the insinuation of his enemies, to the effect that Peter's chronological priority carried with it a superior authority, particularly for Gentile Christians; but, on the other hand, St. Paul did not think his apostleship or mission at all different in kind or superior in authority as compared with that of Peter. The seducers in Galatia were not really preaching Peter's gospel—they were perverting it (Gal 1^{7}); it was as truly founded upon faith in Jesus the Messiah as was St. Paul's (Gal 2^{16}); and both apostles had been equipped in the same authoritative way for the performance of their respective apostolic duties (Gal 2^{8}). Peter had been commissioned to preach the gospel to the Jews, and this work must have seemed to St. Paul quite as important as—perhaps in some respects more important than—his own specific task of Gentile evangelization. He never doubted that God's primary concern was for the welfare of the Jews, and that He had even designed them to be the ultimate heirs of the Kingdom, notwithstanding their temporary rejection of the gospel (Ro 11). In the meantime, the Gentiles were reaping the profits to be derived from the Jews' rejection, St. Paul being especially commissioned to carry on this temporary enterprise of evangelizing the Gentiles, but the original and fundamental task was still Peter's.

---

* Peter is not to be confused with other 'Simons' mentioned in the NT, *e.g.* the 'Cananæan' (Mt 10^{4}, Mk 3^{18}), who is also called 'the Zealot' (Lk 6^{15}, Ac 1^{13}), the brother of Jesus (Mt 13^{55}, Mk 6^{3}), the Pharisee (Lk $7^{40.43f.}$), the man of Cyrene (Mt 27^{32}, Mk 15^{21}, Lk 23^{26}), the father of Judas (Jn 6^{71} 12^{4} $13^{2.26}$), the 'Great' (Ac $8^{9.13.18.24}$), the 'tanner' (Ac 9^{43} $10^{6.17.32}$); or with other 'Symeons,' *e.g.* of Jerusalem (Lk $2^{25.34}$), one of Jesus' ancestors (Lk 3^{30}), 'Niger' (Ac 13^{1}), the patriarch (Rev 7^{7}).

The importance of this phase of St. Paul's thinking—an item sometimes obscured by a too one-sided emphasis upon the legalistic controversy—is further attested by the high estimate he continues to place upon Judaism, and the value he attaches to Christianity's Jewish connexions. The Jew has had the advantage in every way (Ro 3^{1} 9$^{1ff.}$), and St. Paul's ancestry entitles him to a full share in that advantage (Ro 11^{1}, 2 Co 11^{22}, Ph 3^{5}). True, his ancestral heritage must now be brought to its proper consummation in the new faith, toward which all the Divine purposes down through the ages had been tending. From St. Paul's point of view it was altogether essential, however, that Christianity should have had this Jewish origin; and so it was especially fitting, he thought, that those olive branches which had been temporarily severed from the Jewish trunk—as was the case with all Jews who rejected Christianity—should one day be restored to their rightful place along with the few wild olive branches that had in the meantime been grafted upon the native stock (Ro 11$^{11ff.}$). It fell to Peter's lot to engage in the work of preserving, or restoring, the original branches, a work with which St. Paul was in full sympathy and to which he would gladly have given himself at all costs had circumstances permitted (Ro 9^{3}). Hence it is not strange that he should cite the Jewish churches as models (1 Th 2^{14}), that he should refer with manifest satisfaction to their approval of his initial missionary activities (Gal 1^{24}), that he should reckon his own evangelizing activity as formally beginning at Jerusalem (Ro 15^{19}), that he should take occasion to pay Peter a two weeks' visit in Jerusalem (Gal 1^{18}), or that he should in all sincerity seek the approval of the Jerusalem Church upon his Gentile work (Gal 2$^{1ff.}$). Furthermore, his high estimate of the Jewish community's significance found very tangible expression in the collection, which was no mere perfunctory keeping of a past agreement, but an expression of genuine appreciation of the Jewish Christians' willingness to share their special prerogatives with the Gentiles who fulfilled the condition of faith (Gal 2^{10}, Ro 15$^{26-28}$). These facts must be borne in mind when attempting to evaluate St. Paul's testimony to the significance of Peter's position in the early history of Christianity. It is quite erroneous to conclude, as some interpreters have done, that St. Paul's controversy with the legalists really meant any conscious effort on his part to oppose or to supplant Peter, whose unique position in the early community and whose leadership in the work of evangelizing the Jews are clearly attested and highly esteemed by St. Paul.

Unfortunately, St. Paul did not have occasion to mention Peter as often as we could wish; consequently, the latter's career cannot be restored with any degree of fullness from the Pauline letters. Whether he was among the apostles in Jerusalem, whom St. Paul, had he so chosen, might have visited immediately after his conversion (Gal 1^{17}), is not clear; but three years later he was there and entertained St. Paul for two weeks (Gal 1^{18}). He was also in Jerusalem fourteen years later, when the legalistic controversy was going on (Gal 2$^{1-10}$). Soon afterwards, perhaps accompanying St. Paul and Barnabas on their return, he came to Antioch in Syria, where his reactionary attitude upon the question of table-fellowship with Gentiles evoked St. Paul's vigorous censure. An incidental reference to Peter as a travelling missionary accompanied by his wife and deriving support from those to whom he ministered (1 Co 9^{5}), and mention of a Cephas-party in Corinth (1 Co 1^{12} 3^{22}), complete the list of Pauline data. These scanty particulars do not permit of any very extended interpretation, yet they do make it clear that Peter was prominent in the counsels of the mother Church, that he continued to prosecute his work as an evangelist, and that his fame had reached even to Asia Minor and Greece early in the fifties.

Of the remaining Christian literature produced in apostolic times, the Gospels and Acts are the most important for our present purpose. In the first part of Acts, Peter is the leader of the apostolic company, and in the Gospels he occupies a position of prominence, commensurate with the dominant part he subsequently played in the life of the early Christian community. Remembering the ample attestation of Peter's prominence given by his contemporary St. Paul, it is not at all surprising that the evangelists, in selecting gospel tradition and giving it written form, should mention Peter frequently and assign him a position second only to that of Jesus. His name does not appear in any of the non-Marcan sections common to Matthew and Luke (*i.e.* in the Logia [Q]), but in Mark he is a conspicuous figure from first to last. He, with his brother Andrew, is the first to answer Jesus' call to discipleship (1^{16}); they entertain Him at their home in Capernaum, where He heals Simon's mother-in-law (1$^{29f.}$); and the company of the disciples is now known as 'Simon and those with him' (1^{36}). He heads the list of the Twelve (3^{16}), he is named first among the favoured few to witness the raising of Jairus' daughter (5^{37}), he is granted similar favours at the time of the Transfiguration (9^{2}), and in Gethsemane on the night of the betrayal (14^{33}), and it is to him in particular that the women are instructed to announce the resurrection of Jesus (16^{7}). On several occasions he is chief spokesman for the disciples, and is mentioned first among those receiving private instructions or explanations (8^{29} 9^{5} 10^{28} 11^{21} 13^{3}). Notices which reflect somewhat unfavourably upon him are also preserved. Although he is the first of the Twelve to affirm belief in Jesus' Messiahship, his failure to understand the true Messianic programme calls forth a sharp rebuke from Jesus (8$^{32f.}$); he is found asleep when left on duty in Gethsemane (14^{37}); and during the course of Jesus' trial Peter persistently denies his Master (14$^{29. 54-72}$).

With the exception of a few alterations and supplements, Matthew and Luke take over most of the Marcan statements regarding Peter. Matthew omits the paragraph in which 'Simon and those with him' seek Jesus to tell Him that the people of Capernaum desire His return to the city (Mk 1^{36}), nothing is said of Peter's accompanying Jesus when the latter raised the daughter of Jairus (Mk 5^{37}), and Peter's name is expunged from the instructions given to the women by the angel at the tomb of Jesus (Mk 16^{7}). These omissions are relatively insignificant when compared with the main body of Marcan material which

Matthew has preserved. The additional data of Matthew are more important, especially the paragraph supplementing Mark's account of Peter's confession (Mt 16^{17-19}). In comparison with this incident, the other chief Petrine additions of Matthew — Peter's walking on the water ($14^{28f.}$), and the story of the coin found in the fish's mouth (17^{24-27}) — are of only secondary interest. Into Mark's narrative of Peter's confession, otherwise copied rather closely, Matthew interjects three verses, ascribing Peter's exceptional perceptive powers to revelation, designating him the corner-stone of the Church, and committing to his keeping the keys of the Kingdom. These statements are manifestly Matthæan insertions, for they do not stand in Mark, which Matthew is copying in both the preceding and the following contexts, nor do they appear in Luke, where the Marcan narrative at this point is also followed. But from what source the First Evangelist derived his information, and whether the words were actually spoken by Jesus, are much-debated problems. The balance of critical opinion at present inclines to the view that this tradition arose subsequently to the death of Jesus and at a time when the first vivid expectations of an imminent catastrophic end of the present world were being displaced by a growing interest in ecclesiasticism. However this may be, it is perfectly clear from Matthew's language that Peter had lost none of the prestige which was his in St. Paul's day, while his exact position with reference to all other Christians and to the Christian organization itself has been more specifically defined.

Luke furnishes scarcely any additional data to shed light upon the apostolic estimate of Peter. The Marcan account of the disciples' call is omitted in favour of another tradition somewhat richer in descriptive details (Lk 5^{1-11}; cf. Mk 1^{16-20}); and in the account of Peter's denial Luke seems to be following a slightly different source, yet the variations are formal rather than essential so far as the portrayal of Peter is concerned (Lk 22^{31-62}; cf. Mk 14^{26-72}). In copying Mark's account of the Cæsarea-Philippi incident, Luke omits the closing verses which tell of Jesus' upbraiding Peter for his presumption in attempting to regulate the Messiah's conduct (Mk $8^{32ff.}$). Similarly, in Luke's version of the Gethsemane incident Peter is not singled out for rebuke as in Mark (Lk 22^{46}; cf. Mk 14^{37}). Nor does Luke report the special message of the angel to Peter, telling him that he will see the Risen Lord in Galilee (Lk 24^{7}; cf. Mk 16^{7}), because Luke records only Judæan appearances; but he does note that the first appearance was made to Peter (Lk 24^{34}).

It is in the early chapters of Acts that Peter's portrait is drawn most distinctly. He heads the list of the Eleven, and takes the initiative in the election of a successor to Judas ($1^{13.\ 15}$). He is also the chief speaker on the Day of Pentecost ($2^{14ff.}$), the immediate agent in healing the lame beggar at the Temple gate (3^{1-10}), and the principal defender of the new faith during the subsequent period of persecution (*e.g.* $3^{12ff.}$ $4^{8ff.}$ $5^{29ff.}$). His miraculous activity is especially noticeable. Ananias and Sapphira fall dead at his word (5^{3-10}), and he stands out so prominently among the apostolic wonder-workers that apparently his very shadow possesses therapeutic power (5^{12-16}). He is next seen in Samaria, where he represents the Jerusalem Church in supervising and bringing to completion the evangelistic work of Philip (8^{14-25}). Then we are told of missionary enterprises conducted by Peter himself 'throughout all parts' (9^{32}), and particularly of his wonderful miracles performed at Joppa (9^{33-41}). Here he experienced his remarkable vision, in which God showed him that he 'should not call any man common or unclean,' with the result that he went freely to the house of the Gentile Cornelius, preaching that God is no respecter of persons. Accordingly, Peter baptized Cornelius and his friends, thus establishing the first company of Gentile Christians (10). On returning to Jerusalem, Peter is criticized for having eaten with the uncircumcised, but he presents so adequate a defence of his conduct that the Jerusalem Church ultimately glorifies God for the establishment of Gentile missions through his work (11^{1-18}). Later we learn of his arrest and imprisonment by Herod Agrippa I., and his miraculous release, after which 'he departed and went to another place' (12^{1-19}). He is in Jerusalem again at the time of the Council, where he affirms, and James reiterates, that 'a good while ago God made choice among you, that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the gospel, and believe' ($15^{7.\ 14}$). At this point Peter disappears completely from the history of the Apostolic Age as recorded in Acts.

In the Fourth Gospel, likewise, Peter is a conspicuous figure, though he does not always occupy so unquestionably pre-eminent a position as in the Synoptists and early chapters of Acts. In the assembling of the first group of believers his brother Andrew takes precedence over him (1^{40-44}), and is also spokesman for the disciples on the occasion of the miraculous feeding (6^{8}). But Andrew is each time identified as the 'brother of Simon Peter,' thus implying that the latter was really the better known. He is also foremost in John's account of the disciples' confession of belief in Jesus (6^{68}); and, as in the Synoptists, it is Peter who objects on a certain occasion to Jesus' procedure—this time the act of foot-washing (13^{6-9}). Peter's denial is also recorded by John ($13^{36f.}$ 18^{17-27}), and his impetuosity is displayed in cutting off the ear of the high priest's servant ($18^{10f.}$). But Peter's prominence is rivalled by that of the unnamed disciple 'whom Jesus loved.' He, together with Andrew, was the first to follow Jesus ($1^{35f.}$); he had the position of honour at the Last Supper (13^{24}); he was acquainted with the high priest, and so procured Peter's admission to the court (18^{15}); and he seems to have anticipated Peter in believing that Jesus had risen from the dead (20^{2-8}). In the so-called appendix to John (21) Simon Peter is the chief actor, but the beloved disciple standing in the background is certainly a formidable rival for the honour of first place.

Except in the salutations of the two Epistles commonly ascribed to Peter, there is no further mention of his name in the NT. For one who evidently occupied so prominent a place in the life and thinking of the Apostolic Age, the amount of information about him preserved in the literature of the period is relatively meagre. St. Paul's statements are exceedingly fragmentary; the Gospels do not, of course, pretend to give information about apostolic history, yet indirectly they furnish some indications of how Peter was regarded at the time the documents were being produced; and Acts, while tolerably full in its description of Peter's earlier activities, consigns him to absolute oblivion after the Jerusalem Council. It is not at all probable that so important an individual would thus suddenly drop completely out of sight in the actual history of the Christian movement, nor can we assume that the information supplied by our extant NT sources is at all exhaustive—to say nothing of the difficulty of harmonizing what sometimes appear to be striking discrepancies.

3. Peter's earlier activities.—A résumé of such facts as are apparently beyond dispute yields a very definite picture of Peter's earlier activities, notwithstanding some uncertainty in details. He was a Galilæan fisherman living in Capernaum when Jesus began His public ministry. Soon after coming into contact with Jesus he abandoned his business as a fisherman in order to accompany the new Teacher on His preaching tours. How Jesus, who had left His carpenter's bench, and Peter and others, who had similarly forsaken their ordinary daily pursuits to engage in this new enterprise, now supported themselves and their families is not clear from our present sources of information; but this uncertainty can hardly reflect any serious doubt upon the fact of their procedure. Peter was one of the most prominent members in the company of disciples, and so strongly did Jesus and His work appeal to him that he saw in the new movement foreshadowings of the long-looked-for Messianic Kingdom, and ultimately he identified Jesus with the Messiah. But Peter's conception of the Messiah's programme underwent some radical readjustments in the course of time. At first his view seems to have been largely of the political nationalistic type—the earthly Jesus would some day don Messianic robes and set up the new Kingdom. In this schema there was no place for Jesus' death, hence that event proved a stunning blow to Peter's faith. According to one tradition, regarded by many scholars as the more reliable, he returned disappointed to Galilee, where he probably intended to resume his work of fishing. Doubtless he had still kept his home in Capernaum, and thither he would naturally go after his great disillusionment. Then came the experience which constituted the real turning-point in his life: he saw his Master alive again — no longer an earthly but now a heavenly Being. This vision gave him a solution of his difficulties, since it enabled him to resume his belief in Jesus' Messiahship and look forward to the establishment of the new Kingdom. It necessitated, however, considerable readjustment in his thinking, for the Messiah in whom he now believed was not an earthly figure who would demonstrate the validity of His claims by leading a revolt against the Romans; He was a heavenly apocalyptic Being who would come on the clouds in glory when the day arrived for the final establishment of God's rule upon earth.

This new way of thinking gave Peter a new conception of his mission. Now he, and the other disciples, must make haste in gathering members for the new Kingdom. Actuated by the genuinely altruistic motive of mediating this new knowledge to their Jewish kinsmen, and desiring to fulfil as quickly as possible the conditions preliminary to the Kingdom's coming, they began a vigorous preaching activity to propagate the new faith. Whatever doubts may be entertained regarding the verbal accuracy of the speeches of Peter recorded in Acts, the accuracy of the main content is hardly to be disputed, so far at least as the interpretation of Jesus' Messiahship is concerned. Here we have a primitive stage of thinking, when the expectation of the Coming is vivid, and when Christians have not yet come to see—as they did in later times—that Jesus had made an adequate display of His Messiahship while He was still upon earth. In these early discourses of Peter attention is fixed upon the future: the real manifestation of the Messiah is an affair of the future, and the Jews are exhorted to repent so that God may send Jesus to discharge His full Messianic functions (Ac $3^{19f.}$). While upon earth He had been a 'Servant'—a highly honoured messenger of God—who conducted a propaganda of preparatory prophetic preaching (Ac $3^{13. 22-26}$); He had been a 'man approved of God by mighty works and wonders and signs, which God did by him' (Ac 2^{22}), the great and ultimate sign of Divine approval being the elevation of Jesus to a position of heavenly Messianic dignity and lordship through the Resurrection (2^{36}). Since the Messiah's coming awaited the restoration of all things (3^{21}), Peter threw himself energetically into the task of preaching the restorative message. Henceforth this constituted, both for him and for his companions, their great mission, and in this propaganda Peter was undoubtedly the leader. The general situation described in Acts is corroborated by St. Paul when he affirms that Peter had been especially equipped for carrying on the work of Jewish missions (Gal 2^{8}).

Peter's equipment consisted not merely in some new command received from the Risen Lord, or in a new stock of Messianic beliefs; he now possessed a new power, an endowment by the Holy Spirit, as the first believers called it. This phase of the new community's life, as described in the Pentecostal experience of Ac 2, has doubtless been somewhat formalized; but that the early disciples, in the glow of their new faith in the Risen Lord, did experience an elation of feeling which sometimes expressed itself in ecstasy and the performance of miracles, seems beyond question.* In Jewish thinking the work of the Holy Spirit had already come to be very closely associated with the Messiah and His Kingdom. Isaiah had pictured the ideal ruler as one who would be richly endowed by the Spirit (11^{2} 41^{1} $61^{1ff.}$), and Joel ($2^{28ff.}$) predicted, among the displays to precede the advent of the Messianic Age, an outpouring of the Spirit upon all flesh, equipping the sons and daughters of Israel with power to prophesy and inspiring dreams and visions in the old and young. Later Jewish Messianic literature retained and heightened this emphasis upon the functions of the Spirit. Enoch represented the Messiah as a spiritually endowed being (49^{1-4} 62^{2}), and according to the *Testament of Judah* this pneumatic Messiah would similarly equip his subjects (*Judah*, 24; cf. *Levi*, 18). It was perfectly natural that the disciples, who had now come to believe in Jesus as the Messiah elevated upon His throne in heaven, should become conscious of the new power which was theirs by right of membership in the new Kingdom about to be more fully revealed. Their inherited Jewish thinking, together with their visions of the Risen Jesus, supplied a very fitting background for the Pentecostal phenomenon. In view of Peter's preeminence in the early community, we may safely assume that he was one of the first to attain this type of experience.

This unique spiritual endowment normally expressed itself in miraculous activities. On this subject it may be well to supplement the generous testimony of Acts with the somewhat less extravagant, but quite specific, corroborative evidence from St. Paul. Christianity as a historical phenomenon is defined by him largely in terms of spiritual endowment, with its resultant activities. While all Christians share the one Spirit in common, its power is manifested variously in different persons, and among these manifestations 'miracles' and 'gifts of healings' occupy a prominent place (1 Co 12^{28}). In controverting his opponents St. Paul appeals especially to miracles as the unique differentia of the new religion and the final evidence of his own right to be reckoned among the genuine apostles. In denouncing the Judaizers' gospel of the flesh St. Paul (Gal 3^{5}) asks the Galatians a test question designed to prove beyond doubt the genuineness of his gospel of the Spirit: 'He therefore that supplieth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doeth he it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?' Nor was this miraculous power peculiar to the Christianity of St. Paul, for he replies to his opponents in Corinth:

---

* See S. J. Case, *Evolution of Early Christianity*, Chicago, 1914, p. 127 ff.

'In nothing was I behind the very chiefest apostles, though I am nothing. Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience, by signs and wonders and mighty works' (2 Co $12^{11f.}$). Thus the power to work 'miracles' (*δυνάμεις*) was an inherent characteristic of the new religion, and the exercise of this function belonged particularly to its leaders, among whom Peter had preeminence.

Miracles were performed in the name of Jesus, who had been exalted to a position of peculiar authority in the angelic realm. All sickness, especially demon possession, and death itself were believed to be the result of Satanic activity within the present evil age; but now that Jesus had been elevated to a position of heavenly Lordship, His spiritually endowed followers were equipped with a new authority. When they spoke in Jesus' name they could heal the sick, cast out demons, and even raise the dead. This unique efficacy of the 'Name' (*q.v.*), as a characteristic of the new religion, is clearly evident in St. Paul. Christians are those who call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ (1 Co 1^2); sinning members of the community are delivered over to Satan in the name, and so through the authority, of our Lord Jesus ($5^{3f.}$); and God has exalted Jesus to a position of authority so supreme that every knee is to bend 'in the name of Jesus' (Ph $2^{9f.}$). Peter not only shared this belief in the exaltation of Jesus, but was commonly credited with having been the first to receive convincing proof of this fact; and there can be no reasonable doubt that he performed miracles in the name of Jesus. The words put into Peter's mouth by Acts, to the effect that the lame man had been cured through the efficacy of Jesus' powerful name (Ac 3^{16}), are wholly consonant with the primitive situation when Peter was prominent in the activities of the new spiritual community.

This procedure soon caused him and his associates serious trouble. Belief in dynamic personalities, the use of whose name enabled one to effect wonders, was already a familiar phenomenon to the Jews,[*] and was viewed with some suspicion by the authorities. Since Jews who adopted magical practices of any sort were strongly tempted to employ names of heathen deities in their formulæ of exorcism and the like, it had been decreed in the Law that 'whosoever doeth these things is an abomination to Jahweh': Israel's God is alone worthy of recognition (Dt $18^{9ff.}$; cf. Ex $20^{3.7}$, Lv $19^{26.31}$ 20^6, Is 2^6, Jer $27^{9f.}$, Ezk 20^{26}, Mal 3^5, Philo, *de Spec. leg.* i.). When Christians, believing in Jesus' Lordship, proceeded to use His powerful name, the Jewish authorities naturally suspected them of violating the Deuteronomic Law, and questioned them to learn by what authority, by what 'name,' they performed their wonders (Ac $3^{12.16}$ 4^{7-10}). Peter replied that the Christians were not breaking the Law, but were bringing it to fulfilment, because Jesus was that Prophet to whom Moses had referred in the Deuteronomic context as the One to whom Israel should listen. His elevation to heaven was said to justify this affirmation, hence it was quite proper to work miracles in His 'name' (Ac $3^{22ff.}$; cf. Dt $18^{15ff.}$). But the Jews were unwilling to accept Peter's interpretation of Moses, and consequently they tried to restrain the Christians' dynamic activities.

Doubtless also the content of Peter's preaching aroused opposition at a relatively early date. This would be particularly true of his insistence upon Jesus' elevation to a position of Lordship in the angelic sphere. Acts intimates that the Christians' preaching about the Resurrection caused offence to the Sadducees (4^2), but the reverence with which early believers regarded the Risen Jesus might easily seem to many Jews to endanger the supremacy of Jahweh. Apparently this was one of the most important items inciting St. Paul's persecution, judging from those phases of the new religion which he sets in the foreground after his conversion. That which he most vigorously antagonized as a persecutor was very probably the thing which he later set forth as the characteristic feature of his new faith. This was confession of Jesus' Lordship, based upon belief in His resurrection. This was the distinctive mark of the new movement, the fundamental condition for the attainment of salvation (Ro 1^4 10^9, 1 Co $15^{5ff.}$, Gal $1^{1.15f.}$). St. Paul adopted so thoroughly this phase of his predecessors' thinking that he even taught his Gentile converts the characteristic prayer of the Aramaic-speaking Christians, *Marana tha* ('Our Lord, come!' [1 Co 16^{22}]). This prayer was especially appropriate on the lips of Peter and his companions in those early days of persecution when Jesus was expected to appear suddenly as Messiah and vindicate the faith of His loyal disciples.

4. Peter's later activities, as reported in the NT.—Such in general are some of the more evident items in Peter's career during the earlier years of apostolic history. Of his later activities we are less well informed, and the information which has been preserved is sometimes difficult to interpret. To begin with, what were the relative positions of Peter and James in the Jerusalem Church? While Peter is manifestly the most prominent person in the early chapters of Acts, the name of John is sometimes mentioned as one of the leaders of the new cause (*e.g.* 1^{13} $3^{1ff.}$ 4^{13} 8^{14}), but James is never once singled out for notice. Not until Peter goes to 'another place' does Acts hint that James takes precedence in the Jerusalem community (12^{17}), and henceforth he appears to be the generally acknowledged leader ($15^{13ff.}$ 21^{18}). Yet his presence among the believers at a much earlier date is attested by St. Paul, who remarks that James—in all probability meaning the Lord's brother—was the one to witness Jesus' fourth appearance (1 Co 15^7). He was also a member of the new brotherhood when St. Paul, three years after his conversion, paid a visit to Peter in Jerusalem (Gal 1^{18}). At the time of the Jerusalem Council he was not only the head of the Church (Gal 2^9), but was so influential that his objections caused both Peter and Barnabas to withdraw from their former liberal position (Gal 2^{11-13}). Thus from St. Paul's statements it becomes clear that Peter and James were both present in the early company of believers, that the former was the leader in the earliest period of the history, and that James by the middle of the century had become the actual head of the mother church.

But neither St. Paul nor Acts gives the particulars of the process which issued in this result. For an answer to this problem we must rely upon inference, supplemented by later tradition. Eusebius (*HE* II. i. 3) states, on the authority of Clement of Alexandria, that Peter, James (the brother of John), and John, not coveting honour for themselves, chose James to be bishop of Jerusalem soon after Jesus' ascension; but so formal an appointment at this early date is hardly probable. It is far more likely that a gradual development of circumstances produced the later situation in which James supplanted Peter. Peter's work as an evangelist and the opposition which his public preaching aroused among the Jews probably resulted in his leaving the city for longer and longer periods, so that the task of local leadership devolved increasingly upon James. The Jewish opposition which broke out afresh under Herod Agrippa I., and from which Peter barely escaped with his life, was the occasion of his going to 'another place' after he had sent James a message regarding the situation (Ac 12[17]). It has been conjectured with some degree of plausibility that James became actual head of the Jerusalem Church about this time. Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* VI. v. 43) reports a tradition to the effect that Jesus had instructed the apostles to preach to Israel for twelve years before going forth to the world—which may signify that the original apostles' departure from Jerusalem, thus leaving James in charge, was virtually coincident with Herod's persecution. But aside from the question of the historicity of Clement's tradition, James probably supplanted Peter in Jerusalem about this time. This seems to be the most satisfactory explanation of the NT data. James's blood relationship to Jesus would give him a unique position among Christians, and his vision of the Risen Lord would add to his prestige, while his conservative attitude toward Judaism would be a valuable asset to the community in those days of persecution (cf. Eusebius, *HE* II. xxiii. 1 ff.). The impetuous Peter sought other fields of activity. Yet we must not assume that there was any rivalry between these two individuals, notwithstanding the contrasts in their personalities. Between the extremes of Pauline liberalism and Jacobæan conservatism Peter (and Barnabas) sometimes vacillated, but on the whole they seem to have inclined toward the position of James.

---

[*] See W. Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu*, Göttingen, 1903, p. 132 ff.

A second problem left unsolved by our NT information is the question of Peter's real attitude toward the Gentile missionary enterprise. According to Ac 10 f., he had been instructed by God in a vision not to call any man common or unclean, and as a result he went to the house of Cornelius, where he ate with Gentiles and established a Gentile church. On returning to Jerusalem he was arraigned for his conduct, but presented so strong a defence that the mother Church glorified God for the conversion of the Gentiles accomplished through Peter's action. St. Paul, on the other hand, in writing to the Galatians, represents that this problem had been fought out—manifestly for the first time, as St. Paul describes it—over the missionary activities of himself and Barnabas. Even then it was merely the question of admission, and not the question of table-fellowship, that had been discussed at Jerusalem. Not until later, when Peter came to Antioch, did the latter question become acute, and then Peter took the conservative position in line with the wishes of the Jerusalem Church (Gal 2[11ff.]). If St. Paul's representation is correct, it becomes difficult to believe, as the narrative of Acts would seem to demand, that Peter and the Church at Jerusalem had taken exactly the opposite stand a few years earlier.

Different attempts have been made to obviate the difficulty. Appeal is sometimes made to the proverbial fickleness of Peter, but in order to meet the situation we should have to predicate a similar characteristic for the leaders in Jerusalem. Or, again, it is urged that Cornelius was already a 'God-fearer,' that he prayed to Jahweh, gave alms, and wrought 'righteousness' in good Jewish fashion (Ac 10[30. 35]), and so his case was quite different from that of ordinary Gentiles. Yet it must be remembered that the specific thing for which Peter was called to account was 'eating with the uncircumcised' (Ac 11[3]). He affirmed that the Spirit had instructed him to make no distinction in respect to table-companionship between circumcised and uncircumcised believers, and this was the very point in debate at Antioch. We are quite ignorant of any extenuating circumstances which made the Antiochian situation different in principle from that of Cæsarea, and so the difficulty of squaring the narrative of Acts with the representation of St. Paul remains unsolved.

Still another method proposed for relieving the difficulty is to appeal to the alleged apologetic purpose of the author of Acts, who, it is said, desired to bridge the chasm separating Peter from St. Paul, and tried to accomplish this result by 'Paulinizing' Peter in the early part of the book and by 'Petrinizing' St. Paul in the latter part. Thus Peter is credited with inaugurating the Gentile mission, and the Jerusalem Church is made to put the stamp of its approval upon his undertaking. In Acts' account of St. Paul, on the other hand, the Antiochian incident is absolutely ignored. St. Paul voluntarily circumcises Timothy (Ac 16[1]), he also accepts and imposes upon his churches the decrees issued from Jerusalem (Ac 16[4]), and in still other respects his loyalty to Judaism is made evident (*e.g.* Ac 21[17ff.]). Thus 'Theophilus' has been assured—and this is assumed to be the author's chief aim—that the new religion is firmly established through a line of unbroken descent from antiquity, Gentiles having been designed from the first to be its legitimate heirs. Gentile Christianity is not an offshoot from the main movement—the ingrafting of a wild olive branch, as St. Paul says—but an integral part of the whole, having full ecclesiastical supervision and approval from the first. In favour of this interpretation it is possible to cite the manifest interest of Acts in the formal organization of the early community and in Jerusalem as the official centre from which the new religion expands. The appearances of Jesus, both in Luke and Acts, are located in or near Jerusalem; the disciples are instructed to wait in Jerusalem until Pentecost, when the adherents of the new movement are to be formally equipped with the Spirit; in the meantime, the waiting company fills the vacancy in the apostolate, so that the new church may be properly and fully officered from the start; and throughout the entire history of the early period the matter of official apostolic supervision is constantly in evidence. It certainly was not the intention of the writer of Acts to dwell upon differences of opinion among early Christians; and, further, it was quite natural that he should so select or interpret his source materials as to indicate that the certainty and stability attaching to his thought of this movement in his own day were but a continuation of an earlier state of affairs. Consequently it is not improbable that there was a disposition on his part to believe that the proper officers of the church had formally approved the Gentile mission from its very inception, and this feeling quite probably influenced his account of the Cornelius incident. But this fact does not warrant us in concluding that Peter did not come into contact with Gentiles at an early date, although he is not likely to have settled formally the ultimate problem of the whole dispute before it was pushed into the foreground by the work of the Judaizers in Pauline territory.

The foregoing discussion suggests another of the main difficulties in the present study, viz. the exact nature of the relationship between Peter and St. Paul. The so-called Tübingen School has placed great stress upon the supposed cleft between these two apostles, the former representing Jewish and the latter Gentile Christianity.* But this way of interpreting early Christian history is open to some serious objections. We have already noted the vital and important place which St. Paul's Jewish heritage continued to hold in his thinking as a Christian, even to the end of his career. It is a natural, but none the less serious, mistake to assume that the legalistic controversy which bulks so largely in St. Paul's letters to Galatia and Rome furnishes the proper perspective in which to set the whole of the Apostle's activity and thinking. In fact, all his extant writings are designed chiefly to meet some occasional or exceptional problem rather than to set forth comprehensively the character and content of his religion. Common possessions and generally accepted items are mentioned only incidentally, if at all, while debated points are treated at length. It is no doubt true that St. Paul strongly insisted upon the Gentiles' freedom from the ceremonial Law, but still he had much in common with his Jewish predecessors, particularly with Peter. Nor is it correct to think that St. Paul was alone responsible for the whole propagation of the gospel in Gentile lands. The missionary activities of 'the rest of the apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas,' as well as of Barnabas, are mentioned in 1 Co 9^5; yet it may be that only their fame, and not their actual work, extended to Corinth. But it is plain from Romans that an important church had been established in the capital of the Empire without the aid of St. Paul (cf. Ro 1^{8-15}). Even in the East he and his immediate companions were not the only workers in the field, and with some of these his relations were altogether friendly (*e.g.* Ac $18^{2.\ 24\mathrm{ff.}}$ 19^1). It is quite inconceivable that Peter, Barnabas, Mark, and others less well known, ceased proclaiming the new faith in different parts of the Mediterranean world at the moment their names disappear from the pages of Acts. Nor is it likely that they confined their efforts exclusively to Jewish territory. But even if they did work only with Jewish audiences in the Diaspora, they would inevitably be brought into contact with Gentiles attending the services of the synagogue as interested outsiders. There were certainly Gentile Christians in the Church at Rome before St. Paul visited the city (*e.g.* Ro $1^{5\mathrm{f.}\ 13}$ 11^{13}); and probably these were uncircumcised Gentiles, else the Judaizers would have had no occasion to raise the agitation which St. Paul's letter is evidently designed to counteract. We must conclude that the Antiochian incident is not a safe criterion by which to judge the entire history of the relationship between Peter and St. Paul, and their respective conceptions of the character of the new movement as a whole.

---

* See F. C. Baur, 'Die Christuspartei in der corinthischen Gemeinde,' in *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie*, 1831, iv. 61–206, and *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi*^{2}, Stuttgart, 1866. Among the better known followers of Baur are A. Hilgenfeld, C. Holsten, O. Pfleiderer, P. W. Schmiedel.

Still we must ask what relation Peter bore to the various disturbers who from time to time caused St. Paul so much trouble. The Judaizers of Galatia were not, even on St. Paul's own showing, representatives of Peter, although they may have used his less radical but still evident conservatism for the purposes of their self-authentication. It would have been more nearly correct for them to have laid claim to the authority of James, as perhaps they did, but St. Paul does not even identify their position with that of James. They maintained the absolute necessity of circumcision for all Gentiles, while both Peter and James yielded to St. Paul's demands for the Gentiles' freedom. Apparently this was the principle upon which Barnabas had also been working before the Judaizers caused trouble, and there is no reason to suppose that Peter had observed any different practice, in so far as his missionary activities had brought him into contact with Gentiles. It was the work of the reactionary Judaizers that made the problem acute, but in the nascent period of the missionary enterprise the liberal attitude probably prevailed, not by design, but because it was a natural feature in the spontaneous growth of the new movement. Even while the new gospel was being preached to Jews the fundamental condition of membership in the new society was acknowledgment of Jesus' Lordship; consequently, when Gentiles heard this preaching—at first probably in connexion with the Jewish synagogue—and responded by confessing their belief in the Messiahship of the Risen Jesus, they were straightway reckoned among the chosen company to receive the Lord at His coming. This was the prevalent situation until the Judaizers appeared upon the scene. They represented the ultra-conservative position of certain Jewish converts, but whether or not their propaganda emanated in the first instance from Jerusalem is not perfectly clear. In Pauline territory they seem to have claimed the authority of Jerusalem, but St. Paul put their claim to the test by a personal visit to the mother Church, the result of which demonstrated that the Judaizers were not backed either by James or by Peter. On the secondary question of free intercourse between Jewish and Gentile believers in the same community, particularly at table, James and Peter—the latter at least temporarily—and even Barnabas were less ready to follow St. Paul to the logical conclusion of their common position; but their action in this respect does not at all mean their desertion to the ranks of the Judaizers.

So far as the Judaizing movement is concerned, the situation reflected in Romans is in the main similar to that in Galatians; but in the Corinthian correspondence the opposition to St. Paul seems to have developed new features. This is not the place to discuss at length the perplexing problem of the Corinthian parties; we are here concerned only with the question of Peter's relation to these factions. The presence of a group of persons in the Corinthian Church who said they were 'of Peter,' side by side with groups which affirmed allegiance to Apollos and St. Paul respectively, might imply that Peter, like St. Paul and Apollos, had preached in Corinth. This inference—probably it was only an inference—was drawn by Dionysius of Corinth (*c.* A.D. 170), who spoke of this church as 'the planting of Peter and Paul' (Eusebius, *HE* II. xxv. 8). Some modern scholars regard this conclusion as historically correct (*e.g.* K. Lake, *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, London, 1911, p. 112 ff.), but most interpreters are of the opinion that St. Paul's language does not justify it. He says so little about the Cephas-party, mentioning it only once, or possibly twice (1 Co 1^{12} 3^{22}), and then without adequate description, that there is no means of knowing positively whether these sectaries were personally acquainted with Peter or whether they knew him only by reputation. That the Corinthians were aware of his prominence in the history of Christianity is clear from St. Paul's other references to him (1 Co 9^5 15^5), and, as this knowledge need not necessarily have been derived from personal contact, a company of Christians in Corinth may have professed loyalty to Peter simply on the strength of his reputation. It would not follow that these persons were Judaizers of the Galatian type, but only that they took a conservative position on the question of table-fellowship between Jewish and Gentile converts. Perhaps St. Paul has reference to some such condition of affairs when he intimates that the validity of his apostleship has been called in question by the 'weak' brethren, who have been offended by the liberty of the 'strong,' the latter doubtless citing St. Paul as their example. It is true that the question under discussion in the context concerns the eating of meat offered to idols, and so is not a repetition of the Antiochian problem, but the conservative party in Corinth may have appealed to Peter's caution at Antioch in justification of their own conservatism in the present situation. And egged on by the opposition of the 'Paulinists,' they may readily have sought to disparage St. Paul by remarking upon the doubtfulness of his apostolic credentials and his failure to follow the apostolic custom of asking support from the churches. If this was the position of those who said 'I am of Cephas,' it is interesting to note how kindly they are dealt with by St. Paul. He does not retract from his position of absolute liberty in principle, but he does strongly counsel restraint of personal liberty as a concession to the 'weak,' and he fully justifies the conduct of Cephas and others in drawing support from the churches, although he resents the insinuation that he and Barnabas are any less authoritative because they choose to forego their rights in this respect. In view of this lenient attitude of St. Paul, we cannot identify the Cephas-party with the Judaizers; nor is there any intimation that the Galatian problems —circumcision, justification by faith, and the like —had been in dispute at Corinth. On the whole, there is nothing in the situation to indicate that the relation between Peter and St. Paul, even if there was a vigorous Cephas-party in Corinth, was essentially less cordial than that between Apollos and St. Paul (1 Co 3^{4-9} 16^{12}). Moreover, in comparing this with the Antiochian incident, it may be noted as further evidence of the softening effect which time had upon an earlier controversy, that Barnabas was now ranged distinctly on St. Paul's side (1 Co 9^{6}). This fact does not wholly lose its point even if, as is sometimes imagined (*e.g.* W. Bousset, J. Weiss), though without apparent justification, St. Paul is referring specifically to the first missionary tour when he and Barnabas worked together in Asia Minor.

The Christ-party offers still greater difficulties, so far as the question of Peter's relation to St. Paul is concerned. Whether St. Paul intended 'I am of Christ' to designate a separate faction has been several times questioned,[*] though this certainly is the natural meaning of the language. But nowhere in the First Epistle is this party defined with sufficient clearness to disclose its actual character. On the other hand, in 2 Co 10 ff., St. Paul criticizes very sharply and at some length opponents who, on the strength of 2 Co 10^{7}, are often identified with the Christ-party of 1 Co 1^{12}. If this identification is rejected, as has often been the case (*e.g.*, most recently, Allan Menzies, *The Second Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Corinthians*, London, 1912), then the Christ-party is too obscure to have any bearing upon our present discussion. But we should still have to consider Peter's relation to the opposition mentioned in 2 Cor., of which St. Paul speaks at some length. The leaders of this faction affirmed that St. Paul walked 'according to the flesh,' while they were 'Christ's'; they were giving themselves exclusively to the service of Christ, while St. Paul was supporting himself by secular labour. Being thus professionally devoted to Christ, they were apostles *par excellence*, though St. Paul styled them self-made apostles, to be compared to Satan masquerading as an angel of light; and they claimed to have the proper qualifications for their office, since they were Hebrews, Israelites, of the seed of Abraham, as was Christ Himself. In comparison with these sleek 'professionalists,' St. Paul admitted that he might be 'rude of speech' and that he did work independently for his living; but in knowledge, efficiency, and power he would not admit any inferiority. He too was a Jew, he had also shown heroic devotion, proving himself a unique minister of Christ; and although his bodily presence was inferior, he was superior in respect of visions and revelations—in fact, God had allowed him to be afflicted with this bodily infirmity in order that his superiority in other respects might not cause him to be 'exalted over-much.' But in the ultimate and crucial test of the new religion's power—ability to perform signs and wonders and miracles —he had fully displayed the qualifications of the true apostle. Whether he means to imply that all these credentials of his are set over against similar claims put forward by his opponents, or whether he is emphasizing his own superior qualifications ('are they ministers of Christ? . . . I more!'), he does not definitely state; but quite apart from this uncertainty, the characteristics of his opponents are clearly portrayed. Their criticism of St. Paul for failure to take support from the Corinthian Church would seem at first sight to identify them with those sectaries mentioned in 1 Co $9^{4\text{ff.}}$, and so they would be a continuation of the Cephas-party. This view has been generally adopted by Tübingen scholars, who also identify these factionists with the Christ-party and make them all a continuation of the ultra-Jewish 'Petrine' movement which is assumed to be everywhere opposed to St. Paul. But such a conclusion seems wholly untenable. Even identification with the Cephas-party is very questionable. Those features of 1 Co 9, which there suggested a connexion with Peter, viz. reference to the 'weak' and St. Paul's conciliatory attitude, are entirely lacking in 2 Co 10 ff. Furthermore, St. Paul's wholesale criticism of these later opponents is quite different both in spirit and content from that which he metes out to Peter on any previous occasion, not excepting even the aggravating situation at Antioch. If the troublers of 2 Cor. are a continuation of the Cephas-party, they have departed so far from the position of Peter that the bond of attachment between him and them consists in little more than a name. If, on the other hand, they are the lineal descendants of the Judaizers, who have already caused St. Paul so much trouble in Galatia, it becomes still more improbable that Peter is to be connected in any essential way with their propaganda. Several of their characteristics favour identification with the Judaizers.[*] They were Jews, they claimed full apostolic authentication, and they were 'Christ's'; but the astonishing thing is that the question of circumcision is not mentioned, and there is no hint of any discussion about faith *versus* works of the Law—questions which were central in St. Paul's controversy with the Judaizers. It is commonly said that for policy's sake the disturbers had suppressed these features of their propaganda in the strongly Gentile atmosphere of Corinth; but whether that neglect would not have left them without any real mission is a serious question. If still another explanation, to the effect that we have here to do with a Jewish theosophical or antinomian tendency,[†] is accepted, Peter must be still further removed from any connexion with this faction.

Although we have found the NT record of Peter's later activities very meagre and obscure at many points, we are not to imagine that he played no important rôle in the history of Christianity during this period. His greatest significance probably lay in his missionary labours, carried on not only in Palestine but also among the Jews of the Dispersion, although in regions quite unknown to us at present. In this work he must have had some contact with Gentiles, particularly with those known as 'God-fearers.' Later tradition made Mark and Glaukias his interpreters, but we are not sure that he did not know, or ultimately learn, sufficient Greek for conversation with Gentiles when occasion required. His sympathies doubtless were on the side of a Jewish interpretation of Christianity's mission, but he certainly was not a vigorous 'Judaizer,' and there was no such wide breach between him and St. Paul as has sometimes been imagined. While the Judaizers, or other opponents of St. Paul, may often have claimed the authority of the Jerusalem leaders, this claim was sometimes quite factitious and largely a misrepresentation of Peter's real position.

---

[*] *E.g.* J. Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, Göttingen, 1910, p. 15 f.; K. Lake, *op. cit.* p. 127 f.; not to mention earlier authorities.

[*] This view, which has had various adherents, has perhaps been argued most fully by W. Beyschlag in *SK* xxxviii. 2 [1865] 217–276 and xliv. 4 [1871] 635–676. Cf. the more recent statement by B. W. Bacon in *Exp*, 8th ser., viii. [1914] 399–415.

[†] Most recently advocated by W. Lütgert, 'Freiheitspredigt und Schwärmgeister in Korinth,' in *Beiträge zur Förderung christl. Theol.* xii. [Gütersloh, 1908]; K. Lake, *op. cit.* p. 222 ff.

5. Peter in tradition outside the NT.—It is not surprising that a person of Peter's prominence, whose career had been so incompletely described in the NT, should have been made the subject of a vast amount of later tradition. This material has often been collected and interpreted, but, since much of it has little or no historical value, only the more important items will be treated in the present connexion. These sources, roughly classified, are (1) data from the Church Fathers or from catalogues of bishops and martyrs, (2) stories bearing the general title of apocryphal *Acts*, and (3) the so-called 'Clementine' literature — the *Homilies*, the *Recognitions*, and the *Epitome* (an abridgment of the *Homilies*). The materials in the first division are so varied, fragmentary, and widely scattered, that they cannot easily be subjected to specific description; but the *Acts* and the *Clementines* are distinct bodies of literature whose chief characteristics may be briefly noted.[*]

The *Acts* fall into two groups, commonly distinguished as 'Gnostic'[†] and 'Catholic.' Neither of these groups as they now stand constitutes a perfect unit, yet each has its own distinctive traits. The Gnostic *Acts* is unique in removing St. Paul from Rome before Peter arrives. St. Paul is directed in a vision to leave the city and go to Spain. Thereupon Simon Magus appears at Rome, calling himself 'the great power of God,' and winning to himself many Christians through his magical practices. At this point Peter, having completed his assigned task of working for twelve years among Jews only, is Divinely instructed to visit Rome. On his arrival he immediately attacks Simon and wins back the Christians who had been seduced. Peter and Simon vie with each other in the performance of miracles, but Peter is the more successful, and Simon, in attempting to fly to heaven, is brought down by Peter's prayer and dies from the effects of the fall. Nero and his friend Albinus become offended with Peter, who is informed of their evil designs and prepares to leave the city; but outside the gate he meets Jesus, who, when asked whither He is going ('Domine, quo vadis?'), replies that He is on His way to Rome to be crucified. At this Peter returns and gladly submits to crucifixion, requesting that he be nailed to the cross head downwards. Marcellus, formerly a disciple of St. Paul and then of Simon, having been won back to Christianity by Peter, takes care of the Apostle's body; but Peter appears to him in a vision and says, 'Let the dead be buried by their own dead'—an intimation that Marcellus is to await the return of St. Paul to Rome. The Catholic *Acts* has a similar content, yet with some remarkable differences. St. Paul arrives at Rome while Peter is still there, and is besought by the Christians to resist Peter, who is teaching believers to do away with the Law of Moses. The two apostles greet one another with joy, and the disputes between Jewish and Gentile Christians are settled by St. Paul, both apostles working together in harmony. Then the two—though Peter is the chief spokesman—encounter Simon Magus, who, as in the Gnostic *Acts*, dies from a fall while attempting to fly to heaven. Nero imprisons them for the harm they have done his friend Simon, and finally Peter is crucified, while St. Paul is beheaded on the same day (29th June).

The *Clementines*[*] contain two different versions of the same original romance, the chief point of which is the persistent conflict between Peter and Simon Magus. The scene of the conflict is Syria, and it is not certain that the original form of the legend made any reference whatsoever to Rome. But in their present form both versions vaguely intimate that the final scene of the conflict is Rome. The *Homilies* are distinctly anti-Pauline, Simon being in fact merely a mask for St. Paul, who is thus brought into complete subjection to Peter. In the *Recognitions*, on the other hand, the conflict is not so sharp, criticism being directed more particularly against the pre-Christian activities of St. Paul. See art. SIMON MAGUS.

These legendary materials have not been summarized because of their intrinsic historical value, for in this particular they are now admitted by scholars to be in the main quite unreliable. Their importance consists in the use which has been made of their tendency as a key to the reconstruction of the history of the Apostolic Age, and particularly to the solution of the much-debated problem of Peter's Roman residence, which is the next question to claim our attention.

According to traditional Roman Catholic opinion, when Jesus commissioned Peter to be the cornerstone of the Church and the guardian of the keys (Mt 16^{17-19}), He virtually designated him bishop of Rome, the first Pope.[†] Several Protestant scholars also, while not estimating so highly Peter's ecclesiastical significance, are of the opinion that he finally visited Rome and suffered martyrdom there under Nero. This opinion is thought to be supported by a number of early witnesses. The earliest notice is in Clement of Rome, who admonishes the Corinthians to follow the examples of the good apostles: 'There was Peter, who by reason of unrighteous jealousy endured not one nor two but many labours, and thus having borne his testimony went to his appointed place of glory' (*Ep. ad Cor.* i. 5). In the next chapter St. Paul's martyrdom is also mentioned along with 'a vast multitude of the elect, who through many indignities and tortures, being the victims of jealousy, set a brave example among us.' Clement is commonly supposed to have written his epistle about the year 95, and one may easily infer that he was thinking of Peter and St. Paul as having suffered martyrdom at Rome during Nero's persecution. Ignatius, early in the 2nd cent., says the Romans had been enjoined by Peter and St. Paul (*Rom.* 4), which would seem to presuppose Peter's presence in Rome at one time, since nothing is known of any epistle addressed to the Romans by Peter.

---

[*] For a more exhaustive discussion of this whole mass of later tradition see R. A. Lipsius, *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden*, vol. ii. pt. i. [Brunswick, 1887] 1–423; F. H. Chase, art. 'Peter (Simon)' in *HDB*, vol. iii. pp 767–779; P. W. Schmiedel, art. 'Simon Peter' in *EBi* iv. 4589–4627.

[†] That they are really Gnostic is maintained by Lipsius (*op. cit.* p. 258 ff.) and T. Zahn (*Geschichte des neutest. Kanons*, ii. [Leipzig, 1890] 832 ff.); while A. Harnack (*Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur*, Leipzig, 1897. i. 549 ff.), C. Erbes (in *ZKG* xxii. [1901] 163 ff.), and C. Schmidt (in *TU* xxiv. 1 [1903]) believe them to be actually Catholic.

[*] See F. J. A. Hort, *Notes Introductory to the Study of the Clementine Recognitions*, London, 1901.

[†] For a typical statement see Janvier, *Histoire de Saint Pierre prince des apôtres et premier pape*, Tours, 1902. J. Schnitzer, *Hat Jesus das Papsttum gestiftet?*^{3}, Augsburg, 1910, is more critical. Cf. also P. Styger, 'Neue Untersuchungen über die altchristlichen Petrusdarstellungen,' in *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte*, xxvii. [1913] 17–74.

Dionysius of Corinth (*c.* A.D. 170) also states that Peter worked in Italy, doubtless meaning Rome (Eusebius, *HE* II. xxv. 8). Toward the close of the 2nd cent. Irenæus (III. i. 1, iii. 1), and at the end of the cent. Clement of Alexandria (Eusebius, *HE* VI. xiv. 6) and Tertullian (*e.g. de Bapt.* 4; *de Præscript. adv. hær.* 32), all bear witness to a sojourn of Peter in Rome. In the course of time tradition fixes more specifically the date of his arrival, the details of his work, and the circumstances of his death. He was said to have laboured there for twenty-five years (Jerome, *de Vir. ill.* 1), having first completed his twelve required years of residence among the Jews. If we assume that Jesus died in the year 30, this reckoning would bring Peter to Rome in the year 42 and place his martyrdom in 67; yet Nero's persecution, as a matter of fact, occurred in 64. But this fact was easily overlooked, since the ideal numbers (12 and 25) had to be preserved. After sifting the historical kernel from these legends, several modern interpreters conclude that Peter perished at Rome during the Neronian persecution in the summer of 64, but that his stay there had been of comparatively short duration.[*]

Another school of interpretation rejects altogether any notion of Peter's presence in Rome, making all the affirmative tradition merely a product of the early polemic against St. Paul as exhibited, in its later forms, in the 'Clementine' writings and the apocryphal *Acts*. The first stage in this evolution is seen in the *Homilies*, which portrays the sharp antagonism between Simon Magus and Peter in Syria. Simon impersonates St. Paul, and so becomes the arch-heretic of early tradition; and, since St. Paul's Roman residence was too well attested to be ignored, his antagonists were compelled to take Peter to Rome in order to refute Simon (*i.e.* St. Paul) in the centre of the Christian world. Similarly in the 'Gnostic' *Acts* St. Paul vanishes and Simon takes his place in Rome in the encounter with Peter. But in the 'Catholic' *Acts*, representing a later stage of historical development, there is a disposition to synthesize the factions, and so St. Paul is kept in Rome to join Peter in resisting Simon. While this entire Simonian literature, in its present form, belongs to the 3rd or subsequent centuries, the main tradition is thought to have been current at a much earlier date, signs of it already appearing in Ac $8^{18\text{ff.}}$. On this hypothesis the Patristic testimony to Peter's Roman residence is easily set aside. Since the statements of Clement of Rome and Ignatius are not explicit, they are given another interpretation. Thus Dionysius of Corinth becomes the earliest witness, and he is said to be under the influence of the Simonian legend, or even to be deliberately aiming at giving it currency. This interpretation, needless to say, is the result of a rigid application of Tübingen principles to this period of apostolic history;[†] but the fundamental premise of the argument—namely, the supposition of a wide breach between Peter and St. Paul in the earlier period—we have already found to be quite untenable. It is true that adequately attested information about Peter's Roman connexions is still exceedingly scanty, but the Simonian hypothesis surely does not furnish the key to the problem.

There remain to be mentioned a few Patristic notices regarding Peter's activities in other regions. The salutation of 1 Pet. prompted Origen to remark that Peter 'seems' to have preached to the Jews of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia, and Asia (Eusebius, *HE* III. i. 2). This opinion became quite common, but probably 1 Pet. was its only ultimate source. Peter's name was also connected closely with Antioch, where, according to the Chronicle of Eusebius (Lipsius, *op. cit.* p. 25 ff.), he founded the church in the second year of Claudius (*i.e.* 42)—certainly an impossible tradition. The mention of 'Babylon' in 1 P 5^{13} also suggested that general territory as a field of the Apostle's labours—a view which Lipsius and Schmiedel, for example, are inclined to adopt in preference to the tradition of his Roman residence. It is improbable that any of these legends has independent historical value, though undoubtedly Peter's missionary travels extended much more widely than the NT data might, at first sight, seem to imply.

To note, finally, traditions regarding Peter's literary activity, apart from the two canonical works to be considered in another connexion, there are extant fragments of a *Gospel of Peter*, an *Apocalypse of Peter*, a *Preaching of Peter*, and an *Epistle of Peter to James* prefixed to the Clementine *Homilies*. Jerome (*de Vir. ill.* i. 1) refers to a work of Peter's called *Judicium*, but nothing is known of its contents. It may be noted also that tradition connected Peter's name indirectly with the Gospel of Mark (Eusebius, *HE* III. xxxix. 15). Of the *Gospel of Peter* we know only a few paragraphs near the end, which speak of the trial of Jesus, the mockery, the Crucifixion, and the Resurrection. The final words are: 'And I, Simon Peter, and Andrew my brother, took our nets and departed to the sea, and Levi the son of Alphæus was with us, whom the Lord . . .'[*] Serapion, bishop of Antioch (*c.* 190), at first permitted this Gospel to circulate at Rhossus, but later condemned it as heretical because it was alleged to be of Docetic origin (Eusebius, *HE* VI. xii. 2–6). The document probably came into existence about, or not long after, the year 150. The extant remains of the *Apocalypse of Peter* are in quantity about equal to those of the *Gospel*, less than a half-dozen ordinary pages. Jesus is represented as granting the apostles, in response to their request, a vision of their righteous brethren who have passed over to the future world. The abode of the blessed is disclosed, and also the place of torment, where the wicked are suffering punishments corresponding to their respective types of sinful conduct while upon earth. Clement of Alexandria, who has preserved a number of fragments from this work, sometimes cites it as Scripture (*Eclog. prophet.* 41), as does the unknown author of the Muratorian Canon. It probably arose in the 2nd century. The remains of the *Preaching* are more brief and scattered, but apparently it was known and used more widely in antiquity than either of the other works. Clement of Alexandria is our best witness to the content of the document (cf. *Strom.* I. xxix. 182, VI. v. 39–41, 43, vi. 48, xv. 128). The treatise, which he possessed entire, purported to be the work of Peter, and emphasized monotheism in contrast with inferior ideas of Greeks and Jews. Apparently it was designed for use in the missionary propaganda. Its early and wide currency has led scholars to place its composition in the first half of the 2nd cent. (cf. Harnack, *op. cit.* p. 472 ff.).

LITERATURE.—Treatises on the Apostolic Age and on early Christian literature usually deal in a general way with our sub-

---

[*] For detailed defence of this general position see J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, pt. i. [London, 1890] vol. i. pp. 201–345 and vol. ii. pp. 481–502; A. Harnack, *op. cit.* pp. 240 ff., 703 ff.; F. H. Chase, *op. cit.*; C. Schmidt, *op. cit.*

[†] The view has been supported vigorously by Schmiedel in his above-mentioned article in the *EBi*, where he follows in the main Lipsius, *op. cit.* See also C. Erbes, 'Die Todestage der Apostel Paulus und Petrus,' in *TU* xix. 1 [Leipzig, 1899].

[*] The fragment has often been edited since its discovery at Akhmîm in 1886. It may be found in convenient form, together with other Petrine fragments, in H. Lietzmann's *Kleine Texte für theologische Vorlesungen und Übungen*, 'Apocrypha,' i., ed. E. Klostermann, Bonn, 1903.

ject. Discussions devoted exclusively to Peter are mainly artt. in the various Dictionaries, the more important being F. H. Chase, 'Peter (Simon),' in *HDB* iii. 756–779; P. W. Schmiedel, 'Simon Peter,' in *EBi* iv. 4459–4627; F. Sieffert, 'Petrus der Apostel,' in *PRE*3 xv. 186–203; K. Lake, 'Peter, St,' in *EBr*11 xxi. 285–288. Important treatments of special topics have been cited in the course of the discussion. To these should be added the valuable critical work of C. Guignebert, *La Primauté de Pierre et la venue de Pierre à Rome*, Paris, 1909, which has an exhaustive bibliography.

S. J. CASE.

PETER, EPISTLES OF.—The NT contains two writings bearing the name of Peter. Since the problems connected with these Epistles depend for their solution mainly upon the internal *indicia* of the documents themselves, a résumé of their content is first in order. It will also be convenient to treat the two letters separately.

A. FIRST PETER.—**1. Content.**—The content of this Epistle may be outlined as follows:

(*a*) *Salutation* ($1^{1f.}$).—The apostle Peter greets Christians of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia. These believers are reminded of the fact that they are merely temporary residents on earth, their real citizenship being in heaven. God the Father, knowing in advance their ultimate destiny, has given them a spiritual sanctification to the end that they may be obedient children and may receive the saving benefits accruing to those who have been sprinkled with the blood of Jesus Christ.

(*b*) *Praise to God for the surety of ultimate salvation* (1^{3-12}).—Since Christ has been raised from the dead those who are united to Him by faith are sure of obtaining the Divine salvation to be revealed in the near future when the present world-order shall be brought to an end. On the basis of this certainty believers rejoice exceedingly, notwithstanding temporary afflictions, which only serve to prove the genuineness of their faith. Their salvation has been prophesied by the ancients, it was preached by the spiritually equipped evangelists, and even angels desired to peer into these matters.

(*c*) *The type of personal life befitting individuals who are to inherit so great salvation* (1^{13}–3^{12}).—(1) In view of believers' blessed condition as heirs of the heavenly inheritance about to be disclosed, they should be pure in their personal life. Since God who has chosen them is holy, as is also Christ who redeemed them, they too should live righteously. They have been re-born to a new and incorruptible condition of being, and, like new-born infants, their nourishment is to be derived from the sphere of the new life into which they have come. They are a new race, a peculiar people, set apart to live the heavenly life while yet on earth (1^{13}–2^{10}).

(2) But as such they must also live fittingly in relation to their heathen environment. They are to shun all wickedness, and thereby give the lie to the popular charge that they are evil-doers. They are, however, to avoid giving any offence to the authorities. If they are servants in a heathen household, they are to discharge their duties faithfully, bearing buffetings and revilings with Christ-like fortitude. When believers find themselves married to unbelievers, they must exemplify the Christian virtues also in this relationship. In short, they should be living witnesses to the ideal type of conduct in all their relations with outsiders (2^{11}–3^{12}).

(*d*) *Encouragement to bear persecution with fortitude, in view of the Christians' certainty of ultimate salvation* (3^{13}–5^{11}).—(1) If zeal for righteousness brings them suffering, they are but following in the footsteps of Christ. Through His suffering they have been made heirs of a sure salvation; consequently they should continue loyally to confess His Lordship. When their opponents revile and persecute them for their peculiar faith, they may reassure themselves by recalling (i.) Christ's saving mission, which extended even to the spirits in Hades; (ii.) the ordinance of baptism, which formally ensured their spiritual union with the Risen Jesus; and (iii.) the heavenly exaltation of Christ, whereby all authority has been committed to Him (3^{13-22}).

(2) Hence Christians have a ready answer to give their heathen critics who charge them with unsocial conduct. They are no longer men of the flesh, for, having been united in baptism with the heavenly spiritual Christ, they now enjoy a new state of existence; they are citizens of heaven (4^{1-6}).

(3) As their stay upon earth, along with all earthly things, draws to a close, their chief endeavour is to cultivate the true fruits of the Spirit in daily living—sobriety, prayerfulness, mutual love, hospitality, ministrations, and constant glorification of God (4^{7-11}).

(4) Christians ought not to be shocked by the outbreak of severe persecution. In the first place, they should rejoice at the opportunity of becoming actual imitators of Christ. And, secondly, since they do not suffer justly, being guilty of no sins for which God should bring this affliction upon them, their trials are a sign of the approaching end when they are to receive the salvation now being guarded for them in heaven. If the initial stages of the Final Judgment bring such afflictions upon the innocent, how infinitely more terrible will the ultimate fate of the wicked be! Therefore believers should not be ashamed to suffer innocently as Christians, since this is in accordance with the will of God, who always has in mind the ultimate salvation of their souls (4^{12-19}).

(5) Under these circumstances both the leaders of the community and the members of the congregation should order their lives according to the strictest ideals of perfection, knowing that they will ultimately receive their respective rewards. Their temporary affliction will, through the favour of God, issue in the perfect salvation about to be revealed from heaven (5^{1-11}).

(*e*) *Conclusion* (5^{12-14}).—The readers are informed of Silvanus' connexion with the letter, they are exhorted to remain steadfast, greetings are conveyed to them, and they receive the apostolic benediction.

2. Purpose.—The main purpose of the Epistle is to comfort and encourage certain communities embarrassed by heathen opposition—an opposition which had broken out into a conflagration of persecution. The writer seeks to strengthen the Christians' faith by turning their attention to the near future, when God will bring all their troubles to an end by sending Jesus Christ to conduct the Final Judgment and perfect the salvation of believers ($1^{5.\ 7.\ 9.\ 13.\ 20}$ 2^{12} $4^{5.\ 13.\ 17f.}$ $5^{1.\ 4.\ 6.\ 10}$). Christians are strongly exhorted to refrain from doing anything for which they might be justly punished. Possibly some among them were disposed to take too literally the doctrine of soul-freedom and so to forget that the earthly order under which they were now living was really an appointment of God (2^{13-17} 4^{15}). St. Paul had to give the Romans a similar warning (Ro 13^{1-7}; cf. Tit 3^{1-3}; Clement of Rome, *ad Cor.* 61). Not improbably the Christians' sense of superiority to the world tended to engender an unconventional type of conduct which sometimes antagonized the authorities and readily suggested to outsiders that these seemingly recalcitrant people were accustomed within their own private assemblies to cast off all moral restraints. The readers of this Epistle are especially exhorted to make their manner of life such that they can by no possible means be justly reckoned among evil-doers. In all their political, social, and personal relationships they are to exercise the utmost caution not to give offence. But they are not to compromise their ideals by resorting to the heathen mode of living, nor are they to hesitate in confessing Christ's Lordship (3^{15}). They should always be prepared to give reasons for their unshaken faith in Christ and the coming deliverance, and their type of life should be so noble as to put to shame their accusers. Then, in all the attacks which are made upon them they will suffer unjustly, and such suffering will bring them a rich reward. Having seen to it that they themselves do not merit punishment, the trials through which they are passing must be merely premonitory signs of the approaching end when all sinners are to be condemned, while the righteous are to inherit eternal peace. Thus the author endeavours to cheer and strengthen his readers, and this is manifestly the chief aim of his letter.

3. Historical situation.—What, more exactly, were the conditions under which the readers were living? They are addressed as 'sojourners of the Dispersion' (παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς). This expression has sometimes been taken to mean that they were converts from the Jewish Diaspora.* But more probably the language is figurative, used of Christians in general, who are temporarily exiled from their heavenly home and scattered abroad upon the earth,† just as the Jews were exiled from their holy city and dispersed in strange lands. In this sense these Christians may have been converts from both Judaism and paganism, but certain incidental references in the Epistle suggest that they belonged mainly to the latter class. Before conversion they had been in a state of 'ignorance' (1^{14}; cf. Eph 4^{18}) and had followed their passions as their Gentile contemporaries continued to do (1^{14} $4^{2ff.}$); in time past they were in 'darkness,' they were 'no people,' and they had not obtained mercy, but now their situation is completely reversed ($2^{9f.}$); at the outset they had been furthest from God, and now they are nearest to Him—all of which seems to point to Gentile antecedents. They are dwelling in different parts of Asia Minor—Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia. Probably the geographical designations are used in the official sense of the territorial rearrangement into provinces under the Romans. The bearer of the Epistle is thought of as starting his journey from the eastern portion of the province of Bithynia-Pontus, and swinging in a circle back to the western end of it. But the readers will have lived in much the same territory, whether the geographical terms are taken in the technical or in the popular sense. The letter is so uniform in its emphasis upon suffering, and it makes so much of the hope that Christ will soon appear to remedy the present evil, that the writer evidently thought Christians generally throughout this territory were actually enduring, or were soon to experience, very severe persecution. For some of them at least it was already a stunning reality (4^{12}), but they are exhorted not to shrink from this affliction. They should, however, make sure that they are not guilty of any of the evil deeds which their enemies allege against them ($2^{12.\ 15}$ $3^{16f.}$ $4^{4.\ 14\text{-}16}$). They are admonished to refrain from needlessly provoking the authorities, recognizing in the latter Divinely appointed guardians of the civil order ($2^{13\text{-}17}$), and they are to suffer willingly for righteousness' sake; that is, they are to stand loyal to their confession of Christ and to affirm unhesitatingly their hope of salvation, and thus they may congratulate themselves on suffering for the name of Christ, although formally they are being punished for crimes with which their opponents are—falsely, the author hopes—charging them ($3^{13\text{-}17}$ $4^{14\text{-}16}$). Moreover, their situation is not unique, but is characteristic of the brotherhood throughout the world (5^{9}).

4. Date.—There is much difference of opinion as to the date of composition (see J. Moffatt, *LNT*, pp. 338–342). A most important question in this connexion is, When were the Christians of northern Asia Minor suffering this type of affliction? Of the various answers which have been given in the past, only three demand detailed consideration.* According to one hypothesis, these events took place in the latter part of the reign of Nero (54–68), a second view locates them under Domitian (81–96), while still another refers them to the time of Trajan (98–117). Notwithstanding numerous discussions of the subject, there is still much uncertainty regarding the exact extent and character of the persecutions which are commonly supposed to have occurred under these three Emperors.† Our first explicit information outside the NT about the persecution of Christians in Asia Minor is found in the extant correspondence which Pliny the Younger and Trajan carried on about the year 112 (*Ep.* xcvi. f.). When Pliny became governor of Bithynia he soon found himself in conflict with the Christians, of whom he put a number to death, or, if Roman citizens, held them for transportation to Rome. Pliny had not started out with any well-defined anti-Christian policy, and so he was much perplexed by the situation which early developed. When he found that the Christians were not guilty of the crimes usually charged against them, he was in doubt as to whether it was proper to punish them merely for their loyalty to the name of Christ, and he did not know what disposition ought to be made of those who were willing to recant. Further, he wanted to know to what extent Christians were to be deliberately sought out for punishment. To Pliny's inquiries the Emperor replied that (1) flagrant cases were to be punished, but (2) no active search for Christians was to be made, nor (3) were anonymous accusations to be entertained, and (4) all who recanted, proving their sincerity by denying the name of Christian and observing the rites of the State religion, were to be pardoned regardless of any former suspicions against them. This, so far as our extant information is concerned, is the first time in history when the mere confession of the name 'Christian' itself constituted a punishable offence in the eyes of the law, but henceforth persecution for the 'Name' was the ordinary form of procedure.‡ In earlier times the name 'Chris-

---

[*] So E. Kühl, *Die Briefe Petri und Judæ*, p. 21 ff. The same opinion has been affirmed more recently by C. F. G. Heinrici, *Der litterarische Charakter der neutestamentlichen Schriften*, Leipzig, 1908, p. 75 f.

[†] Cf. 1 P 1^{17} 2^{11}, He 11^{13} 13^{14}, Eph 2^{19}; also the salutations of Clement of Rome, *ad Cor.*, Polycarp, *ad Phil.*, and *Martyrdom of Polycarp*. This is the view held by the majority of modern scholars, *e.g.* R. Knopf, *Die Briefe Petri und Judä*, p. 3 ff.

[*] B. Weiss in various writings, and more recently in *Der erste Petrusbrief und die neuere Kritik*, has advocated a date early in the fifties, and he is followed by Kühl, *op cit.* pp. 49–60. But this opinion has not found any general acceptance. A similar neglect has attended the hypothesis of a post-Trajanic date, as advocated, for example, by G. Volkmar, 'Ueber die katholischen Briefe und Henoch,' in *ZWTh* iv. [1861] 427–436, v. [1862] 46-75; and by E. Zeller, 'Zur Petrusfrage,' *ib.* xix. [1876] 35–56.

[†] The extensive literature has recently been summarized by L. H. Canfield, *The Early Persecutions of the Christians*, New York, 1918. The more important recent works of a general character are W. M. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire before A.D. 170*, London, 1893; E. G. Hardy, *Studies in Roman History*, 1st ser., do., 1906; H. B. Workman, *Persecution in the Early Church*, do., 1906; P. Allard, *Histoire des persécutions pendant les deux premiers siècles*[3], Paris, 1903; A. Linsenmayer, *Die Bekämpfung des Christentums durch den römischen Staat bis zum Tode des Kaisers Julian*, Munich, 1905. For treatises on special topics see Canfield, *op. cit.* pp. 211–215.

[‡] So Canfield, *op. cit.* p. 96 ff. Other authorities believe this to have been the situation even in Nero's day, *e.g.* Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 324 f.

tian' might have aroused suspicion, but apparently suspected persons had to be convicted of some particular crime—or at least the crime was assumed by the authorities to be capable of proof—before punishment was inflicted. This, indeed, seems to have been the principle upon which Pliny himself had acted at first, for he was at a loss to know what to do when he found that the Christians were innocent of the usual charges brought against them, and that they had even obeyed the edict forbidding private assemblies. In the case of those who refused to recant, he justified his own severity on the ground of their criminal obstinacy, but Trajan's rescript removed all necessity for any such special justification. Henceforth, if one persistently confessed Christianity, that in itself was sufficient basis for legal action. Christianity was now, in the eyes of the law, a *religio illicita*.

Is this the situation of the Christians to whom 1 Peter is addressed? Scholars who answer this question in the affirmative do so mainly because of the reference in 1 P 4^{14-16} to suffering for the Name.* But were the readers as yet technically suffering for the Name? Apparently not, in the formal sense. Their opponents are certainly bringing specific charges against them ($2^{12.\ 15.\ 19f.}$ $3^{9.\ 16f.}$ 4^{4}), reviling their manner of life in order to persuade the authorities to act. Believers are not being arraigned because it is a crime *per se* to be a Christian, nor are they condemned on this charge; it is only from the point of view of their own clear conscience that they can glory in being reproached for the name of Christ. The stress which the writer places on false accusations, and his earnest admonitions to avoid all criminal conduct, show that the letter was written to persons who were being charged—though falsely, the author hoped—with specific crimes. Moreover, by a correct and cautious mode of conduct they may hope to gain the favour of the governor who is thought capable of giving praise to them that do well (2^{14}), while even their accusers may be silenced and put to shame by the Christians' good manner of life in Christ (2^{15} 3^{16}).† This encouragement would have been quite pointless if the mere acknowledgment of the 'Name' already constituted a capital offence in the eyes of the law. The Christians might console themselves with the thought that they were in reality being reproached simply for the name of Christ, but apparently their enemies were still obliged to make specific criminal charges against believers in order to effect legal action.

1 Peter can hardly have been designed to meet the new condition of affairs following the rescript of Trajan, if, as seems probable, the mere confession of Christianity was henceforth the only point needing to be established in law ('si deferantur et arguantur [*i.e.* if they are proven to be Christians], puniendi sunt'). But a date shortly before Trajan's rescript, during Pliny's preliminary activity, would suit admirably certain details in the situation. Under the immediately preceding governors little attention had been paid to the internal affairs of the province, which was in a wretched state generally. Pliny was a more efficient executive, and his efforts to establish better conditions must almost immediately have brought the Christians to his attention. They were held largely responsible for the general decline, because they had interfered with traditional religion and with that part of civic life which depended upon religion for prosperity. Even in the villages and country districts the temples had been forsaken and the trade in fodder for the victims had been almost ruined. So Pliny, in order to restore the commercial prosperity of the province, took action against the Christians. He put to death a few who had refused to recant and induced others to resume their former manner of life. This action encouraged the enemies of the new religion to bring still others to his attention, and even anonymous charges were entertained. This procedure must have seemed to the Christians like the sudden outburst of a devastating conflagration, a veritable activity of their adversary the devil (4^{12} 5^{8}). But still there was a hopeful side to the situation. The governor had shown a disposition to investigate the charges, and if Christians would only take care always to be found innocent they might hope for favours from the courts and at the same time put their accusers to confusion. According to Pliny's testimony, this was the course which the Christians of his province were actually pursuing. In obedience to his edict they had ceased holding meetings, and the criminal charges preferred against them proved on investigation to be wholly false.

Thus we might easily suppose, on the basis of conditions described by Pliny, that 1 Peter had shortly before been received by the Christian community and had borne good fruit. Furthermore, the problems which it treats have several points of correspondence with the situation presupposed in Pliny's letter to the Emperor. He had called upon believers to revile Christ and worship Cæsar, and they are especially admonished in 1 Peter to sanctify in their hearts Christ as Lord ($3^{15ff.}$), to remain loyal to His name ($4^{14ff.}$), and to refuse to return to their former mode of living ($4^{2ff.}$). The last item was the thing which Pliny was especially desirous of bringing about, and he says that his efforts in this direction had been measurably successful. This fact may have furnished one of the incentives for the writing of 1 Peter, exhorting believers to maintain a firm defence of their faith in Christ, yet a defence to be made with meekness and fear, while they thus retain a good conscience and hope for the best ($3^{15f.}$). Many items in the letter are admirably suited to the early days of Pliny's governorship, previous to his appeal to Trajan and the issuance of the Emperor's rescript.

On the other hand, several interpreters prefer a Domitianic date, believing that it furnishes a more appropriate setting for the conditions described in 1 Peter. The situation under Trajan is thought to exhibit a too advanced type of persecution.* Even in comparison with Revelation, which is supposed to have been written in the last years of Domitian's reign, 1 Peter is believed to reflect a slightly earlier situation. The persecution seems to have broken out only recently (4^{12}), and resentment toward the authorities has not yet had time to develop (2^{13-17}); while in Revelation the persecutors are hated bitterly and Christians have been enduring afflictions for some time (2^{13} 6^{10} 18^{24}). It is also said that in 1 Peter Christians are not being called upon to pay homage to the Emperor's image (but see 1 P 3^{14}), while this demand has become very offensive by the time Revelation was written (13^{15} 20^{4}). Therefore 1 Peter is placed in the earlier part of Domitian's reign (*e.g.* von Soden, *c.* 90; McGiffert, before 90; Knopf, 81–90; Harnack, 83–93).

---

* For statements of this opinion, in more recent times, see S. Davidson, *An Introduction to the Study of the NT*^{2}, i. 522 ff.; J. M. S. Baljon, *Commentaar op de katholische brieven*; P. Schmidt, 'Zwei Fragen zum ersten Petrusbrief,' in *ZWTh* xlix. [1907] 28–52. A. Jülicher, *Einleitung in das NT*^{6}, p. 182, would make the date about A.D. 100, because Polycarp, Papias, and the author of James are thought to have known and used 1 Peter.

† Perhaps the author even contemplated the possibility of some counter legal action against the false accusers when they failed to make good their charges. According to Suetonius (*Aug.* xxxii.), Augustus had enacted a law by which malicious informers made themselves liable for the very punishment which they sought to bring upon their innocent victim.

* Detailed arguments against a Trajanic date are given by J. M. Usteri, *Wissenschaftlicher und praktischer Commentar über den ersten Petrusbrief*, pp. 243–248; but he is equally opposed to a Domitianic date (p. 248 ff.). The latter view, however, is held by a number of scholars—*e.g.*, in more recent times, H. von Soden in H. J. Holtzmann's *Hand-Kommentar zum NT*^{2}, iii. 117 (making Silvanus the real author); A. C. McGiffert, *A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*^{2}, p. 596 f. (ascribing the letter to Barnabas); R. Knopf, *op. cit.* p. 24 f. The same date is assumed for the original form of the letter as re-constructed by A. Harnack, *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur*, i. 451–465, and by W. Soltau, 'Die Einheitlichkeit des ersten Petrusbriefes,' in *SK* lxxviii. [1905] 302–315, lxxix. [1906] 456–460.

This line of argument assumes that conditions north of the Taurus were practically identical with those of eastern Asia Minor, and that Revelation is a reliable witness to the Domitianic persecution. The former assumption might easily be disputed, and perhaps the latter is open to some question. Certainly the popular belief that Domitian instituted a vigorous persecution in the East is not substantiated by the earliest authorities.[*] Perhaps the Christians' troubles described in Revelation may have been brought on by certain local authorities acting on their own initiative and being zealous for the cult of the Emperor which had been prominent in Asia since the time of Augustus, its chief seat being at Pergamum (Dio Cassius, li. 20; Tacitus, *Annals*, iv. 37; cf. Rev 2^{13}). But there is manifestly little similarity between the situation reflected in 1 Peter and that of the Christians in Revelation, nor is it certain that the two situations stand to one another in the relation of antecedent to consequent.

Those who adopt a Neronian date—a view which has been widely accepted[†]—have even greater difficulties in obtaining substantial evidence for a persecution of the desired type in northern Asia Minor in the sixties. There is, however, very explicit evidence for a severe persecution in Rome during Nero's reign. Tacitus (*Annals*, xv. 44), writing about A.D. 115, says that Nero, in order to free himself from the charge of incendiarism, alleged that the Christians were responsible for the great fire of the year 64. While Tacitus does not think they were guilty, he does regard them as malefactors deserving the severest of the punishments which they received at Nero's hands. Likewise Suetonius (*Nero*, 16), writing about five years later, says that Nero severely punished the new and mischievous superstition, though he does not make the great fire the occasion for this action. Clement of Rome (*ad Cor.* 5–7), about the year 95, speaks less explicitly, but in the light of the statements of Tacitus and Suetonius it seems altogether probable that Clement has in mind the Neronian persecution. Whether Tacitus is right in connecting the fire with Nero's action against the Christians is sometimes disputed,[‡] but the evidence for a Neronian persecution some time after the conflagration of the year 64 is overwhelming. The ground of the persecution was crimes of one sort or another commonly charged against these people who were 'hated for their enormities' (so Tacitus). Clement says that 'envy' was the cause of the trouble, and his language doubtless reflects the same popular animosity of which Tacitus speaks. The new religionists probably were hated 'as Christians,' and from their point of view they might regard themselves as suffering for the name of Christ, but legally they were being punished for crimes of which they were accused by their enemies.

This situation might be said to correspond fairly well with that of 1 Peter, but we have no certain knowledge that the Neronian persecution reached to the East, and particularly to the peoples addressed in 1 P 1^{1}. Advocates of the Neronian date quite plausibly remark that members of the new cult, because of their hostility to contemporary customs, would everywhere become objects of hatred, a hatred which might break out in fiery persecution at any time when the magistrates could be induced to act. Some such hypothetical situation may have existed in northern Asia Minor during the reign of Nero, but this is only a possibility and not a certainty.

From the standpoint of the persecutions, the advantage would seem to be with a date shortly before the rescript of Trajan and during the early days of Pliny's governorship. But if the letter was written at this time, or even under Domitian, it must have been pseudonymous (or anonymous). Peter cannot possibly have been alive in the second decade of the 2nd cent., nor is he likely to have lived until the time of Domitian.[*] Pseudonymity of itself is not inconceivable. The use of some ancient worthy's name to lend authority to a message, especially in crises, was a literary phenomenon familiar to that age.[†] But for many interpreters other considerations weigh heavily in favour of Petrine, or near-Petrine, authorship, and this conviction necessitates the choice of a Neronian date. Thus the question of date shades into that of authenticity.

5. Authenticity.—Outside the NT the earliest specific testimony to Petrine authorship is by Irenæus (IV. ix. 2, xvi. 5; V. vii. 2), and, from this time on, similar statements are common (*e.g.* Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Cyprian, Eusebius).[‖] But the book was not mentioned in the Muratorian Canon, and it seems to have been less well known at Rome than in the East and in Africa. Echoes of its language have been suspected in certain passages of Clement of Rome, but the resemblances are not sufficiently strong and distinctive to establish literary interdependence.[‡] The same thing is true in the case of Hermas[§] and Ignatius.[‖] But Polycarp and Papias seem beyond doubt to have been acquainted with the letter, although we have no information from them on the question of authorship. Of Papias, Eusebius (*HE* III. xxxix. 16) says: 'he used testimonies from the First Epistle of John and likewise from that of Peter'; and in Polycarp's letter to the Philippians there are several passages so closely akin to the language of 1 Peter that Polycarp's acquaintance with the document is commonly thought to be beyond question.[¶] This opinion was expressed as early as the time of Eusebius (*HE* IV. xiv. 9). It is remarkable that Polycarp never mentions the name of Peter, and on the strength of this fact Harnack (*op. cit.* p. 457 ff.) believes that the document was anonymous in Polycarp's day and that the opening and closing verses ($1^{1f.}$ 5^{12-14}) were added later, probably by the author of 2 Peter, in the interests of canonization. This view is adopted, in a somewhat modified form, by McGiffert (*op. cit.* p. 598 ff.), who makes Barnabas the original author. Thus the external evidence leaves the question of authorship in some doubt, although it establishes the fact that the letter was known in the East as early as the second decade of the 2nd cent., when Polycarp wrote to the Philippians (*c.* 115). But even this conclusion would admit the possibility of a Neronic, or a Domitianic, or a Trajanic date. Jülicher, it is true, would date the letter about the year 100 in order to allow time for Polycarp to become familiar with the document; but so early a date is not necessary, since Polycarp was in a position to become acquainted with the letter almost immediately after it was dispatched. Moreover, the habit of diligently exchanging letters during these trying days is brought out clearly in Polycarp's own epistle (iii. 1, xiii. 1 f.; also Ignatius, *ad Polyc.* viii. 1).

---

[*] See Canfield, *op. cit.* pp. 70–85, 161–175.

[†] Lately defended by Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 323 ff., who also lists the names of its chief adherents.

[‡] See especially A. Profumo, *Le fonti ed i tempi dell' incendio Neroniano*, Rome, 1905.

[*] Ramsay, *op. cit.* p. 279 ff., thinks Peter was still alive in the year 80, so that the letter may have been written under Vespasian. But there is little, if any, positive evidence for a persecution of Christians at this time, and there are very strong reasons for believing that Peter's death occurred in the sixties.

[†] See the pertinent note of J. B. Mayor, *The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter*, p. cxxv.

[‡] Cf. Clement, *ad Cor.* xxx. 1 with 1 P 5^{5}; xxxviii. 1 with 2^{8} 4^{10} 5^{5}; xlix. 5 with 4^{8}; lvii. 1 with 2^{1} 5^{5}; lix. 2 with 2^{9}; lxi. 1 with $2^{13f.}$

[§] Cf. Hermas, *Vis.* III. xi. 3 with 1 P 5^{7}; *Vis.* IV. iii. 4 with 1^{7}; *Mand.* ii. 1 with 2^{2}; *Sim.* IX. xxi. 3 with 4^{16}; *Sim.* IX. xxviii. 5 f. with $4^{13f.\,16}$; *Sim.* IX. xxix. 1 with 2^{2}.

[‖] Cf. Ignatius, *ad Magn.* xiii. 2 with 1 P 5^{5}; *ad Polyc.* iv. 3 with 2^{6}.

[¶] *E.g.* Polycarp, *ad Phil.* i. 3=1 P $1^{8.\,12}$; ii. 1=$1^{13.\,21}$; v. 3=2^{11}; viii. 1=$2^{20f.\,22.\,24}$ $4^{14.\,16}$; x. 2=2^{12}. Cf. also ii. 2, vii. 2, x. 1 with 4^{5} 4^{7} 2^{17} respectively.

Further data on the problem of authenticity have to be drawn from internal indications. Petrine authorship is explicitly affirmed in the salutation, and this, apparently, is corroborated by 2 P 3^{1}. Yet several traits in the letter have often been thought to count seriously against its authenticity. Much stress has been placed upon its alleged 'Paulinism.' Possible parallels to the earlier Pauline letters have been pointed out (*e.g.* 1 P 5^{8}=1 Th 5^{6}; 1 P $1^{4f.}$ 2^{16} 3^{6}=Gal 3^{23} 4^{7} 5^{13} 4^{24}; 1 P $2^{1ff.}$=1 Co $3^{2.\ 16f.}$), but the closest affinities in both language and thought are with Romans; and, with few exceptions (*e.g.* B. Weiss, Kühl), scholars generally admit the priority of Romans. A comparison, *e.g.*, of 1 P 2^{13-17} with Ro 13^{1-7} shows close similarity not only in language and subject-matter but also in the very arrangement of the ideas. In various other places there is a striking parallelism between the two documents.[*] The points of agreement between 1 Peter and Ephesians are so close that even identity of authorship has sometimes been assumed.[†] This is an extreme conclusion, yet literary interdependence can hardly be doubted, and priority is generally allowed to rest with Ephesians. This distinctly Pauline, or deutero-Pauline, character of 1 Peter is thought by many interpreters to make Petrine authorship impossible. Still other data are also brought forward in favour of this scepticism. The close affinities of 1 Peter with certain late NT writings, such as the Pastorals and James, is said to show that it belongs to the same period as, even if it is not dependent upon, those books.[‡] Nor would Peter, it is said, write to Christians belonging to Paul's territory without so much as mentioning the latter's name; and a writer who had been a personal companion of Jesus would surely have made more frequent reference to that relationship. Even stronger is the objection that Peter, originally a Jewish Galilæan fisherman, cannot, for purely linguistic reasons, have been the author of a letter the Greek of which is not only thoroughly idiomatic but shows a richness of vocabulary and an appreciation of style thought to be quite beyond his ability.

Although this is a formidable array of objections, the force of which has led several well-known scholars to doubt the authenticity of the letter, others prefer an explanation of the difficulty which will admit the possibility of some form of Petrine authorship. Among more recent writers, the arguments in favour of full authenticity have been stated most elaborately by F. H. Chase (*op. cit.* p. 785 ff.). He would account for the 'Paulinism' of the letter by supposing that Peter had been summoned to Rome by Paul 'with the supreme object of showing to the Christians at Rome and to the brotherhood in the world the unity of the Body and of the Spirit.' The time spent by Peter in missionary work outside Palestine is believed to have been sufficient to give him the necessary linguistic equipment for writing in Greek; and failure to mention Paul, or absence of other personal data, is to be explained by the fact that Silvanus, who carried the letter himself, supplied such information.

Other scholars would defend only a secondary form of Petrine authorship. Peter wrote 'through Silvanus' [διὰ Σιλουανοῦ]; that is, the Apostle was responsible for the general content of the letter, but the diction and even to some extent the thought were due to Silvanus. Since the latter, who is identified with the Silas of Acts ($15^{22.\ 27.\ 32.\ 40}$ $16^{19.\ 25.\ 29}$ $17^{4.\ 10.\ 14f.}$ 18^{5}), had been a personal companion of Paul (*e.g.* 1 Th 1^{1}, 2 Th 1^{1}, 2 Co 1^{19}), it was quite natural that 1 Peter should show a Pauline colouring and should be written in a more excellent style than Peter himself could command. This supposition also allows room for the recognition of the stylistic resemblances between this Epistle and the early chapters of Acts as well as certain portions of the Synoptic Gospels.[*] They all contain, so it is said, a more or less strong Petrine cast, due ultimately to the influence of the Apostle. On this hypothesis 1 Peter will have been written from Rome in the time of Nero.[†] Failure to mention Paul may be taken to imply that he was already dead. Others would not attach any special significance to this silence, and would assume that the letter was sent from Rome before the death of either of the two leading apostles.

A few minor problems remain to be considered briefly.

6. Place of writing.—The only hint which the author gives as to the place of writing is contained in 5^{13}, 'the co-elect [fem. sing.] in Babylon salutes you.' The 'co-elect' (ἡ συνεκλεκτή) probably refers to the church with which he is associated at the time, although it has been supposed that he might be referring to some individual, and more particularly to his wife (cf. 1 Co 9^{5}). This is the view of several older commentators and, more recently, of Bigg. As for the location of this church, there are three possibilities, viz. (1) Babylon on the Euphrates, (2) Babylon in Egypt, or (3) Rome. The first of these possibilities has several advocates, both among the defenders of the letter's authenticity (*e.g.* B. Weiss, Kühl) and among those who make it post-apostolic (*e.g.* R. A. Lipsius, H. J. Holtzmann, P. W. Schmiedel). The former opinion is based upon the assumption that 1 Peter is too early to allow time for the Apostle to have reached Rome, and the latter view presupposes that the (fictitious) tradition about his Roman residence had not yet grown up when the letter was written —or, at least, that this tradition was not approved by the author. Both positions are open to serious doubt, as is also the supposition that the author was residing in the Egyptian Babylon. This town, located on the site of the present Cairo, is mentioned by Strabo (XVII. i. 30), and apparently it was at that time mainly a military station and is not likely to have been the home of a Christian community in the 1st century. Furthermore, ecclesiastical tradition does not connect Peter's name with Egypt in any such way as we should expect if he had actually worked there or if tradition regarding his alleged activities in that territory had been sufficiently general to make the reference to 'Babylon' intelligible in a pseudonymous epistle. Hence the probabilities favour the view that Babylon is used metaphorically for Rome, as is the case in Revelation (14^{8} 16^{19} 17^{5} $18^{2.\,10.\,21}$; cf. *Sib. Orac.* v. 143, 158; Eusebius, *HE* II. xv. 2). Mark, who is included in the greeting, was also closely associated with Rome in early tradition (Col 4^{10}, Philem ^{24}, 2 Ti 4^{11}; cf. Irenæus, III. i. 1; Eusebius, *HE* II. xv. 1 f., VI. xiv. 6 f.).

---

[*] *E.g.* 1 P 1^{14}=Ro 12^{2}; 1 P 2^{4-8}=Ro $9^{32f.}$; 1 P 4^{1}=Ro 6^{7}; 1 P $4^{10f.}$=Ro $12^{6f.}$; 1 P 3^{9}=Ro 12^{17}.

[†] So W. Seufert, 'Das Verwandtschaftsverhältniss des ersten Petrusbriefs und Epheserbriefs,' in *ZWTh* xxiv. [1881] 178–197, 332–380. The following parallels may be noted: 1 P 1^{3-5}=Eph 1^{3-14}; 1 P 1^{12}=Eph $3^{5.\ 10}$; 1 P 1^{14-18} $4^{2f.}$=Eph 4^{17} 5^{8}; 1 P 2^{4-6}=Eph 2^{18-22}; 1 P 2^{18}=Eph 6^{5}; 1 P 3^{1-7}=Eph 5^{22-33}; 1 P $3^{21f.}$=Eph 1^{20-22}; 1 P $5^{8f.}$=Eph 6^{11-13}.

[‡] Cf. 1 P 1^{3-5} with Tit 3^{4-7}, 1 P 1^{12} with 1 Ti 3^{16}, 1 P $2^{1.\ 9}$ with Tit 3^{3} 2^{14}, 1 P $1^{1.\ 6f.}$ 1^{23}–2^{2} $5^{5f.}$ with Ja $1^{1.\ 2f.\ 18-22}$ $4^{6.\ 10}$. For lists of parallelisms between 1 Peter and other NT writings see J. Monnier, *La première épitre de l'apôtre Pierre*, Paris, 1900, pp. 259–274; C. Bigg, *ICC*, 'St. Peter and St. Jude,' New York, 1901, pp. 15–24; F. H. Chase, 'Peter, First Epistle,' *HDB* iii. 788; R. Knopf, *op. cit.* pp. 7–10.

[*] See E. Scharfe, *Die petrinische Strömung der neutestamentlichen Literatur.*

[†] Some of the better known names attaching to this view are J. M. Usteri, T. Zahn, J. Monnier, B. W. Bacon, J. Moffatt.

Does the assumption that Rome was the place of composition meet the implied conditions regarding the delivery of the letter? The phrase 'through Silvanus' probably means that he was the bearer, yet he may also have been the amanuensis. Similar expressions in the writings of this period commonly refer, however, more particularly to the bearer.* Apparently he is supposed to take a route bringing him first to Pontus, whence he swings in a circle through Galatia, Cappadocia, and Asia, completing his journey in Bithynia. To accomplish this he would follow one of the main lines of travel by water from Italy to the Black Sea, landing perhaps at Amastris or Sinope, and after completing his mission he may have returned to Herakleia, where he would take ship again for Italy (see F. J. A. Hort, *The First Epistle of St. Peter I. 1–II. 17*, London, 1898, pp. 157–184).

7. Literary structure and integrity.—Is this document a 'homily,' an 'epistle,' or a 'letter' in the proper sense of the term? That is, was it originally simply a hortatory discourse intended for general edification, or was it such a discourse thrown into epistolary form mainly for literary effect; or was it a specific message from a writer whose heart went out in sympathy to particular persons in the hour of their great affliction?† The first of these views is held by Harnack, who, as previously observed, thinks the epistolary introduction and conclusion are later additions. The second view, which is essentially the same so far as literary considerations are concerned, is more generally adopted. In its favour one may note that the document is addressed to a wide circle of readers with whom the writer does not appear to be in immediate personal contact, items of personal intimacy are conspicuously lacking, and the moral and religious exhortations of the document are capable of very general application. On the other hand, there is much to suggest that the writer has a very strong personal interest in the welfare of his readers. He knows the specific trials and temptations which beset them, and he is strongly moved with compassion for them in their affliction. In this respect we have a real 'letter,' notwithstanding the wide circle of readers addressed—if one allows that a circular letter can be a real 'letter,' as would seem unquestionably true of Galatians, for example. The writer of 1 Peter, whether the Apostle or not, had much the same personal interest in the problem which the persecution had raised among his readers as Paul had in the problems which the legalistic controversy had aroused in the churches of Galatia.

As for literary analyses of the letter, there have been a few proposals which are more thoroughgoing than Harnack's. D. Völter (*Der erste Petrusbrief, seine Entstehung und Stellung in der Geschichte des Urchristentums*, Strassburg, 1906) works out in detail an original document, written by Peter or one of his pupils, which is wholly free from Pauline colouring—so free, in fact, that the mention of the name 'Jesus Christ' was studiously avoided. This original document, composed some time before the persecution of Domitian, was freely interpolated by a Paulinist in the time of Trajan. Still another hypothesis is advanced by W. Soltau, 'Die Einheitlichkeit des ersten Petrusbriefes,' in *SK* lxxviii. [1905] 302–315, lxxix. [1906] 456–460. By excising a series of supposed interpolations he recovers the original document which contained $1^{3\text{-}22a}$ $2^{6\text{-}11}$ 2^{13}–3^{18} $4^{1\text{-}4.\,7\text{-}19}$ $5^{6\text{-}11}$. This was a hortatory homily written during the reign of Domitian. More recently a third theory has been proposed by R. Perdelwitz, *Die Mysterienreligion und das Problem des ersten Petrusbriefes: Ein literarischer und religionsgeschichtlicher Versuch*, Giessen, 1911. He distinguishes two originally independent and self-consistent parts, (1) 1^{3}–4^{11} and (2) $1^{1f.}$ 4^{12}–5^{14}. The former was a discourse to candidates on the occasion of their baptism, and the latter was a letter written later by the same person and probably addressed to the same community. It aimed at encouraging and admonishing the readers. The two documents, after lying for some time in the archives of the community, were either intentionally or accidentally copied together and henceforth circulated as one letter.

None of these several partition hypotheses has proved at all convincing.

8. Text and interpretation.—For a full discussion of textual and interpretative questions recourse must be had to the standard commentaries cited below. The text presents comparatively few difficulties, and only one or two points of interpretation, which have been the subject of more recent or more especial discussion, interest us at present.

Perhaps the most difficult passage in the letter is $3^{18\text{-}20}$, relating to the preaching to 'the spirits in prison.' Four main questions have to be answered, viz. (1) Who did the preaching? (2) To whom was it addressed? (3) When was this mission performed? (4) What was its purpose? Each of these queries has been answered in different ways, and the answers have been blended variously in the final interpretation of the passage.* As for the first question, the usual text makes Jesus Himself the preacher to these imprisoned spirits. But this reading is rejected by a few interpreters, who think the present Greek is corrupt. The clause which reads: 'In which he [Jesus] went and preached also to the spirits in prison,' has been treated as a marginal gloss which originally referred to Enoch, reading 'Ενὼχ for 'Εν ᾧ καὶ. Others would make this substitution in the text itself, or else add the word 'Enoch' to the present text, on the assumption that the four letters ΕΝΩΧ might easily have dropped out after the similar ΕΝΩΚΑΙ. In that case we should read: 'In which [spirit] Enoch also went and preached to the spirits in prison.* But it is very doubtful whether there are really substantial grounds for questioning the integrity of the text. Probably we ought to concede that, in the author's opinion, Jesus was the preacher.

---

* *E.g.* Ignatius, *ad Rom.* x. 1, *ad Phil.* xi. 2, *ad Smyrn.* xii. 1, *ad Polyc.* viii. 1 (*διὰ τῶν ὑπό σου πεμπομένων*); Polycarp, *ad Phil.* 14 ('per'). See also *διά* similarly used in a papyrus letter of the year A.D. 41 in G. Milligan, *Selections from the Greek Papyri*, Cambridge, 1910, p. 39.

† On these formal distinctions as applied to NT writings, see A. Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, Marburg, 1895, pp. 189–251 (Eng. tr., *Bible Studies*, Edinburgh, 1901, pp. 1–59), *Licht vom Osten*, Tübingen, 1908, p. 157 ff. (Eng. tr., *Light from the Ancient East*, New York, 1910, p. 217 ff.); Heinrici, *op. cit.* p. 56 ff.; J. Moffatt, *op. cit.* pp. 47–50.

* For modern discussion of this much-debated topic see F. Spitta, *Christi Predigt an die Geister*, Göttingen, 1890, who cites earlier literature; C. Bruston, *La Descente aux enfers*, Paris, 1890; W. Kelly, *Preaching to the Spirits in Prison*, London, 1900; C. Clemen, *Niedergefahren zu den Toten*, Giessen, 1900, *Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des NT*, do., 1909, p. 153 ff. (Eng. tr., *Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources*, Edinburgh, 1912, p. 198 ff.); J. Turmel, *La Descente du Christ aux enfers*, Paris, 1905; W. Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, Göttingen, 1907, p. 255 ff.; H. J. Holtzmann, 'Höllenfahrt im NT,' in *ARW* xi. [1908] 285 ff.; F. Loofs, 'Christ's Descent into Hell,' in *Transactions of the Third International Congress for the History of Religions*, Oxford, 1909, ii. 290–301; J. C. Granbery, 'Christological Peculiarities in the First Epistle of Peter,' in *AJTh* xiv. [1910] 69 ff.; K. Gschwind, *Die Niederfahrt Christi in die Unterwelt* [=*Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen*, vol. ii. bks. iii.–v.], Münster i. W., 1911; D. Plooy, 'De descensus in 1 Petrus 3^{19} en 4^{6},' in *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, xlvii. [1913] 145–162; art. DESCENT INTO HADES.

To whom, then, was the message addressed? It may have been directed (1) either toward Noah's contemporaries generally, who are now dead (cf. 1 P 4^{6}), or (2) toward those 'giants' of Noah's time whose wickedness brought down Divine wrath in the Flood (cf. Gn 6$^{1ff.}$, 2 P 2^{4}). The latter view is to be preferred, since it is in line with the beliefs of that age regarding the angelic powers which were being held in temporary bondage in the lower world. In view of the fact that Christ's mission extends not only to ordinary men but even to the notorious sinners of antiquity, the readers are exhorted to be confident in the power and surety of the new salvation which has been mediated through Him.

When did Christ preach to these 'spirits'? Some have said that it was while these giants were still upon earth, the pre-existent Christ being present in Noah and using him as a means of expression. This was Augustine's suggestion (*Ep.* 164, 'ad Euodium,' 15 ff.), and he has had many followers, who have held this opinion much more confidently than Augustine did. It is a very unnatural interpretation, and has in recent years given way to the idea that Jesus, in the interim between His death and resurrection, visited the nether regions, where He preached to the giant spirits there imprisoned.

What, finally, was the content of His message? It may have been either a proclamation of judgment or an offer of salvation. The context strongly supports the latter supposition, which is probably the correct one; although the former has been defended, particularly by interpreters who desired to emphasize the hopeless condition of all who die in sin.

According to 1 Peter, the fallen angels are not the only persons in the nether world to be included within the range of the new salvation. A similar opportunity of hearing the gospel has been extended to human beings who have passed on to the lower regions (1 P 4$^{5f.}$). All humanity falls into two classes, the living and the dead. Both groups are to be brought into judgment, but not without first having had an opportunity to hear the gospel. The author would strengthen the confidence of those who are suffering the agonies of present persecution and would give them new courage by reminding them that the Christian salvation is so comprehensive and powerful that it can bring deliverance to the condemned angels and to all mortals even in the under world, if the dead will exercise faith as the living Christians have done. The pertinence and force of this appeal become more evident when we note current belief about the nature of a full salvation. In the *Book of Enoch* there are indications that the expected Messianic salvation will be efficacious even for the fallen angels (50$^{5.\ 25}$ 59^{26}), while Justin Martyr (*Dial.* lxxii. 4) and Irenæus (III. xx. 4, IV. xxii. 1) affirm that the Jewish Scriptures (Isaiah or Jeremiah) had originally contained a promise of salvation for the dead. These Fathers are probably assigning to Isaiah or Jeremiah words which really belonged to some other Jewish writing. (For similar ideas in *Bereshith Rabba*, see F. Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, Leipzig, 1897, pp. 342 f., 368.) But for the readers of 1 Peter there was still another realm of religious imagery, even more immediately accessible than the Jewish, which could be used in interpreting the supreme significance of the Christian salvation. In the Hellenistic religious syncretism with which the peoples of Asia Minor had long been familiar, the notion of redemption had been pictured in terms of the activity of a Divine or semi-Divine deliverer mediating blessings not only to people of the earth but even to the inhabitants of the under world; and it was very fortunate for the progress of Christianity in Hellenistic circles that the Christian preachers and teachers were able to affirm the adequacy and supremacy of Jesus Christ in these respects.* A number of other items in 1 Peter, such as the efficacy of blood-sprinkling (1^{2}), the new birth (v.^{3}), and the saving significance of baptism (3^{21}), will doubtless have been interpreted through association with current religious imagery.†

B. SECOND PETER.—As compared with 1 Peter, the problems of 2 Peter are less perplexing and will be treated much more briefly.

1. Content.—The Epistle may be outlined as follows:

(*a*) *Salutation* (1$^{1f.}$).—The author, styling himself 'Symeon Peter, slave and apostle of Jesus Christ,' addresses fellow-Christians in general.

(*b*) *The surety of the Christian salvation* (1$^{3-21}$).—Certainty is guaranteed (1) by the present experience of believers who share in the Divine nature (1$^{3f.}$), and who should therefore be diligent in cultivating the Christian virtues (vv.$^{5-11}$). Further assurance is given (2) through the personal testimony of the apostle Peter (vv.$^{12-18}$) and (3) through ancient prophecy, which is a true expression of God's own will (vv.$^{19-21}$).

(*c*) *Condemnation and refutation of false teachers* (2^{1}–3^{10}).—(1) The errorists are successors of the false prophets of former times, and a sure judgment, like that which befell the sinners of old, awaits them (2$^{1-9}$). (2) Their depravity is displayed (i.) in a disposition to throw off all Divine restraints (vv.$^{10-12}$), and (ii.) in the licentious life which they themselves live, and persuade others to live, in the name of liberty (vv.$^{13-18}$). As a result (iii.) they have become slaves of licentiousness and are worse than before they associated themselves with the Christian community (vv.$^{19-22}$). (3) Consequently, impending judgment threatens them, notwithstanding their scepticism regarding the Parousia. They should remember that (i.) a catastrophic end has been predicted by apostles and prophets (3$^{1-4}$), and that (ii.) the order of nature is first a destruction of the world by water and then a destruction by fire (vv.$^{5-7}$). Furthermore, (iii.) the delay is easily explicable, since God reckons time in larger units than do men, and by temporarily holding off the Judgment He is giving men opportunity to repent (v.$^{8f.}$); but (iv.) of the certainty of impending judgment there can be no reasonable doubt (v.^{10}).

(*d*) *Duty of Christians in the present situation* (3^{11-18a}).—(1) They will live a pure life, thus making ready for the new life of righteousness in which they are to participate after the earth has been purified (3$^{11-14}$). (2) They will not misinterpret the delay, nor will they pervert the Christian doctrine of liberty, particularly as stated by St. Paul ($3^{15f.}$). (3) They will steadfastly resist the false teachers and will derive their spiritual instruction and nourishment from the Lord only ($3^{17.\ 18a}$).

---

* The suggestion that the whole clause originally stood on the margin is made by J. Cramer, *Exegetica et Critica II; Het glossematisch Karakter van I. Ptr 3:19–21 en 4:6* [=*Nieuwe bijdragen op het gebied van godgeleerdheid en wijsbegeerte*, vii.], Utrecht, 1891. For the notion that the word 'Enoch' has dropped out of the text, see J. Rendel Harris and others, in *Exp*, 6th ser., iv. [1901] 194–199, 346–349, v. [1902] 317–320, vi. [1903] 70–72, 316–320, 377 ff.

* See W. Bousset, *op. cit.* p. 238 ff.; A. Dieterich, *Nekyia*, Leipzig, 1893, p. 128 ff.; M. Brückner, *Der sterbende und auferstehende Gottheiland in den orientalischen Religionen und ihr Verhältnis zum Christentum*, Tübingen, 1908; S. J. Case, *Evolution of Early Christianity*, Chicago, 1914, pp. 219–238, 283 ff. For evidence that NT writers other than the author of 1 Peter took advantage of these notions about the under world, see Mt 27$^{52f.}$, Ro 10$^{6f.}$ 14^{9}, 1 Co 15^{29}, Eph 4$^{9f.}$, Ph 2^{10}, Col 2^{15}, He 12^{23}, Rev 1^{18} 5^{13} 6$^{9-11}$.

† See A. Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie*^{2}, Leipzig, 1910, pp. 92–179; R. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, do., 1904, pp. 226 ff., 368 ff.; S. J. Case, *op. cit.* p. 350, n. 1.

(*e*) *Benediction* (3^{18b}).

2. Historical situation.—The chief purpose of the Epistle undoubtedly is to combat false teachers who, in the opinion of the author, are making the Christian teaching of liberty identical with licence and are ridiculing the notion of an impending punitive catastrophe as preached by an earlier generation of Christians. Thus the main purpose of the writing is clear, but more exact information about the actual historical situation in which it arose is hard to obtain. Although the writer calls himself 'Symeon Peter,' the document is notably devoid of specific temporal and local *indicia*. There is no clear statement as to its destination, and, unlike most of the other NT letters, the conclusion does not contain any personal items which might help to identify the circumstances more exactly. In fact, the writing is epistolary only in a very liberal sense of the term, for in reality it is a homily addressed to Christians at large (1^1). And the errors which the author would correct seem not to have been confined to one particular congregation, but to have been somewhat widespread.

In order to ascertain more accurately the historical situation, we must examine more closely the character of the heresy. The false teachers are distinguished by two distinct, though not unrelated, traits: they are antinomians and antieschatologists. They are not open antagonists of the Christian movement, but are actually within the community, where they propagate their pernicious doctrines among their unwary brethren ($2^{1-3.\ 13f.\ 18f.}$). They lay stress upon freedom, claiming St. Paul as their authority (3^{16}), and apply their doctrine so literally in daily conduct that their character is severely impugned by the writer, who accuses them of gross immorality. Their sin is classed with that of the fallen angels mentioned in Gn 6, and their fate is to be like that which overtook the wicked people of Sodom and Gomorrah. They are bestial debauchees, given over to adultery and insatiable wickedness, and they persist in drawing others down to their own base level. Furthermore, they have cast off that restraint which belief in an impending judgment would naturally impose, and they even scoff at the teaching of the early Christian worthies who made so much of this belief (v.$^{3f.}$). Thus, in addition to being grossly immoral, they are disrespectful toward authorities ($2^{1.\ 10}$), and are greedy for worldly things in a way ill becoming those whose gaze should be fixed chiefly upon the future, and especially upon that moment when the present world-order is to pass away ($2^{3.\ 13-15}$ 3^{11-13}).

Is it possible to locate with any degree of probability a period and a territory answering to this historical situation?

3. Date and provenance.—2 Peter is not the only NT book to concern itself with heretical teachers. It is true, the Judaizers who troubled St. Paul have essentially nothing in common with the disturbers of 2 Peter, and the latter have only a faint likeness to the heretics of Colossæ (Col 2^{4-8}, Eph $5^{6ff.}$), or to the antinomians of Ph $3^{18f.}$. In the Pastoral Epistles there are closer analogies to 2 Peter (*e.g.* 2 Ti $3^{1ff.}$, Tit $1^{10f.\ 16}$), as also perhaps in the Johannine Epistles (*e.g.* 1 Jn $2^{18.\ 22.\ 26}$ 4^1, 2 Jn ^{7}, 3 Jn $^{9ff.}$). But it is in Revelation (*e.g.* $2^{2.\ 6.\ 9.\ 13f.\ 15.\ 18}$ $3^{4.\ 8}$), and particularly in Jude, that the closest parallels are to be found. In fact, Jude is taken over almost bodily into 2 Peter—that is, assuming that Jude is the earlier document.* Yet this fact does not positively fix the date of composition, since the date of Jude is not certain. But it is commonly placed comparatively late in the list of NT letters.

Further evidence for the date of 2 Peter is furnished by a number of incidental notices in the Epistle itself. In $3^{15f.}$ we learn that the Epistles of St. Paul had already been assembled into a collection which has canonical authority like 'other scriptures'—probably meaning the OT. The first generation of Christians had died (3^4), and even Jn $21^{18f.}$ seems to be known to the author (1^{14}). Acquaintance with the tradition of Papias, to the effect that Peter was ultimately responsible for the record of Jesus' career contained in Mark, has been suspected in 2 P 1^{15}, while $1^{17f.}$ may reflect familiarity with Mark's account of the Transfiguration, and 2^{20} may be coloured by the language of Mt 12^{45} or Lk 11^{26}. Literary affinities with Josephus and with Philo have also been discovered, but there are especially strong resemblances between 2 Peter and the *Apocalypse of Peter* (see for particulars J. B. Mayor, *op. cit.* pp. cxxv–cxxxiv). On the other hand, there are very few references to 2 Peter in the writings of the early Fathers. The earliest certain allusion to the Epistle is by Origen (*ap.* Eusebius, *HE* VI. xxv. 8), but possibly it was known to Clement of Alexandria (Eusebius, *HE* VI. xiv. 1). In earlier times there is no certain trace of its existence and it was very late in obtaining a place in the canon. It is not mentioned in the Muratorian fragment, nor is it included in the Peshiṭta or in the Old Latin (see J. B. Mayor, *op. cit.* p. cxvi ff.). Eusebius (*HE* III. xxv. 3) doubted its canonicity, although he attested the esteem with which it was regarded by Christians.

From the foregoing considerations we may draw some inferences regarding the time and place of writing. It may not be possible to identify with certainty the false teachers, but they clearly represent a more advanced type of antinomianism than that of the Pastorals or of the Johannine Epistles. This fact points to a 2nd cent. date and possibly to Asiatic territory as the home of the heresy. The latter supposition agrees with the statement of 2 P 3^1 (cf. 1^{16}), which probably is a reference to 1 P $1^{1ff.}$; nor is it out of harmony with 2 P 3^{15}, for St. Paul had addressed letters to various communities in Asia Minor. (But see J. B. Mayor, *op. cit.* p. cxxxvii, who thinks that the destination was Rome.) Reference to a Pauline canon already perverted in the process of interpretation is not probable before the 2nd cent.; and the late date at which 2 Peter appears in ecclesiastical tradition also marks it as one of the very last NT books to be written. These data would seem to bring the time of its composition down not only to the 2nd cent. but even past the first quarter of that century. Yet the Epistle was known to Origen, and perhaps to Clement of Alexandria, so it must have been in circulation some time before their day. The most probable supposition is that it formed a part of that body of literature which grew up around the name of Peter (*Gospel*, *Preaching*, *Apocalypse*) about the middle of the 2nd century. This hypothesis is confirmed by the strong resemblances between 2 Peter and the *Apocalypse of Peter*, which have led some interpreters to suggest identity of authorship (W. Sanday, *Inspiration* [*BL*, 1893], London, 1893, p. 347 f.; cf. also Kühl, *op. cit.* p. 376). While this may not be probable, the two works undoubtedly belong to the same general period and territory.

---

[*] This opinion is fairly well established; see, *e.g.*, F. H. Chase, art. 'Jude, Epistle of,' in *HDB* ii. 802 f; J. B. Mayor, *op. cit.* pp. i–xxv. This is the prevailing view at present, yet the priority of 2 Peter has found recent defenders in F. Spitta, *Der zweite Brief des Petrus und der Brief des Judas*; T. Zahn, *Einleitung in das NT*, ii. 43 ff. (Eng. tr., *Introduction to the NT*, ii. 194 ff.); C. Bigg, *op. cit.* p. 216 ff.

Since Egypt has been regarded as the home of the *Apocalypse*, that too has been made the place of 2 Peter's origin (so A. Harnack, *op. cit.* p. 469; Jülicher, *op. cit.* p. 206 [Palestine or Egypt]; F. H. Chase, 'Peter, Second Epistle,' *HDB* iii. 816 f.). But the possibility of a Palestinian or an Asiatic (Asia Minor) origin must be admitted, and the type of heresy refuted—which the author presumably knew at first-hand—would seem to count strongly in favour of the latter territory.

4. Authenticity.—The foregoing considerations would appear to render the authenticity of 2 Peter quite indefensible. But since Petrine authorship is still advocated by a few scholars, we shall now state their position, selecting, as representative, Spitta, *op. cit.*; Zahn, *op. cit.* ii. 42–110 (Eng. tr., ii. 194–293); and Bigg, *op. cit.* pp. 199–247. Spitta defends the priority of 2 Peter over Jude, finding in the latter (*e.g.* vv.$^{4f.\ 12.\ 17f.}$) clear evidences of direct dependence upon the former.* In fact, Jude was written in order to fulfil the wish of Peter expressed in 2 P 1^{15}. A detailed comparison of the thought and vocabulary of the two Epistles leads Spitta (pp. 405–470) to affirm the secondary character of Jude. 2 Peter was actually written by the Apostle toward the close of his life; it was addressed to some Jewish Christian community unknown to us, and the same community had previously received letters from both Peter and Paul (3$^{1.\ 15}$). These letters have now been lost. The difficulty of believing that 1 and 2 Peter can have come from the same pen is met by ascribing to Silvanus an important rôle in the composition of the former. The tardiness with which 2 Peter gained a place in ecclesiastical tradition is explained by supposing that its Jewish connexions militated against its admission to an epistolary canon in which Pauline writings predominated (p. 535 ff.).

Zahn holds very similar views, but is more specific on certain points of detail. He agrees with Spitta in making 2 Peter earlier than Jude, and regards the former as the work of Peter, who wrote from Antioch to Jewish Christians in or near Palestine, shortly before his departure for Rome in the year 63. Although the Apostle was addressing Jewish communities, he aimed at anticipating the activity of heretical teachers whose work he had already noted in Gentile communities such as Corinth. Since the language of 1 Peter is due to Silvanus, the stylistic distinctiveness of 2 Peter is thought, as by Spitta, to be truly Petrine; and reasons similar to those of Spitta are given to account for the obscurity surrounding 2 Peter in the 1st and 2nd centuries.

Bigg follows the same general lines, but is more ready to believe that both letters are the literary work of the Apostle himself, the differences being due merely to different amanuenses. Even though 2 Peter is placed earlier than Jude, Bigg finds in 2 P 3^1 a distinct reference to 1 Peter rather than to some hypothetical lost letter; and he thinks 2 Peter was addressed to some Gentile community in Asia Minor to which the disturbances originally arising in Corinth had spread.

Other writers save a portion of the Epistle to Peter by removing later interpolations. Kühl, *op. cit.* pp. 346–363, will serve as an illustration.† He would restore the original by removing 2^1–3^1, which he thinks was taken from Jude and inserted in 2 Peter probably by the author of the *Apocalypse of Peter*. The primary document antedates Jude; it is the work of the apostle Peter about the year 65, and it is addressed to some Gentile Christian community. Stylistic difficulties are solved by resorting when necessary to the redactional activity of the interpolator.

5. Text and interpretation.—2 Peter furnishes many textual perplexities, and the meaning of the author's language is not always clear. But since these problems have been treated fully in good recent commentaries (*e.g.* J. B. Mayor, R. Knopf, *et al.*), they do not call for detailed discussion in the present connexion.

LITERATURE.—The standard NT Introductions discuss the principal problems connected with 1 and 2 Peter. Among the more recent and important are A. Hilgenfeld, *Hist.-krit. Einleitung in das NT*, Leipzig, 1875, pp. 618–641; S. Davidson, *Introduction to the Study of the NT*^{2}, 2 vols., London, 1882, i. 501–532, ii. 438–473; B. Weiss, *Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das NT*^{3}, Berlin, 1897, pp. 407–433 (Eng. tr., 2 vols., London, 1887–88, ii. 128–174); G. Salmon, *A Historical Introduction to the Books of the NT*^{6}, London, 1892, pp. 433–447, 481–508; H. J. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der historisch-krit. Einleitung in das NT*^{3}, Freiburg i. B., 1892, pp. 309–327; W. H. Bennett and W. F. Adeney, *Biblical Introduction*, New York, 1899, pp. 440–450; B. W. Bacon, *Introduction to the NT*, do., 1900, pp. 150–158, 170–173; T. Zahn, *Einleitung in das NT*^{2}, Leipzig, 1900, ii. 1–111 (Eng. tr., New York, 1909, ii. 134–293); A. Jülicher, *Einleitung in das NT*^{6}, Tübingen, 1906, pp. 175-185, 200–208 (Eng. tr., New York, 1904, pp. 204–215, 232–241); A. S. Peake, *A Critical Introduction to the NT*, London, 1909, pp. 90–100; J. Moffatt, *LNT*, Edinburgh, 1911, pp. 318–344, 358–372.

Among general works one might also mention treatises on the Apostolic Age: J. V. Bartlet, *The Apostolic Age*, Edinburgh, 1900; G. V. Lechler, *Das apostol. und nachapostol. Zeitalter*, Karlsruhe, 1885 (Eng. tr., 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1886); A. C. McGiffert, *A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*^{2}, New York, 1899; O. Pfleiderer, *Das Urchristentum, seine Schriften und Lehren*^{2}, 2 vols., Berlin, 1902 (Eng. tr., *Primitive Christianity*, 4 vols., London, 1906–11); G. T. Purves, *Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, London, 1900; J. H. Ropes, *The Apostolic Age in the Light of Modern Criticism*, do., 1906; C. von Weizsäcker, *The Apostolic Age*^{2}, Eng. tr., 2 vols., do., 1897–99; and works on NT Theology: W. Beyschlag, *Neutestamentliche Theologie* (Eng. tr., 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1895); J. Bovon, *Théologie du NT*^{2}, 2 vols., Paris, 1902–05; P. Feine, *Theologie des NT*, Leipzig, 1910; E. P. Gould, *The Biblical Theology of the NT*, New York, 1900; H. J. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie*^{2}, 2 vols., Tübingen, 1911; E. Reuss, *History of Christian Theology in the Apostolic Age*, 2 vols., London, 1872–74; G. B. Stevens, *The Theology of the NT*, Edinburgh, 1899; H. Weinel, *Biblische Theologie des NT*, Tübingen, 1911; B. Weiss, *Lehrbuch der bibl. Theologie des NT*^{3}, Berlin, 1880 (Eng. tr., 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1882–83).

Special discussion of the Petrine literature will be found in P. J. Gloag, *Introduction to the Catholic Epistles*, Edinburgh, 1887, pp. 109–255; E. Scharfe, *Die petrinische Strömung der neutestamentlichen Litteratur*, Berlin, 1893; F. H. Chase, artt. 'Peter, First Epistle' and 'Peter, Second Epistle,' in *HDB* iii. 779–818; O. Cone, art. 'Peter, the Epistles of,' in *EBi* iii. 3677–3685; F. Sieffert, 'Petrus der Apostel,' in *PRE*^{3} xv. 203–212; A. Harnack, *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur*, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1897, i. 450–475; K. Henkel, *Der zweite Brief des Apostelfürsten Petrus geprüft auf seine Echtheit*, Freiburg i. B., 1904; B. Weiss, *Der erste Petrusbrief und die neuere Kritik*, Grosslichterfelde, 1906; H. Grosch, *Die Echtheit des zweiten Briefes Petri*^{2}, Berlin, 1911.

The chief modern commentaries, many of which contain full bibliographies, are C. F. Keil, *Commentar über die Briefe des Petrus und Judas*, Leipzig, 1883; F. Spitta, *Der zweite Brief des Petrus und der Brief des Judas*, Halle, 1885; J. M. Usteri, *Wissenschaftlicher und praktischer Commentar über den ersten Petrusbrief*, Zürich, 1887; R. Johnstone, *The First Epistle of Peter*, Edinburgh, 1888; H. von Soden, 'Briefe des Petrus,' in H. J. Holtzmann's *Hand-Kommentar zum NT*^{2}, Freiburg i. B., 1892, iii. 109–158, 192–211; A. H. de Hartog, *Korte aanteekeningen op de brieven van den apostel Petrus*, Amsterdam, 1894; J. T. Beck, *Erklärung der Briefe Petri*, Gütersloh, 1896; E. Kühl, *Die Briefe Petri und Judæ*, Göttingen, 1897; F. J. A. Hort, *The First Epistle of St. Peter I. 1–II. 17*, London, 1898; J. Monnier, *La Première épître de l'apôtre Pierre*, Paris, 1900; C. Bigg, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and Jude*, New York, 1901; O. Cone, *International Handbooks to the NT*, New York, 1901, iii. 297–342; J. M. S. Baljon, *Commentaar op de katholische brieven*, Utrecht, 1904; J. B. Mayor, *The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter*, London, 1907; H. Gunkel, on 1 Peter, in J. Weiss, *Die Schriften des NT*^{2}, Göttingen, 1908, ii. 529–571; G. Hollmann, on 2 Peter, *ib.* ii. 582–596; J. H. A. Hart, *EGT*, 'The First Epistle General of Peter,' London, 1910, pp. 1–80; R. D. Strachan, *EGT*, 'The Second Epistle General of Peter,' do., 1910, pp. 88–148; H. Windisch, 'Die katholischen Briefe erklärt,' in H. Lietzmann's *Handbuch zum NT*, Tübingen, 1911, iv. 2; R. Knopf, *Die Briefe Petri und Judä*, Göttingen, 1912; G. Wohlenberg, *Der erste und zweite Petrusbrief und der Judasbrief*, Leipzig, 1915.

S. J. CASE.

---

* This is the view generally held by those who think 2 Peter authentic.

† For advocacy of a displacement hypothesis, as a means of relieving certain incongruities in the letter, see P. Ladeuze, 'Transposition accidentelle dans la II^a Petri,' in *RB*, new ser. ii. [1905] 543–552.

PHARAOH, PHARAOH'S DAUGHTER.—The term 'Pharaoh' was an honorary title of the kings of Egypt. In biblical history several Pharaohs are met with, especially in connexion with Abraham, Joseph, and Moses. In the NT there are some interesting references. Thus in his speech (Ac 7) St. Stephen proves God's care for Joseph and Moses by the confidence Pharaoh placed in the former, and the protection given to the latter by the daughter of the reigning king. The writer of Hebrews (11^{24}) finds in the story of Moses who 'refused to become the son of Pharaoh's daughter' an outstanding instance of faith refusing this world's glory for the better part. St. Paul in his great argument for election in Romans (ch. 9) gives the Pharaoh of the Exodus as an illustration of God's absoluteness in dealing with men. 'Just as the career of Moses exhibits the Divine mercy, so the career of Pharaoh exhibits the Divine severity, and in both cases the absolute sovereignty of God is vindicated' (Sanday-Headlam, *ICC*, 'Romans'^{5}, Edinburgh, 1902, on 9^{17}). J. W. DUNCAN.

PHARISEES.—The Pharisees (פְּרוּשִׁים, *Φαρισαῖοι*) were a religious sect among the Jews, probably originating in Maccabæan times.

1. The name.—*P^{e}rûshîm* has generally been interpreted to mean 'separatists.' In a recent work, however, Oesterley suggests another view. He points out that the Pharisees were the popular party; that one of their precepts was, 'Separate not thyself from the congregation,' and that they reproached the Sadducees as the separatists. He finds it more probable that the name means 'expounders.' In support he quotes Josephus, who says of the Pharisees that 'they are those who seem to explain the laws with accuracy' (*BJ* II. viii. 14), and asserts that in Rabbinical literature the root *p-r-sh* is constantly found used in the sense of 'explain,' 'expound,' or 'interpret,' in reference to Scripture which is explained in the interests of the Oral Law (Oesterley, *Books of the Apocrypha*, p. 131 f.). The view is certainly interesting and worth consideration. But it seems to the present writer that all the arguments by which it is supported admit of an easy answer, and that the balance of probability inclines towards the familiar view that 'Pharisee' means 'separatist.'

2. General position of Pharisees in the 1st cent. A.D.—In this article we confine ourselves to the period from the times of Christ to the close of the 1st century. For the previous history of Pharisaism and the development and character of its tenets and practices, the reader must consult *HDB* and *DCG*. At the opening of our period we find the Pharisees noted for piety, learning, and strict observance of the Law. They were held in high esteem among the people (Jos. *Ant.* XIII. x. 5, 6, XVII. ii. 4). Almost up to this point, indeed, they might be regarded as a people's party, the champions of popular rights against the aristocratic Sadducees. They were the party of progress. Against the Sadducees they represented a living faith, and their theology was simply orthodox Jewish doctrine. They preached a religion for the people and conducted a missionary propaganda (Mt 23^{15}). At this time they had little direct political power, though they held some seats in the Sanhedrin (Ac 5^{34} 23^{6}). But such was their influence with the people that the ruling Sadducees were largely amenable to their advice (Jos. *Ant.* XVIII. i. 4). Passionately devoted to the Law as they were, they interpreted and applied it in a more tolerant, generous sense than the Sadducees (*Ant.* XIII. x. 6, XX. ix. 1). No doubt it was among the Pharisees that the best type of Jewish character and piety was found. But in the Gospels it is clear that the Pharisees, the popular party, were drawing themselves apart into a new aristocracy, and that the party of progress had become rigidly conservative. Every one of their own interpretations of the Law was stereotyped. Their traditions were regarded with greater veneration than the original Law. In the accumulated mass of precepts all sense of proportion was lost. All true spirituality was in danger of suffocation under the complex of ritual and ceremonial.

3. Pharisees and foreign domination.—Pharisaism attained its fullest development while there was a mere semblance of national independence, and nearly all civil power had passed from the Jews. No doubt this circumstance was of considerable importance in enabling pious Jews to distinguish between a Church and a nation (see Bousset, *Religion des Judentums*, p. 62 f.). How the Pharisees regarded the rule of Herod and the Romans it is difficult to judge. On their attitude to Herod two different views will be found in *HDB* iii. 827 and Bousset (*op. cit.* p. 62 f.) respectively. The statement in the former that they abhorred Herod is too dogmatic (see Jos. *Ant.* XV. i. 1). Probably we should say that, while they were not enamoured of the rule of Herod, they submitted to it as a necessary evil. As to their attitude to Rome, matters are even less clear. We know that they discussed whether tribute should be paid (Mt 22$^{17ff.}$). Further, the party of the Zealots who agitated for the overthrow of Roman power were an off-shoot from the Pharisees. Though Josephus is desirous of representing them as a distinct party, he is compelled to admit this (*Ant.* XVIII. i. 1, 6; *BJ* II. viii. 1). We may take it that certain of the Pharisees favoured political action, others deprecated it. The former were the Zealots, who were responsible for stirring up the great revolt which ended in the destruction of Jerusalem, and involved the disappearance of the last shreds of Jewish national independence.

4. Effects of the Fall of Jerusalem.—This catastrophe, so calamitous in itself, came to the Pharisees, as to Jewish Christians, really as an emancipation. If the Church was henceforth free from serious Jewish persecution, and the distraction of Judaizing propaganda, the Pharisees were free of their conflict with the Sadducees, who disappeared with Temple and priesthood. The Jews ceased to be politically a nation, but in reality they had ceased to be that long before. Judaism as a Church, a religious system, was not seriously affected by the loss of the Temple. For long the priests as a class had been declining in favour. For long the real centre of religious life had been not the Temple but the Synagogue. Many influences had conspired to produce this result, but we cannot discuss them here (see Bousset, *op. cit.* p. 97 ff.). It was the great service of Pharisaism to Judaism that it had so developed Jewish piety that the loss of the Temple was more of a relief than a disaster. The Pharisees set themselves more diligently than ever to the development of the Law. In two particulars the fall of the city seemed to harden Pharisaic tendencies.

(*a*) *Their attitude to the common people.*—We noted how even in the time of Christ the Pharisee looked down upon the *'am haarets*. Piety to the Pharisee was associated with culture. The people who knew not the Law were accursed (Jn 7^{49}). This tendency towards an exclusiveness of culture increased, and the breach widened between the Pharisee and the *'am haarets*. The dealings of the Pharisee with the *'am haarets* were as strictly limited and carefully regulated as his dealings with the Gentiles. Bousset (*op. cit.* p. 167) quotes a dictum of a certain Rabbi Eleazar, which forbids all transactions with the *'am haarets*, makes the murder of an *'am haarets* under certain circumstances permissible, and declares that the hatred of the *'am haarets* is greater than that of the Gentiles against Israel.

(*b*) *Their attitude to the Gentiles.*—As we have noted above, at one time a missionary propaganda was carried on among Gentiles. Manifestly this was in opposition to the Pharisaic tendency towards exclusiveness, and it was the latter that conquered. The increasing restiveness under the Roman domination which culminated in the great war was a decisive factor in this struggle of principles. Probably a short time before the fall of the city eighteen points of difference between the schools of Hillel and Shammai, all dealing with relations with Gentiles, were decided in favour of the Shammaists, the more rigid school. One of the decisions forbade the learning of Greek (Mishna, *Shabb.* xiii. 6; see H. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, Berlin, 1856, Eng. tr., ii. [London, 1891] 131 ff.). We may take it that this ended all missionary enterprise, and that after the fall of the city the exclusive tendency reigned supreme.

5. Pharisaism and Christianity.—In saying what was the attitude of Pharisees to Christianity, we are in danger of arguing from isolated and therefore perhaps exceptional cases. In the Gospels we find that while Jesus carries on a sharp polemic against the class, He has friendly relations with individuals (*e.g.* Simon the Pharisee), and that, on the other hand, certain of the Pharisees (*e.g.* Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea) were friendly towards Him. Arguing from the known tendency of the Pharisees to be moderate in judgment, and from the definite illustrations of it which we have (Ac $5^{34\text{ff.}}$ 23^{9}), we may hold that as far as the persecutions in Jerusalem are concerned, the main responsibility at least does not lie on the Pharisees. On the other hand, in the case of Stephen we know that Saul the Pharisee 'was consenting unto his death' (8^{1}). Saul also on his own confession was specially strong in urging persecution (26^{9-11}; cf. 8^{3}). And outside Palestine it cannot be doubted that the Pharisee scribes were instigators of popular tumults against Christians.

When we remember that the Pharisees with all their faults were the leaders of Jewish piety, and the orthodox theologians, it is clear that it is difficult to overestimate the part they played in preparing the way for Christianity. St. Paul was a Pharisee of the Pharisees, and what would Christianity have been but for him? It was the Pharisees who settled the OT canon, and the Christian Church accepted it. Pharisees developed the Messianic hope, distinguished the Church from the State, taught a religion that was independent of priests and Temple, developed doctrines of immortality, resurrection, and judgment to come, that with only little modification passed into Christian theology. The best of the Pharisees understood the inwardness of the Law as Jesus taught it, and some of His most characteristic sayings are to be found in almost identical form in the sayings of the Rabbis. The missionary propaganda did incalculable service in preparing for that of the Church. The Pharisaism of the best period, when it was a progressive, democratic, missionary movement, became the inheritance of Christianity.

Pharisaism, or something very like it in its degenerate form, was imported into the Church by Jewish Christians (see EBIONISM). St. Paul is meritorious not more as the Apostle of the Gentiles than by the fact that he, a former Pharisee, saw so clearly the danger of this incipient neo-Pharisaism with its exclusiveness and 'desire to be under the law,' and combated it so successfully. While the statement in the *JE* (ix. 665) that in the Gospels the word 'Pharisee' has been substituted for an original 'Sadducee' in the denunciations of Jesus is to be mentioned only as a curiosity, according to the evidence we possess, it has to be said that the Church paid back with interest the persecutions and calumnies she suffered from the Jews. How soon this anti-Judaism began, and to what extent if any it is present in the NT writings, are problems that require investigation.

LITERATURE.—The only authorities are the Gospels, Acts, and Josephus (passages referred to above). From a mass of Rabbinical writings, a few details may be gathered which add little to our knowledge. Works on the Pharisees and Sadducees are numerous. We need refer the reader only to E. Schürer, *HJP* II. ii. [Edinburgh, 1885] 1 f.; W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Books of the Apocrypha, their Origin, Teaching, and Contents*, London, 1914; W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutest. Zeitalter*, Berlin, 1903; also to articles in *HDB*, *DCG*, *EBi*, *JE*, *EBr*^{11}.

W. D. NIVEN.

PHENICE.—See PHŒNICIA, PHŒNIX.

PHILADELPHIA (*Φιλαδέλφεια*, T WH *-ία*).—Philadelphia was called after its founder, King Attalus II. Philadelphus of Pergamos (159–138 B.C.), whose surname marked his affection for his brother and predecessor, Eumenes II. Philadelphia occupied a strong and commanding position in the valley of the Cogamus, an affluent of the Hermus, at the N.E. base of Mt. Tmolus (Boz Dagh), where Lydia, Phrygia, and Mysia met. Northward and eastward from the city stretched a great volcanic plateau, the Katakekaumene or 'Burnt Region'—called also the Decapolis—whose famous vintages were one of Philadelphia's chief sources of revenue. The important trade-route from Smyrna (83 miles west) branched at Philadelphia, one branch going N.E. through Phrygia and the other S.E to the cities of the Lycus Valley. The city was founded for the spread of the Greek language and culture in Lydia and Phrygia, but it made little impression upon the old deep-rooted Anatolian nature-religion.

Christianity became strong where Hellenism had been weak. The Church of Philadelphia, founded probably at the time of St. Paul's residence in Ephesus (Ac 19^{10}), had firmly established itself by the time of Domitian, and is praised by St. John almost as warmly as that of Smyrna (Rev 3^{7-13}). Before her is set 'a door opened, which none can shut' (v.^{8}), a metaphor usually interpreted as implying a special opportunity for successful evangelistic work, such as Philadelphia certainly had as the centre of a large and populous district. Ramsay accordingly calls her 'the Missionary City' (*The Letters to the Seven Churches*, p. 391). But the whole character of the letter, the ideas of which are closely articulated with each other, points to a different exegesis. The Jews of Philadelphia, enraged apparently at the conversion, which they regarded as the perversion, of some of their number, displayed a more than ordinary malignity in their efforts to crush the infant Church, making free use of their most formidable weapon, the *ḥērem* or sentence of excommunication, by which they thought to shut not only the door of the synagogue but the gate of the Kingdom of Heaven against the apostates. The prophet's answer, given in Christ's name, meets them on this ground. Alike as a rebuke to the persecutors and a *sursum corda* to the persecuted his message is perfect. He denies to the Jews of Philadelphia every sacred title and privilege which had ever belonged to their race. They have disinherited themselves. Hating instead of loving, they are a synagogue not of God, but of Satan. Having forfeited their great and good name, they merely lie when they call themselves Jews. The spiritual succession, and with it the historical title, consecrated and endeared by countless memories, have passed from them to the Christian Church, the true Israel of God. And their boast of opening and shutting the door of God's house, of admitting and excluding whom they please, of blessing some and cursing others, is foolish and futile. They have indeed the key of their splendid earthly synagogue, but Another has the key of David (Is 22[22]), the symbol of regal authority, and He, as supreme in the spiritual realm, has set before the Church of Philadelphia an open door which no man can shut. Great minds run parallel, and the words of the prophet of Ephesus are in spirit identical with those uttered long afterwards by the prophet of Florence. 'I separate thee,' said the bishop of Vasona to Savonarola, 'from the Church militant and triumphant.' 'Militant,' was the reply, 'not triumphant, for this is not in thy power.' The power belongs to Him who 'having overcome the sharpness of death, has opened the kingdom of heaven to all believers.'

Philadelphia had so many festivals and temples that it was often called 'Little Athens.' The hope of a memorial—a name, a statue, or a pillar—in one of its great temples often proved a powerful incentive to good citizenship. But the volcanic region of Philadelphia was frequently visited by seismic shocks, in which the most massive buildings and all their memorials perished. In A.D. 17, *e.g.*, 'twelve populous cities of Asia fell in ruins from an earthquake which happened by night, and therefore the more sudden and destructive was the calamity. . . . It is related that mountains sank down, that level places were seen to be elevated into hills, and that fires flashed forth during the catastrophe' (Tacitus, *Ann.* ii. 47). Philadelphia was one of the twelve shattered cities. But she is promised, in Christ's name, the things that cannot be shaken. Every victor in the spiritual conflict will be as a pillar, not in a crumbling earthly shrine, but in the enduring temple of God, and have graven on the tablets of his own memory—*monumentum ære perennius*—the mystic names of God and His new Jerusalem.

Christian Philadelphia made a long and brave stand against the Turks, but was conquered by Bayezid in A.D. 1390. It has now a population of 17,000 Muslims and 5,000 Christians. About two dozen ancient churches, lying in ruins, tell their own tale.

LITERATURE.—R. Chandler, *Travels in Asia Minor and Greece*^{3}, 1817; W. M. Ramsay, *The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia*, 1904; Murray's *Handbook to Asia Minor*, 1895.

JAMES STRAHAN.

PHILEMON (Φιλήμων).—Philemon was a citizen of Colossæ (cf. Col 4[9] with Philem [11]) and a convert of St. Paul (Philem [19]). His conversion took place not at Colossæ (Col 2[1]), but presumably during the Apostle's three years' abode at Ephesus, between which town and the cities of the Lycus (of which Colossæ was one) the relations were intimate (see Lightfoot, *Colossians*^{3}, 1879, p. 31). There is no reliable evidence of Philemon's holding any office in the Church either at Colossæ or elsewhere, although the *Apost. Const.* (vii. 46) represent him as 'bishop' of Colossæ, and pseudo-Dorotheus (6th cent.) as bishop of Gaza: but manifestly he was an influential member of the Colossian Christian community. St. Paul calls him a fellow-labourer (συνεργός), who had an Ecclesia, or gathering of Christians, in his home (Philem [1, 2]). He must have been a well-to-do citizen, possessing a house large enough for this purpose, along with means sufficient to enable him liberally to 'distribute to the necessity of saints.' The Apostle testifies that 'the hearts of the saints were refreshed' by Philemon's loving fellowship and helpful bounty (vv.[6, 7]). St. Paul's past experience of Philemon's 'love and faith,' generosity to fellow-believers, and loyalty to himself, gave the Apostle 'confidence' in interceding with his friend on behalf of that friend's runaway but now converted slave, Onesimus, and in beseeching Philemon not only to forgive the slave's misdemeanours, but to receive him as now a brother in Christ. According to a probably well-founded tradition, the Apostle's confidence was not misplaced (see ONESIMUS). The Greek Menæa (under Nov. 22) represent Philemon as having suffered martyrdom during Nero's reign (see Tillemont, i. 290, 574, quoted by Lightfoot, *Colossians*^{3}, p. 306).

Philemon, like Onesimus, is quite a common Greek name and is specially notable in the Phrygian legend of Philemon and Baucis (Ovid, *Metam.* vii. 626), the two peasants who hospitably entertained gods unawares, and whose story may have suggested to the Lystrans in adjacent Lycaonia their procedure as related in Ac 13.

LITERATURE.—See under following article.

HENRY COWAN.

PHILEMON, EPISTLE TO.—1. Authenticity.—The Pauline authorship of this Epistle is beyond reasonable doubt. The repeated use by Ignatius, *c.* A.D. 109 (*Eph.* 2, *Magn.* 12, *Polyc.* 6), of the words ὀναίμην σου, 'let me have joy of thee,' used in Philem [20], may be a coincidence, the phrase being fairly common; but before the middle of the 2nd cent., Marcion, who rejected a large portion of the NT, including several Pauline Epistles, retained this letter, without mutilation, ascribing it to St. Paul (Tertullian, *c. Marc.* v. 21). It is also included in the Muratorian Canon (*c.* A.D. 170) among St. Paul's Epistles. Early in the 3rd cent., Origen repeatedly quotes the letter as Pauline (*Com. in Matt.* Tract. 33, 34); and Eusebius (*HE* iii. 25) includes all St. Paul's Epistles among 'acknowledged Scriptures.' In the 4th cent. it was rejected by some as either not Pauline or, if Pauline, uninspired; but for no other reason, apparently, than its supposed non-edifying character (see Jerome and Chrysostom, *Comm. in Philem.*). In modern times Baur (*Paul*, Eng. tr.^{2}, 1873–75, ii. 80) has stood almost alone among eminent critics in rejecting (with hesitation, however) the Pauline authorship, owing chiefly to his more emphatic rejection of Colossians, with the authenticity of which that of Philemon stands or falls (see COLOSSIANS, EP. TO THE). For the view that the letter is allegorical (grounded on the name Onesimus and on the play thereon in v.[11]) there is no semblance of ancient authority; and historical reality is stamped on every sentence of the Epistle (see ONESIMUS).

2. Place and date of composition.—As St. Paul was in captivity at the time (Philem [9]), the letter must have been sent either from Rome or from Cæsarea; and although the subscription 'written from *Rome* to Philemon' cannot be traced further back than the 5th cent. (it is ascribed then to Bishop Euthalius), it appears to be correct. Some critics, indeed (including Meyer, Weiss, Holtzmann, etc.), prefer Cæsarea, chiefly because (1) a runaway slave would choose a near city as refuge; (2) St. Paul hoped soon to visit Colossæ (v.[22]), and (3) he had more reason to expect early release from Cæsarean than from Roman imprisonment. But (1) Rome would be preferable for Onesimus, with a view to avoiding detection: and v.[18] suggests, without actually indicating, that the slave, like many runaways, had purloined enough to defray expenses; (2) at Cæsarea, the Apostle must have always looked forward to Rome (Ac 23[11] 25[11]) and therefore would not be contemplating an early visit to Phrygia; (3) Ph 2[24] (certainly written from Rome) shows that St. Paul *had* then some hope of release.

The place of composition so far fixes the date; for St. Paul's 'two years' of Roman confinement (Ac 28^{30}) are usually ascribed to the period between A.D. 59 and 63 (see COLOSSIANS, EP. TO THE, with which the letter to Philemon was simultaneously dispatched, the salutations being similar).

3. Occasion and object.—See ONESIMUS and PHILEMON.

4. Contents.—After salutations to Philemon, Apphia, and Archippus (*qq.v.*) in which Timothy (who had been with St. Paul at Ephesus, Ac 19^{22}) is appropriately associated with the Apostle, the letter begins with a cordial recognition of Philemon's faith and love towards Christ and towards brethren whose hearts he had refreshed by Christian fellowship and generous charity. He then indicates that something which he might have boldly enjoined he prefers to plead for as a favour; 'old man* as he now is,' and 'a prisoner of Jesus Christ,' he is to be indulged. He solicits a friendly reception for Philemon's slave Onesimus, in spite of past delinquency through which he had belied his name, and become 'unprofitable.' Onesimus was St. Paul's spiritual son, and had become most helpful to the Apostle in ministry, and much beloved. St. Paul calls him his 'very heart.' He would have liked to retain him at Rome as the representative of Philemon, knowing the latter's anxiety to serve him (Paul). But the Apostle will do nothing without his friend's consent, so that Philemon's favour to himself might be quite voluntary and not constrained. 'Perhaps, however,' continues the Apostle (who assumes with delicate tact the deep regard which Philemon would now have for his penitent and converted slave), 'perhaps he was parted from thee for a season' (note how the idea of an over-ruling Providence is adroitly introduced) 'in order that thou mightest receive him back for altogether, not now as a slave, but as a beloved brother in the Lord.' There is a possible barrier, however, which St. Paul seeks to remove. Onesimus had in some way wronged Philemon, apart from desertion. 'Let me discharge his debt,' writes St. Paul euphemistically; 'put it to my account: here is my signature—I, Paul, will repay.' 'For,' he adds, recalling Philemon's conversion by himself, 'I will not plead that thou owest to me thy very self.' 'Yea, brother,' he continues, adducing what would be the strongest motive in Philemon's eyes, viz. his love of St. Paul, 'let me have joy of thee; refresh my heart in the Lord.' Finally, as if apologizing, with winning courtesy and confidence, for the injustice he has been doing to Philemon through superabundant intercession, 'I well know,' he declares, 'that thou wilt perform even beyond what I ask.' After an expression of hope that, through the prayers of Philemon and others, he may soon be set free, and so be able to visit his Colossian brethren, he sends salutations from mutual friends (including Luke and Demas, the faithful and the faithless at a later time, 2 Ti $4^{10.\ 11}$), and concludes with the Apostolic Benediction: 'The Grace of the Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit.'

5. Testimony to the Epistle.—Against depreciators, in the 4th cent., of the Epistle as trifling and unedifying, Jerome, the most learned, and Chrysostom, the most eloquent, of the Fathers, vindicate, as we have seen, its apostolic worthiness and religious helpfulness. In the Reformation epoch, Luther (in his German Bible) eulogizes it as showing a 'right noble and lovely example of Christian love'; and Calvin (*Com. in loc.*) discerned in it a 'life-like portrayal of the gentleness' of the apostolic spirit. Among modern writers, Sabatier (*The Apostle Paul*, Eng. tr., 1891, p. 226) describes it as 'full of grace and wit, of earnest, trustful affection,' gleaming 'among the rich treasures of the NT as a pearl of exquisite fineness.' 'Nowhere,' writes Ewald (*Com. in loc.*), 'shall we find the sensibility and warmth of delicate friendship more beautifully blended with the higher feeling of a superior intellect, of a teacher and an Apostle.' Lightfoot compares it with the younger Pliny's similar letter (*Ep.* ix. 21) to a friend on behalf of an offending but penitent freedman, and awards the palm to the Apostle's Epistle, which 'stands unrivalled as an expression of simple dignity, of refined courtesy, of large sympathy, and of warm personal affection' (*op. cit.* p. 319). 'A veritable little masterpiece of the art of letter-writing,' exclaims Renan (*L'Antéchrist*, 1873, p. 96). 'Those sweet utterances of an author deeply imbued with the Christian spirit,' writes Baur, even while rejecting the authenticity of the Epistle (*Paul*, ii. 83). Hackett (in Lange's *Com. on Holy Scriptures*, 'Philemon,' p. 7) notes the Apostle's delicacy and skill in 'harmonizing contrarieties.' 'He must conciliate a man who supposed that he had good reason to be offended. He must commend the offender, and yet neither deny nor aggravate the imputed fault. He must assert the new ideas of Christian equality in the face of a system which hardly recognized the humanity of the enslaved. . . . His success must be a triumph of love, and nothing be demanded for the sake of the justice which could have claimed everything. He limits his request to a forgiveness of the alleged wrong, and a restoration to favor and the enjoyment of future sympathy and affection, and yet would so guard his words as to leave scope for all the generosity which benevolence might prompt' (including emancipation).

6. Incidental instruction.—(1) *Christianity and slavery.*—We have in this letter an illustration of the two-fold relation of primitive Christianity to slavery. On the one hand, slaves are instructed to recognize the obligation of faithful and obedient service, along with careful avoidance of any teaching which might seem to identify the Church with the social revolution, rapine, and murder by which slave-insurrections were then characterized. On the other hand, there is fearless proclamation of the grand truth of universal Christian brotherhood, through which eventually slavery was to be expelled from Christendom; along with emphatic encouragement of Christian masters, like Philemon, to treat their slaves with humane consideration, and their Christian slaves as brethren in the Lord. The outcome of this policy was the immediate betterment of the condition of slaves, their more frequent liberation, and their ultimate emancipation by all Christian nations. Christianity, moreover, has delivered from moral as well as from material bondage; from the bondage of spiritual ignorance and from subjection to sinful tastes and habits. 'Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free' (Gal 5^{1}).

(2) This Epistle illustrates *the refining influence of Christianity.* St. Paul, while honest from the outset even amid anti-Christian prejudice, had yet a rough element in his original nature. He not only persecuted but 'outraged' (ἐλυμαίνετο) the Church, dragging (σύρων) even women to prison, and breathing out slaughter (Ac 8^{3} 9^{1}). Christian faith not only reformed but refined him, made him (as this Epistle emphatically indicates) a true gentleman, through the development in him of a fine spirit of Christian courtesy and consideration.

(3) The Epistle, while manifestly describing a

---

* πρεσβύτης. Lightfoot (*Colossians and Philemon*^{3}, p. 338) translates 'ambassador,' and gives some philological authority for this translation; but the usual meaning of the word, 'old man,' suits the appeal better. St. Paul might very well have been about sixty at this time, and prematurely aged through prolonged hardship.

real incident, is none the less incidentally, what Weizsäcker regards it as essentially, *an allegory.* 'We are all by nature Onesimi,' as Luther said; we have revolted from the service of our rightful Master and Lord; we have sought again and again to be fugitives from His presence, and to live in a 'far country,' 'without God in the world.' In Christ, whom the Apostle here represents, we have at once a Friend in need, a Redeemer from sin and misery more effective than St. Paul, an Intercessor at the throne of grace, more sympathetic and more persevering even than him who mediated with Philemon for the runaway Onesimus.

LITERATURE.—Commentaries (among others) of Jerome, Chrysostom, and Theodore of Mopsuestia; of Calvin, Bengel, and Rollock; of H. Ewald (1857), H. Alford (*Gr. Test.*^{5} iii. [1871]), H. A. W. Meyer (Eng. tr., 1880), C. J. Ellicott (^{3}1865), J. B. Lightfoot (^{3}1879), H. B. Hackett (in Lange's *Com. on Holy Scriptures*, 'Philemon,' Eng. tr., 1869), A. H. Drysdale, *Philem.*, 1906, H. von Soden (in Holtzmann's *Handkom. zum NT*, 1893), M. R. Vincent (*ICC*, 1897), A. Maclaren (*Expositor's Bible*, 1887); F. W. Farrar, *The Messages of the Books*, 1884; A. L. Williams, *Col. and Philem.*, 1907; A. Schumann, *Philem.*, 1908. For Christianity and slavery, see W. A. Becker, *Gallus*, tr. F. Metcalfe, ^{2}1849, and W. E. H. Lecky, *History of European Morals*^{8}, 1888, chs. ii. and iv.

HENRY COWAN.

PHILETUS.—See HYMENÆUS.

PHILIP THE EVANGELIST.—'Philip the Evangelist,' or 'Philip one of the Seven,' or 'Philip the Deacon'—these are the three names by which Philip is called, each of them intended to distinguish him from Philip the Apostle, with whom in both ancient and modern times he has often been confounded. As in Stephen's case, so in Philip's—we have no previous mention of him till he was elected to be one of the Seven (Ac 6^{5}). In the list of the Seven he comes second, next to Stephen. The same emphatic praise is not accorded to him by the author of the Acts as to Stephen, and probably while Stephen lived Philip was overshadowed by his more striking personality. It seems, however, probable that the account we have of the appointment of the Seven, of the trial of Stephen (though not his speech, which was more probably derived from the reminiscences of St. Paul), and of Philip's own subsequent doings, was derived from Philip himself, who may well have communicated it to St. Luke during one of his two visits to Cæsarea (21^{8-14} 27^{1}). As with respect to Stephen so with respect to Philip we should infer that he was a Hellenist, and therefore a suitable agent for extending the gospel to those who were not strictly Jews; but the inference is not certain in either case. Philip belonged to a band who were scattered from Jerusalem in consequence of the persecution which followed on the death of Stephen (8^{4}). He began his preaching among the Samaritans apparently in the principal city of the district, in Sebaste or Samaria itself. Here he encountered a famous magician resident in the city, named Simon. This Simon subsequently became the founder of one of those religio-philosophical sects, resulting partly from the break-up of the old religions, partly from the contact of the older religious faiths or philosophies with Judaism, which are known by the general name of Gnosticism. The object of all these systems was to suggest some intelligible scheme through which the God of philosophy might be brought into relations with the God of the OT and the God who was active in creation. This they generally effected by imagining some arbitrary hierarchy of emanations, among which, and by the help of which, a place might be found for the God of the OT, the Giver of the Mosaic Law, and for the Creator of the universe, and generally also for our Lord Jesus Christ. In his system he assigned to himself and the prophetess Helena, whom he associated with himself, a high position; he described himself as the power of or emanation from God which is called 'Great.' But at the moment he seems to have been completely over-awed by the spiritual energy of Philip, received baptism at his hands, and joined the band of his disciples and associates.

The conversions of Simon and his fellow-Samaritans represented a great step in advance in the widening of the Christian Church. True, our Lord had made converts among the Samaritans partly through the testimony of the Samaritan woman, partly by His own teaching and influence (Jn 4^{39-42}), but it is not clear that they were actually admitted to baptism, and they were directly excluded from those to whom during the continuance of His ministry the disciples were to address themselves (Mt 10^{5}). Though partially akin to the Jews in blood and in religious faith, the Jews would have no dealings with them (Jn 4^{9}) and used the name 'Samaritan' as a term of the deepest reproach (8^{48}), so that to proclaim that they too were to be included within the Kingdom of God was an innovation of the most startling kind. How startling the innovation was we may gather from the fact that St. Peter and St. John were dispatched by the Church of Jerusalem to inquire into the matter, and it was only when, in answer to the apostles' prayers and the laying on of their hands, the Holy Ghost had descended on them, that Philip's action was regarded as fully ratified (Ac $8^{17.25}$).

The next step was taken under the direct prompting of the Spirit. Philip was moved by the Spirit to take the southern route to Jerusalem, which led to Gaza, then, in consequence of its overthrow by the Maccabees, 'deserted' (cf. G. A. Smith, *HGHL*, 1897, p. 186 f.). In this neighbourhood he fell in with an Ethiopian eunuch of Queen Candace, whom he converted by explaining to him part of Is 53, and received at once to baptism (perhaps also to confirmation). From Gaza, Philip was snatched away by the Spirit and carried off to Ashdod, from which he passed through the various coast towns and villages till he reached Cæsarea, where he settled down, and is found still living some twenty years later.

It is on the occasion of St. Paul's last visit to Jerusalem that Philip is brought before us once more in the Acts. At his house, St. Paul, and apparently St. Luke also, stayed on their way from Ptolemais to the capital (Ac 21^{8}). Philip had now 'four daughters, virgins, which did prophesy,' and they, along with Agabus, the prophet who came down from Jerusalem, attempted to divert St. Paul from continuing his journey thitherward, but unavailingly (vv.$^{10-14}$). St. Luke collected, probably partly during this visit, and partly at a later date, the details of Philip's earlier life contained in the passage in Acts already considered. At this point Philip disappears from the Acts. What little more we know about him is derived from ecclesiastical tradition; but this tradition is rendered uncertain from a tendency there is among ecclesiastical writers to identify Philip the Apostle with Philip the Evangelist. This was due to their having the same name, to both having daughters, and to both having settled in later years in Asia Minor, possibly both at Hierapolis. Yet there can be no doubt that the author of the Acts distinguishes the two, and the tradition does not really confound them, but distinguishes the three daughters of Philip the Apostle (one of whom was married and settled at Ephesus) from the four daughters of Philip the Evangelist, who were all virgins (see Polycrates, quoted in Eusebius, *HE* iii. 31). And then tradition makes Philip the Evangelist settle not at Hierapolis but at Tralles (*AS*, June 6).

LITERATURE.—W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, 1895; R. B. Rackham, *Acts of the Apostles*, 1901; J. B. Lightfoot, *Colossians and Philemon*³, 1879; A. Harnack, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Eng. tr., 1909.

W. A. SPOONER.

PHILIPPI (Φίλιπποι).—Philippi was a city in the E. of Macedonia, re-founded in the middle of the 4th cent. B.C. by Philip of Macedon, who made it one of his frontier strongholds. Built on an outlying spur of the Pangæan range (‘Pangæa nivosis cana jugis’ [Lucan, *Phar.* i. 680]), and separated by that range from its seaport Neapolis, it looked westward and northward over a vast green plain watered by many springs, from which it derived its original name of *Crenides* (Strabo, vii. p. 331). In 168 B.C. Macedonia was subdued by the Romans, who broke up her national unity by dividing the country into four districts, the inhabitants of which were forbidden to marry or hold property outside their respective boundaries (Livy, xlv. 29). Philippi was included in the first region, of which Amphipolis was the capital. In 42 B.C. the Roman Republic made its last stand on the plains of Philippi, and to commemorate the victory of Imperialism the city was re-founded by Octavian under the name of *Colonia Julia Augusta Victrix Philippensium*. Receiving the *Jus Italicum*, it became a miniature Rome, enjoying equal privileges with the mother-city. After the battle of Actium it provided a home for the defeated veterans of Mark Antony. Even the Greek natives (*incolæ*), who still probably outnumbered the *coloni*, caught the now prevailing spirit and gloried in being Roman (Ac 16^{21}). Latin was the official language of the *colonia*, whose magistrates, chosen by a senate of the citizens, were attended by lictors (‘sergeants,’ 16^{35}) bearing fasces. The *Via Egnatia*, the second part of the great overland route between Rome and Asia, passed through the city.

Christianity first came to Philippi in the autumn of A.D. 50 (so Turner; Harnack, 48; Ramsay, 51 [see *HDB* i. 424]). In response to the appeal of ‘the man of Macedonia,’ whom Ramsay wishes to identify with St. Luke, St. Paul crossed the Ægean to Neapolis, took the Egnatian Way over Mt. Symbolum, and reached the *colonia*. The change from ‘they’ to ‘we’ in the narrative after the departure from Troas (Ac 16^{10}) indicates that the historian accompanied the Apostle on this journey into Europe.

Philippi is described as ‘a city of Macedonia, the first of the district, a Roman colony’ (16^{12} RV). The words πρώτη τῆς μερίδος form an exegetical crux. (1) Conybeare and Howson hold that they ‘must certainly mean the first city in its geographical relation to St. Paul's journey’ (*The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, i. 341), *i.e.* the first he came to in the district; but this seems a feeble observation for a first-rate historian to make, and moreover one not strictly accurate, as Neapolis, which had just been left behind, belonged to the same μέρις as Philippi. (2) F. Blass (*Philology of the Gospels*, 1898, p. 68) and others emend the text (though it is found in ℵAC) into πρώτης μερίδος, so that Philippi would be described as ‘a city of the first region of Macedonia’; but it is unlikely that St. Luke wished to refer to the old and now almost forgotten division of the country into tetrarchies. (3) Van Manen (*EBi* iii. 3702) thinks that Philippi was a ‘first’ city in the same sense in which Ephesus, Pergamus, and Smyrna bore that distinction—a ‘first-class’ city; but it does not appear that this phraseology was used outside the Commune of Asia. (4) WH's ingenious proposal (Appendix, p. 97) to read Πιερίδος for μερίδος—‘a city of Pierian Macedonia’—has not commended itself. (5) It is best to take the phrase as an *obiter dictum* of St. Luke, who unofficially confirms the great Roman colony's estimate of itself as the most important city of the district. ‘Of old Amphipolis had been the chief city of the division, to which both belonged. Afterwards Philippi quite outstripped its rival; but it was at that time in such a position that Amphipolis was ranked first by general consent, Philippi first by its own consent’ (Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 206 f.).

Had there been a synagogue in Philippi, St. Paul would, according to his invariable practice, have visited it without delay. But a military colony did not offer the same attractions as a commercial city to the Jews of the Diaspora, and apparently the sojourners in Philippi were few. There was, however, a προσευχή, or place of prayer, outside the gate by the side of the river—the Ganges or Gangites, a tributary of the Strymon—where some women were in the habit of meeting on the Sabbath (Ac $16^{13.16}$). προσευχή evidently denotes something simpler than a fully organized συναγωγή with all the proper officials and appointments. It is true that Philo and Josephus employ the two terms as synonymous (Schürer, *HJP* II. ii. [1885] 68–73). The latter, *e.g.*, describes the προσευχή of Tiberias as μέγιστον οἴκημα καὶ πολὺν ὄχλον ἐπιδέξασθαι δυνάμενον (*Vita*, 54). But the fact that St. Luke everywhere else uses the word ‘synagogue’ indicates a distinction in his own mind. Only women attended the Philippian προσευχή, whereas the presence of at least ten adult male persons was required for the conduct of the regular worship of the synagogue. The Philippian worshippers had doubtless some enclosure which marked off their meeting-place as sacred, but no roofed building like a synagogue. The river-side gave them the means of Levitical washings, as well as a refuge from the interior of a city tainted with idolatry. Philo (*in Flaccum*, 14) mentions the instinctive desire of Jews residing in a foreign city to pray ἐν καθαρωτάτῳ, in the purest place they could find. It was in green pastures and beside still waters that St. Paul won his first European convert, the proselyte (σεβομένη τὸν θεόν, Ac 16^{14}) Lydia.

Another Philippian woman, who was attracted by the Apostle and his message, was well known in the city as a soothsayer (16^{16}). She was in the hands of a syndicate of masters who exploited her strange powers, advertising her as the possessor of a Python. According to Plutarch (*de Defec. Orac.* 9), Python was a name assumed by ἐγγαστρίμυθοι (ventriloquists), persons whom the LXX identifies with diviners. Popularly regarded as inspired by the Pythian Apollo, the girl was evidently no mere impostor, but a person of abnormal gifts and temperament, perhaps with symptoms of epilepsy, who believed herself to be the mouthpiece of a divine power, and gave free expression to her intuitions, often astonishing those who consulted her by the justice and truth of her oracular words. She was irresistibly drawn to the evangelists, rightly divining that they had brought to Philippi another and greater power than that of Apollo. She calls them servants of ‘God the Most High’—an expression widespread in paganism, as Ramsay notes (*St. Paul*, p. 215). St. Paul's mode of saving her is an example of the mighty workings (δυνάμεις) of which he speaks (1 Co 12^{28}). An authoritative word in the name of Christ broke the spell of her unhappy possession, and liberated her to serve a new Master.

Her conversion was the signal for an outburst of pagan hatred, to which St. Paul alludes years afterwards (προπαθόντες καὶ ὑβρισθέντες . . . ἐν Φιλίπποις [1 Th 2^{2}; cf. Ph 1^{30}]). Enraged at the loss of their income (τῆς ἐργασίας, ‘business,’ ‘gain’), the girl's owners avenged themselves by contriving to get the apostles charged with disturbing the peace and teaching a *religio illicita.* St. Paul and Silas were dragged before the magistrates, scourged without a hearing, and flung into the innermost prison. Weizsäcker (p. 285) thinks that 'the story is rendered impossible by the conduct of Paul; he lets himself be chastised illegally, in order afterwards to secure greater satisfaction. Paul could not have acted so.' But in the tumult he may well have made a protest which was drowned by a babel of hostile voices. Or who will blame him if he sometimes chose to suffer in silence—*τρὶς ἐρραβδίσθην* (2 Co 11^{25})—like ordinary Christians, who could not shelter themselves under the ægis of the Roman citizenship?

The magistrates of Philippi are first called *ἄρχοντες* (16^{19}) and then *στρατηγοί* (vv.$^{20. 22. 35. 36. 38}$). Ramsay (*St. Paul*, p. 217) thinks that the two clauses, 'dragged them into the agora before the rulers,' and 'brought them before the magistrates' (vv.$^{19. 20}$), mean the same thing, and holds that if St. Luke had revised his narrative he would have struck out the one or the other. Blass says, 'non licet distinguere inter *ἄρχοντες* et *στρατηγοί*' (*Acta Apostolorum*, 1895, p. 180). The former is the ordinary term for the supreme board of magistrates in a Greek town, the latter the popular equivalent of *prætores.* St. Luke knew no doubt that in a *colonia* like Philippi the highest governing power was in the hands of *duumviri* (see inscriptions in J. B. Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 51), the exact translation of which would have been *δύο ἄνδρες*, but he preferred good Greek to slavishly technical accuracy on such a point. His use of *στρατηγοί*, therefore, does not prove either that the magistrates of Philippi had duly received the dignity of the prætorship, or that they had assumed it without leave, as provincial *duumviri* were said sometimes to do (Cicero, *de Leg. Agr.* ii. 34).

St. Luke is characteristically careful to make it clear that the majesty of Roman law might have been invoked against the Philippian authorities and on behalf of the apostles. By illegally punishing Roman citizens—Silas was apparently one as well as St. Paul (16^{37})—the magistrates had rendered themselves liable to be degraded and counted unfit ever to hold office again (Cicero, *in Verr.* II. v. 66). The scourging and imprisoning were acts of high-handed violence. The accused were subjected to these indignities 'without a trial'; that is the meaning of the word *ἀκατακρίτους*, which is translated 'uncondemned' (16^{37}). In the end the magistrates saved themselves by begging the prisoners to leave the town quietly, and the historian's point is that in acceding to this request the apostles forfeited the unquestionable right to appeal against a gross maladministration of justice.

Many writers regard the story of the earthquake and the conversion of the jailer as legendary. H. J. Holtzmann asserts that this is the view of the whole critical school ('Apostelgeschichte' in *Hand-Kom. zum NT* i. [1889] 389). The interpretation of such a passage is naturally affected by one's whole attitude to the miraculous. The older view is defended by Ramsay, whose acquaintance with Turkish prisons helps him to remove some of the difficulties of the narrative (*St. Paul*, pp. 220–222).

Five years later, probably in the autumn of A.D. 55, St. Paul re-visited Macedonia, giving the believers 'much exhortation' (20^{2}); and in the spring of the following year, having unexpectedly to begin his journey from Greece to Palestine by land instead of by sea, he had the happiness of keeping the Passover with the brethren of Philippi (v.^{6}). None of his converts gave him the same unalloyed satisfaction as the Philippians, his 'beloved and longed for,' his 'joy and crown' (Ph 4^{1}). He repeatedly showed his confidence in them by accepting at their hands favours which he refused from every other church. To Thessalonica, and again to Corinth, their messengers followed him with the tokens of their love (Ph 4^{16}, 2 Co 11^{9}); and when he was a prisoner in Rome, Epaphroditus of Philippi made a journey of 700 miles over land and sea to bring him yet another gift, which was acknowledged in the most affectionate letter St. Paul ever wrote (see PHILIPPIANS, EPISTLE TO THE).

The prestige of women in the Church of Philippi, as in the other Macedonian churches (Ac $17^{4. 12}$) is a striking fact, 'only to be compared with their prominence at an earlier date in the personal ministry of our Lord' (Lightfoot, *op. cit.* p. 57). St. Paul's first Philippian audience consisted entirely of women (16^{13}); his first convert was a woman of influence, whose *familia* was baptized with her, and who became his hostess (vv.$^{14. 15}$); and the only element in the Philippian Church which called for reproof in his letter was the variance of two prominent Christian ladies, both of whom he remembered gratefully as his fellow-workers in the gospel (Ph $4^{2. 3}$). Lightfoot (*op. cit.* p. 56) quotes a number of Macedonian inscriptions which 'seem to assign to the sex a higher social influence than is common among the civilised nations of antiquity.'

In the time of Trajan—*i.e.*, before A.D. 117—Philippi became a stage in the triumphal progress of St. Ignatius from Antioch to Rome, where he was to die in the arena. His visit made so deep an impression on the Philippian Church that they soon after requested the martyr's young friend Polycarp to write them and send them copies of St. Ignatius' own letters. Polycarp's *Epistle to the Philippians* was the response, and it is still extant. The writer congratulates the Church of Philippi on 'the sturdy root of their faith, famous from the earliest days' (1), warns them against certain doctrinal and practical errors, and sets before them the example of apostles and saints who have gone to their rest. The later history of this remarkable church is almost a blank.

The village of Filibedjik (Little Philippi) is all that remains of the once famous city.

LITERATURE.—W. M. Leake, *Travels in Northern Greece*, 1835, iii. 215–223; J. B. Lightfoot, *Philippians*^{4}, 1878, p. 47 f.; Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, new ed., 1877, i. 341 f.; W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, 1895, p. 213 f., *The Church in the Roman Empire*, 1893, p. 158 f.; C. von Weizsäcker, *The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church*^{2}, Eng. tr., i. [1897] 279 ff.; A. C. McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, 1897, p. 239 f.

JAMES STRAHAN.

PHILIPPIANS, EPISTLE TO THE.—1. Author.—This document purports (1) to be a letter sent from St. Paul and Timothy to the Christian community in Philippi. Although Timothy is mentioned in the address as joint author, the letter throughout is St. Paul's own. He commences at once in the 1st person singular—*εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ μοῦ* (1^{3})—and continues so throughout. When he does use the plural (1st person), it is not at all clear that he simply means Timothy and himself. Thus in 3^{3}—*ἡμεῖς γὰρ ἐσμεν ἡ περιτομή*—the meaning seems to be that Christians are the real people of God. Zahn (*Introd. to the NT*, Eng. tr., i. 538) opposes this view, maintaining that St. Paul and Timothy alone are meant, because they were circumcised; but his argument is forced and inconclusive. What St. Paul says is that 'we who worship in the spirit of God and put no confidence in the flesh' are the true circumcision, and this would apply to Pauline Christians generally, not simply to St. Paul and Timothy. Again, in 3^{17}, 'Brethren, unitedly imitate me, and mark (approvingly) those so walking even as you have *us* as an example' (*καθὼς ἔχετε τύπον ἡμᾶς*), other leaders are probably included as well as Timothy. And in $3^{15.\,20f.}$ 4^{20}, and in those passages of inferior MS authority where the 1st plur. occurs, *e.g.* 1^{3}—*ἐγὼ μὲν εὐχαριστῶ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν* (a reading approved by Zahn, *op. cit.* i. 535, and by Haupt in Meyer's *Kommentar über das NT*^{7}, *in loco*, for different reasons)—$1^{28.\,29}$ (*ἡμῖν* for *ὑμῖν*), the reference is general. Not even in 4^{21}, the final salutation, where one might naturally expect it, is Timothy mentioned. Moreover, he is spoken of in the 3rd person, and his character and intentions are described quite objectively (2^{19-23}): 'But I hope in the Lord Jesus to send Timothy speedily to you, that I may be encouraged, when I come to know your affairs. For I have none like-minded with him, who will genuinely concern himself about your affairs. For all seek their own, not the things of Christ Jesus. But ye know the proof of him, that, as a son with a father, he served with me in spreading the gospel. Him then I hope to send at once, whenever I come to know how my affairs turn out.'

The letter, then, on its face value is St. Paul's own, nor is there any reason for exercising false subtlety to account for the presence of Timothy's name in the address. His presence with St. Paul at the time of writing, and especially his intimate relations with the Philippians in the past, and his coming visit are a sufficient explanation. (Timothy was with St. Paul at the founding of the Church [Ac $16^{12ff.}$]. When St. Paul left, he seems to have stayed behind. He was sent to Corinth through Macedonia [Ac 19^{22}, 1 Co 16^{10}]. When 2 Cor. was written, he was again with St. Paul in Macedonia.) Nor is there any reason to doubt the genuineness of the letter because of St. Paul's use of the 1st person singular throughout in spite of Timothy's name at the beginning (as W. C. van Manen, *EBi* iii. 3705). In Col 1^{3}, 1 Th 1^{2}, 2 Th 1^{3}, and 2 Co 1^{5} the joint authorship is indeed remembered, but we have a parallel in 1 Co 1^{4}, where it is at once forgotten, as here.

Besides Timothy, St. Paul associates with himself in the closing salutation the brethren, *οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ ἀδελφοί* (4^{22}). Who these were we are not told, but they can have had no part in the composing of the letter, as they are evidently those referred to in 2^{21} and accused of selfishness. Their own interests came before the interests of the Philippian Church, to which St. Paul probably asked them to convey authoritative tidings of himself. Nor would the saints as a whole (*i.e.* the Christians generally, but especially those of Cæsar's household) know anything of the letter save that it was being sent. The saints of Cæsar's household were not members of the ruling family but freedmen and slaves connected with the Imperial court (cf. Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 171 f. ; Zahn, *op. cit.* i. 550).

It is possible that the letter was written by Epaphroditus (that Epaphroditus is mentioned in the 3rd person is no absolute objection to this) if the phrase 'true yokefellow' (*γνήσιε σύνζυγε*, 4^{3}) is to be taken as an appellative. The meaning is, however, very doubtful, and the most varied suggestions have been made—Christ, Lydia, Paul's wife, Timothy, Peter, Paul's brother, an allegorical personage, etc. Lightfoot (*in loc.*) and Zahn (*op. cit.* i. 537) are of the opinion that Epaphroditus, who was either beside St. Paul as he wrote or who actually wrote the letter, was directly addressed in this way. This Epaphroditus was a messenger (*ἀπόστολος*) sent by the Philippian Church to St. Paul with a monetary gift (4^{18}), and his experience is described in the letter: 'I think it needful to send to you Epaphroditus, my brother, fellow-worker and fellow-soldier, your messenger and minister of my need. For he was home-sick for you all, and distressed because you heard he was ill. And indeed he was nigh to death; but God had pity on him, and not on him alone but also on me, lest I should have sorrow upon sorrow. I am sending him then all the more eagerly, that you may rejoice again when you see him, and that I may sorrow the less. Receive him then in the Lord with all joy ; and have such in honour, because on account of the work of Christ he came near to death, hazarding (*παραβολευσάμενος*)* his life to make up what was wanting in your ministry to me' (2^{25-30}).

But it is perhaps better to regard Synzygus as a proper name—possibly the person to whom the letter would directly come before it was read in the church assembly. The author, in a passage full of earnest passion, runs hurriedly over certain autobiographical details. He was of true Hebrew descent—circumcised on the eighth day, of the race of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of the Hebrews, as regards the Law a Pharisee, as regards zeal persecuting the Church, with a clean record as far as Law-righteousness went. But all these privileges he considered loss and still so considers them for Christ's sake. To know Christ (perhaps *γνῶσις* is here used as being admitted to His intimate friendship ; cf. *σεβαστόγνωστης* ; Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, p. 288, Eng. tr., p. 383), to gain Him, to be found in Him, that is worth all, and the rest is worth nothing in comparison with it. Earthly fortune, future, and fame are but stable-sweepings compared with this (Ramsay says Paul gave up literally his patrimony and was disowned, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, London, 1895, p. 34 ff.). For by faith in Christ the writer has been pardoned and empowered to live a new righteous life—the very thing the Law could not do. Thus the power which animated Christ in His resurrection, in His life and Passion, in His death is working in St. Paul, and St. Paul is energizing to live in the absolute newness of life that this implies. Absolute attainment is not yet his, but it is his single aim. Whatever his past progress may have been, he is not contented with that. Past attainment is not perfection, but it brings nearer the realization of what is implied in the high calling of God in Christ Jesus (3^{4-14}).

Here then is a letter purporting to be from one with such a history who specially associates Timothy with himself, who sends greetings from brethren, especially those of Cæsar's household with whom was Epaphroditus, to a Christian community in Philippi. Does a careful study of the letter itself substantiate such a view? Is there anything in the letter itself (as Baur and others think) inconsistent with its own account of its origin and authorship?

Before we can answer we must ask who were the recipients and what were their relations with the writer.

2. The recipients of the letter.—The letter is written to all the saints in Philippi, with the bishops and deacons (1^{1}). Throughout the letter, however, there is no further mention of officials; and there is a remarkable impartiality as well as cordiality towards the members of the community as a whole (cf. the use of *πᾶς*, $1^{1.\,4.\,7.\,8.\,25}$ $2^{17.\,26}$ 4^{21}). We have an account by an eye-witness in Ac 16^{12-40} of the founding of the Philippian Church—a Church interesting to us as being the first Christian community on European soil. It is, however, to be remembered that the distinction between Europe and Asia was not anything like so real to men in ancient times as it is now. Dubiety is at once raised by the mention of 'bishops and deacons,' but this is largely due to modern associations. We think of these words in their modern sense or in their 3rd cent. sense. That they are not so used here is evident from the fact that what we have is 'bishops,' not 'bishop.' That the author of the letter is not advocating any special ecclesiastical organization is evident from the casualness of the reference, and from the absence of any further allusion to these officials. It may be taken for granted that every church would have an organization of some sort. It was not easy—perhaps not possible—for the individual Christian to maintain his position without the social strength of his brethren behind him. Is it possible, then, to think of two orders in a church like that of Philippi, in the lifetime of St. Paul? There were officers in the Thessalonian Church called οἱ κοπιῶντες, οἱ προϊστάμενοι, οἱ νουθετοῦντες (1 Th 5^{12}), but it is clear that their authority was a moral one, and their position due to their spiritual influence. The terms used evidently describe the same persons from different points of view. Haupt regards both terms in our letter as applied to the same persons, but it is probable that two orders are in view.

---

* See G. A. Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*^{3}, Tübingen, 1909, p. 57, Eng. tr., *Light from the Ancient East*, London, 1911, p. 84.

Elsewhere (Ac $20^{2ff.}$) we understand that the essential constituted officials were πρεσβύτεροι, and that these were also known as 'bishops.' They formed the essence of church government.

From the Pastorals also it is clear that πρεσβύτεροι and ἐπίσκοποι are interchangeable terms (Tit $1^{5ff.}$, 1 Ti $3^{1.2}$). With the alterations in later times in the usage of these terms we are not concerned; only with this, that there seems no ground for suspicion as regards their occurrence here. It is certainly preferable to regard them as interpolations than to reject the whole letter as spurious, but it is not necessary to do this if the terms are dissociated from later associations. As we shall see, one main cause of writing the letter was to thank the Philippians for monetary help, and it is not inappropriate to regard these persons as being instrumental in the collecting and dispatching of this money.

Certain individuals are mentioned by name, especially two women—Euodia and Syntyche ($4^{2.3}$). 'Euodia I beseech, and Syntyche I beseech that they show practical agreement in the Lord.' It is surely the *reductio ad ridiculum* of criticism to find here, under assumed names, subtle references to church parties. Zahn gives an account of the subtle hidden meanings found in these names (now proved to be so common, although not yet attested for Philippi) by Schwegler, Baur, Hitzig, and Holsten, and calls them 'fantastic conceits' (*op. cit.* i. 561 f.). This is now the unanimous opinion, so that one need not further dwell on it. What we have to do with is a quarrel between two women, the origin or extent of which we know not (although it cannot have been serious). A certain person (Synzygus) is asked to help in their reconciliation: 'I would request you (ἐρωτῶ), genuine Synzygus (or yoke-fellow), help those women, inasmuch as they laboured with me in the gospel and with Clement and other fellow-labourers of mine whose names are in the book of life' (4^{2-4}). There is some doubt as to the interpretation of the passage. Some take the writer to mean that Clement and his fellows should help in settling this difference (Lightfoot, Zahn); others—and this seems the only feasible view—that the women laboured with the apostles and with Clement. Indeed, from the tone of the passage one would naturally conclude that Clement was already dead. To identify this Clement with Clement of Rome on the ground that no other of that name is known to us from either history or legend (Baur, *Paul*, Eng. tr.^{2}, 2 vols., London, 1873–75, pp. 63, 77), is foolish, as the name Clement seems to have been common (cf. Zahn, *op. cit.* i. 534). Moreover, this Clement is a Philippian, not a Roman. That women should have a conspicuous place in the Philippian Church agrees with Ac 16, and, indeed, as Lightfoot points out (*Philippians*, p. 56), with the conditions in Macedonia generally. Various attempts have been made to identify one or other of these women with Lydia, on the ground that Lydia is not a proper name but simply means 'the Lydian lady'; but there is no certainty in the results. It is certainly curious that neither Lydia nor the jailer is mentioned, but the omission of their names is no ground for identifying the one with Euodia or Syntyche or the other with Clement. It seems a strong proof of authenticity rather than the reverse.

The only other person mentioned in the letter as belonging to Philippi is Epaphroditus (see above). He is, however, with the writer at the time of writing, preparing to go back after having delivered their gift to St. Paul: 'I am filled, having received from Epaphroditus the things that come from you, an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God' (4^{18}).

That St. Paul should have written to Philippi is *a priori* very probable. Is there any reason to reject our present letter, then, as an authentic communication by the Apostle to this church? It is extremely difficult to see anything in this artless affectionate letter which raises any suspicion, and the *onus probandi* lying on him who would reject it owing to difficulties which may reasonably be explained otherwise is very great.

3. Purpose of the letter.—As Edith Bellenden's letter revealed its purpose in a postscript (see Scott, *Old Mortality*), so this letter also. The Philippians had sent monetary help by Epaphroditus, and St. Paul hereby acknowledges receipt of it (ἀπέχω [πάντα], a *terminus technicus*, as is now abundantly proved) (Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, Marburg, 1897, p. 56, Eng. tr., *Bible Studies*, Edinburgh, 1901, p. 229, *Licht vom Osten*, p. 77 f., Eng. tr., p. 110 f.; see also *Exp*, 7th ser., vi. [1908] 91). The language of the whole passage is full of half-humorous allusions to a financial transaction. He tells them how he is filled with Christian joy because of the proof it furnished him of the revival of their interest in him. They had, indeed, always thought about him (that he knew), but they lacked opportunity (very probably owing to poverty; cf. 1^{9-11}, where possibly he expects that by a more enlightened ἀγάπη on their part this may be avoided in the future). His joy is not that of one whose material necessities have for the moment been relieved. The fact is that he has learned the true secret of contentment (αὐτάρκεια), and is able to endure any material situation. He can do this not in his own strength but in the strength of Him in whom is his life (cf. ἐμοὶ γὰρ τὸ ζῆν Χριστός) and the source of his energy. Nevertheless, he feels keenly the transparent goodness of their succour when thus they shared in his affliction. It is, indeed, what was to be expected of them, in view of their past liberality. For he is glad to recall that at the very beginning of his European mission they opened, as it were, a bank account with him—even sending twice help to him while he was yet in Thessalonica, and, besides, when he had left Macedonia they regularly contributed to his support (cf. 2 Co $11^{8.9}$). It is not the present gift itself, *qua* gift, that pleases him, but the spiritual reality it represents. It shows him that they feel their indebtedness to him. As he gave them spiritual riches, so they give him material help. His God is thus become their banker, and He pays large interest, now and especially hereafter, when Christ through whom His riches are mediated appears in glory. Their gift then—as an exhibition of their spiritual gratitude for His unspeakable gift (cf. 2 Co 9^{15})—is a sweet-smelling savour and an acceptable and well-pleasing sacrifice to God (4^{10-20}).

Now that Epaphroditus has sufficiently recovered and is about to return to them, St. Paul thus acknowledges their generosity. He takes advantage of his intended departure to dispatch this letter (cf. Cic. *ad Atticum*, I. ix. 1). It may seem strange thus to postpone mention of their gift if this be the main object of sending the letter, but there are references in the very beginning also when the Apostle thanks God for their *κοινωνία* in the furtherance of the gospel from the first day until now (cf. 4^{15}, 'in the beginning of the gospel'); and for this very reason he feels convinced that God will carry on in them the good work till Christ's day and complete it. Their spiritual condition, as evidenced by their liberality, is a proof that the perseverance of the saints shall be effective in them.

He cannot otherwise regard them—his affections being witness—for, indeed, they are fellow-participators with him in grace because thus they have shown their identity with him both in his chains and in his defence and confirmation of the gospel. What more graceful reference could be made than this, and what more spiritual inferences drawn from Christian liberality?

Besides, there is the reference to their offering in 2^{25} (*ὑμῶν δὲ ἀπόστολον καὶ λειτουργὸν τῆς χρείας μου*).

There are, however, other objects for the letter as well as this main one. For one thing, the Philippians had heard of the sickness of Epaphroditus and were anxious about him (2^{26}), and the Apostle tenderly refers to him and commends him to them, in view of his return, for his work's sake. Epaphroditus was evidently sent by the Philippians in order to stay with St. Paul and minister to him, and his return home so soon needed explanation, perhaps apology, and the Apostle does this in graceful and affectionate language. How he came to know of their feelings as regards Epaphroditus we are not told, but it is natural to infer that they had meanwhile written to him about this and other matters as well. Indeed, the letter becomes much more intelligible when we regard it as answering questions and meeting a situation unfolded in an actual correspondence of recent date from Philippi, which was before the Apostle as he wrote, and which may well have conditioned the order of his topics. (That such communications took place is self-evident. He would surely have acknowledged their previous gifts, and these would be accompanied by writing.) There is some ground, indeed, for explaining the difficult passage (3^1) as referring to a letter written shortly before this by the Apostle to them. At any rate, to explain the *τὰ αὐτά* from the contents of the letter itself is not easy, and the reference to other communications is a feasible one. Zahn has used this clue in the interpretation of the letter (cf. also W. Lock, *Exp*, 5th ser., vi. [1897] 65 ff.; and especially J. Rendel Harris, *ib.*, 5th ser., viii. [1898] 161 ff.).

It is clear that the Philippians were inclined to take a pessimistic view of the effect of St. Paul's imprisonment and situation in general on the cause of the gospel. The statement in $1^{12\text{ff.}}$ is a correction of this, and we may well explain the repeated injunctions to joy as proof that they were apt to be dispirited owing to the seeming failure of the Apostle's missionary activity.

Perhaps also they needed to be told that their gifts were thoroughly appreciated by the Apostle, and that there was no feeling of disappointment in his mind in regard to the tardiness or smallness of their liberality. 'The Philippians must recently have expressed their dissatisfaction with what they had done to support Paul and his work, and their doubt as to whether Paul had been satisfied with the same. The tone in which Paul speaks of the matter throughout the letter (ii. 17, 25, 30, iv. 10–20) is natural only on the supposition that this feeling had been very strongly expressed, and the Church had lamented and apologised for the smallness and tardiness of their last remittance' (Zahn, *op. cit.* i. 527).

St. Paul also is anxious to tell of his intention to visit them (2^{24}, *πέποιθα δὲ ἐν κυρίῳ ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸς ταχέως ἐλεύσομαι*) and to assure them that their prayers help to this end. It is possible that they spoke of him in their letter as their *καύχημα* (1^{26}; cf. Rendel Harris, *Exp*, 5th ser., viii. 178). The sharp change of tone in 3^2 may also be due to a fear expressed by the Philippians of a possible Judaistic propaganda among them. It may, however, be quite well explained out of St. Paul's own experience.

Besides all this, there are the differences of opinion in the Church itself and the consequent reiterated charges to present a united front to the enemy, and as in all his letters there are the Christian moral injunctions based on the great Christian verities. It is not difficult thus to get a pretty clear conception of the purposes and aims of the writer in this Epistle, nor can it be held that there is anything in this incompatible with the Pauline authorship. What one has to fear in interpretation is over-subtlety and the tendency to forget that the canons of criticism that apply to a modern theological treatise are not applicable to an informal letter which its author never intended as a *κτῆμα ἐς ἀεί*.

4. Genuineness.—(*a*) *External evidence.*—So much attention is given by recent critics to internal evidence that the external is apt to be undervalued or overlooked, although it is as strong as one can reasonably expect. The first unmistakable reference of a direct kind to St. Paul's Epistle is found in Polycarp's letter to the same church (*ad Phil.* iii. 2):

> 'For neither I nor anyone else like me can attain to the wisdom of the blessed and glorious Paul, who while he was among you taught those then living the words of truth accurately and vigorously, who also in his absence wrote letters to you' (ὃς καὶ ἀπὼν ὑμῖν ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολάς).

That our letter is referred to here seems clear. Indeed, it is evident that Polycarp knew it well, as there are distinct echoes of it in his short epistle (cf. *ad Phil.* i. 1 = Ph 2^{17} 4^{10}; ii. 1 = 2^{10} 3^{21}; ix. 2 = 2^{16} [or Gal 2^2]; x. 1 = $2^{2\text{-}5}$; xii. 3 = 3^{18}). The difficulty is to account for the plural 'letters.' It is sometimes explained as if it were simply equivalent to the singular (cf. examples in Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 140 ff.). Others, however, point out that Polycarp appreciates the difference between the singular and the plural in this epistle (cf. xiii. 2), and that we must here understand a real plural. Zahn (*op. cit.* i. 536) and others accordingly explain it on the supposition that 1 and 2 Thess. and Philippians formed a Macedonian group, and Zahn shows that Tertullian so regarded them (*Scorp.* 13), and probably Polycarp himself (xi. 3); cf. also Harnack, *TU*, new ser., v. 3 [1900] 86 f. It may be said, however, that a later tradition supports the theory of more letters than one (cf. Georgius Syncellus, who quotes Ph 4^3 as occurring in St. Paul's first letter [*Chronographia*, i. 651]; cf. also *Studia Sinaitica*, ed. A. S. Lewis, i. [Cambridge, 1894] 11 ff., for the mention of a Second Epistle in the Syrian Canon, *c.* A.D. 400). As we shall see later on, this is used freely to support modern theories of fusion in our extant Epistle, but it remains to be proved on its own merits that the present Epistle contains two or more letters joined together; for there is every likelihood that many letters written by St. Paul are now lost, and possibly among them one or more to Philippi. It is, however, problematical if lost letters are here referred to, as it is quite possible to explain the plural otherwise, and it is not likely that if more letters than one existed in Polycarp's time they would have been lost afterwards.

The statement in *ad Phil.* xi. 3—'qui estis in principio epistolæ eius'—is difficult. Some supply 'laudati' ('you who are praised') in the beginning of his letter. Others, however, say the text is meaningless (*sinnlos*) (cf. E. Hennecke, *Handbuch zu den neutest. Apokryphen*, Tübingen, 1904, p. 103), and translate 'in the beginning of his gospel [cf. Ph 4^{15}] *or* his mission,' ἀποστολῆς (E. Nestle acc. to Zahn, *op. cit.* i. 536). Others again, referring to 2 Co $3^{2.3}$, make 'epistolæ' plural, 'You who are his epistles.' The latter is not likely. There can be no doubt, however, that Polycarp (*c.* 125–130) knew our letter, although it is doubtful if he knew of more than one. It is also quoted in his *Martyrdom*, i. 2 (= Ph 2^4).

There is also cumulative evidence that both Ignatius and Clement of Rome were acquainted with our letter (see Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 75 f.). It is quoted by Eusebius (*HE* v. ii. 2) in the *Epistle from Lyons and Vienne.* According to Clem. Alex. and Hippolytus it was recognized by the heretical Valentians and Sethites who quoted 2^6, the latter to prove their own doctrine. The Apologists recognize it (*Epistle to Diognetus*, v. 9 = Ph 3^{20} and elsewhere), and it is found in all the 2nd cent. canons as well as in the *Apostolicum* of Marcion. Irenæus, Tertullian, and Origen also recognize it. The fact is, the genuineness of the letter was never questioned till within recent times, and that solely on internal grounds (see Vincent, *ICC*, 'Philippians and Philemon,' Introd.; C. R. Gregory, *Canon and Text of the NT*, Edinburgh, 1907, and, indeed, all books on the Canon of Scripture).

(*b*) *Internal evidence.*—It is impossible and fortunately unnecessary to review in detail the various arguments that have been brought against the authenticity of the Epistle to the Philippians since F. C. Baur (*Paul*, Eng. tr.^{2}, ii. 45–79). Perhaps the three most formidable opponents are Baur himself, Holsten, and van Manen. Baur laid special stress on Gnostic affinities, especially in $2^{6\text{ff.}}$. According to him, the writer knew the theories concerning the æon Sophia, its bold *actus rapiendi* to gain an equality with the All-Father and its consequent degradation into the region of darkness and emptiness (ἐν σκιαῖς καὶ κενώματος τόποις). The occurrence of words like μόρφωσις and κένωμα (not ἁρπαγμός) lends colour to this view, and the Gnostic descent into hell was, it is held, well known to the writer. The whole passage is thus explicable only on the supposition 'that the writer's mind was filled with certain Gnostic ideas current at the time' (Eng. tr.^{2}, vol. ii. p. 46). The writer was not, of course, advocating these ideas, but they were employed by him with the necessary modifications for his own purpose. O. Pfleiderer still holds to this view (*Das Urchristentum*, Berlin, 1887, p. 320 f.), although he believes in the genuineness of the letter, and so is compelled to regard the passage as interpolated (*ib.* p. 153). It was, however, given up by Holsten, and van Manen (*EBi*, art. 'Philippians [Epistles]') does not refer to it.

More recently attempts have been made to trace the genesis of the conceptions used in the passage to primitive apocalyptic traditions (see W. Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, Göttingen, 1907) of an ἀρχάνθρωπος, or *Urmensch*, pre-existent in the highest heaven, who descended to the lowest, such a view for instance as is given in the *Ascensio Isaiæ*, x. 29 f. Isaiah hears God telling His Son to descend into the world, and the stages of this descent through the heavens are given. In the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* we have phrases which readily suggest affinity with Ph $2^{6\text{ff.}}$ (cf. *Benj.* x. 7: 'worshipping the king of the heavens who appeared on earth, ἐν μορφῇ ἀνθρώπου; *Zeb.* ix. 8: ἐν σχήματι ἀνθρώπου). These, however, are probably borrowed from Christian traditions. It is well known that Philo had the conception of an ideal man (*de Conf. Ling.*, ed. Mangey, i. 411), and that there are vague indefinite references in *Enoch* (*Simile*), *Psalms of Solomon*, *Apocalypse of Baruch*, etc.

Moffatt quotes (*LNT*, p. 172) from Poimandres (after Reitzenstein) the description of this Original Man: ἀθάνατος ὢν καὶ πάντων τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἔχων τὰ θνητοῦ πάσχει ὑποκείμενος τῇ εἱμαρμένῃ· ὑπεράνω γὰρ ὢν τῆς ἁρμονίας ἐναρμόνιος γέγονε δοῦλος.

Holsten was greatly concerned with the representation of Christ in Philippians because it contradicted the 'heavenly man' view of Ro 5^{12-21} and 1 Co 15. But it is clear, on a careful examination of these passages, that what St. Paul has in mind is the contrast between the glorified pneumatic body of the Redeemer and the earthly bodies of His people. Holsten is right, however, in maintaining that in Philippians what we have is not a Christ originally man—but a Divine Being, and a Divine Being showing His Divinity in becoming man and in the energy of His exalted power. It is extremely doubtful if St. Paul has in his writings at all the conception of a pre-existent man either ideal or actual (see H. A. A. Kennedy, *Exp*, 8th ser., vii. [1914] 97 ff.). The danger in these researches into origins is to conclude that vague hints in popular traditions suggest to St. Paul the facts. The facts were prior and creative, causes not effects. They were not suggested by his early acquaintance with a Rabbinic doctrine of a Heavenly Man.

Whatever the affinities or affiliations with vague traditions may be—whether he has Adam, Lucifer (Is 14^{12-15}) or an ἀρχάνθρωπος in mind is very uncertain; what is certain is that Christ's life on earth and St. Paul's own experience of His exalted power necessarily suggest to him these transcendent views of His worth (cf. 2 Co 8^9, and especially Col.).

The attempts of Baur to find in the γνήσιε σύνζυγε (4^3) a mediator of the two extreme parties in early Christianity and the identification of the Clement of our Epistle with Clemens Romanus and T. Flavius Clemens need not be further commented on (see above). Objections also to our Epistle on the ground of what Baur calls 'the questionableness of some of the historical data'—viz. the references to the Prætorium and the saints of Cæsar's household—are due to an inadequate exegesis, and Baur himself readily admits their credibility were it not for his theory of a conflict of parties in the early Church. Besides, the mention of bishops and deacons (1^1) lends no support to the theory of false historical references when one remembers that bishops are just the presbyters found in all churches, and the deacons servants of the Christian community under them. We are not to think of these officers as sacramentally mediating grace, but as spiritually guiding the community. One feels that the objections to such terms are to a large extent exhibitions of annoyance at our own ignorance of 1st cent. conditions, and are largely biased by modern associations.

The objections on the score of doctrinal divergences from the *Hauptbriefe* are forcibly set forth by Holsten (as also by Baur) and van Manen. It is said that the Epistle is vague and nebulous, that it lacks any leading idea, that it is characterized by monotonous repetition, by lack of profound connexion of ideas, and by poverty of thought, of which the author himself is conscious when he writes 3^1. St. Paul is said here also to show a desire for self-glorification (3^{4-17}); his acknowledgment of the Philippians' gift is lacking in grace; his acceptance of it is contrary to his statement in

1 Co $9^{12\text{ff.}}$; he shows uncertainty as to his future, even expressing doubt as to his participation in the resurrection (3^{11}). His views of justification, perfection, and the Parousia are not what we would expect from the genuine St. Paul. He imitates freely and skilfully, especially 2 Cor. and Rom.; but, like all imitators, wrongly (cf. his use of *ἐπιχορηγία τοῦ Πνεύματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, Ph 1^{19}). His attitude of rejoicing in the preaching of those who preach Christ in pretence is wholly unlike the real St. Paul. Holsten collects words used which are un-Pauline and anti-Pauline as well as non-Pauline. The autobiographical section is based on 2 Co $11^{13\text{ff.}}$. In short, whatever agrees with the *Hauptbriefe* is imitated, and whatever does not is invented. This kind of criticism looks too much like the story of the wolf and the lamb to carry conviction save by opposition. Let any one read van Manen's column (*EBi* iii. 3709) as to the views of the writer of Philippians concerning Christ, arranged by the critic to convince us that they could not have been held by St. Paul, and one feels at once that if these were not St. Paul's views we simply know not what they were.

Van Manen feels it necessary to defend the writer from the charge of fraudulency, declaring that he wrote more from modesty than from arrogance. His very defence shows the uneasiness of his conscience. There are difficulties in the Epistle to the Philippians, but they are not difficulties like the above. One of these—perhaps the most serious—is the change of tone in $3^{1\text{ff.}}$; and the unsatisfactoriness of the various attempts to explain the *γράφειν τὰ αὐτά* reveals the difficulty and has given rise to various theories as to the integrity of the letter itself—all more or less motived by this so-called chasm. Many feel as if here two distinct strata appear; and, although it is not possible to say definitely where the second ends, it is, they say, clear that it begins here. This leads us to consider various theories regarding the integrity of the letter.

5. Integrity.—Various attempts since Heinrichs (1810) and Paulus (1799) have been made to find in our Epistle two or more letters fused together. The suggestion was first put forward in 1685 by S. le Moyne (Moine or Mayne), in *Varia Sacra*, ii. 332 ff., and it is the view (in varying forms) favoured still by many critics (cf. Bacon, *The Story of St. Paul*, London, 1905, p. 367 f.; and Kirsopp Lake, *Exp*, 8th ser., vii. [1914] 487 f.). There is, however, little unanimity as to what portions make up the different letters, or, indeed, how many letters are incorporated in the single canonical Epistle (J. E. Symes, *Interpreter*, x. 2 [1914] gives five). The view of Heinrichs is that 3^{1}–4^{19} is an interpolated communication addressed to the leaders of the Philippian Church, and that 1^{1}–2^{30}, 4^{21-23} was a letter to the church as a whole. It is difficult to reconcile this view with 4^{10} where the whole church is addressed and where the tone of rejoicing is again heard. Accordingly, Kirsopp Lake adopts the theory that the interpolated letter stops at 4^{3}. Both are genuinely Pauline letters. A simpler view is that we have two letters, chs. 1 and 2 forming the first (but in time the second), and 3 and 4 forming the second—in point of time the first (Hausrath, *Paulus*, Heidelberg, 1865, p. 486 ff.; cf. also Bacon, *op. cit.* It may be objected to this view that neither of these sections is a complete letter in itself, and also that we have no clear mention of their gift in the first one save the allusion in 2^{25}, for although the Apostle speaks of their 'fellowship' yet this is too indefinite in itself to be a thanksgiving for their contribution. Besides, it is doubtful if it really explains anything, although it creates fresh difficulties. It is meant to free us of $3^{1\text{ff.}}$, as indeed all such theories are, but with little success. It is surely not necessary to see any contradiction in what is said in 2^{21} regarding the brethren with St. Paul and what is said in 1^{14}, nor to equate those spoken of in ch. 3 with those referred to in 1^{18} (so also Moffatt, *LNT*, p. 175). The view elaborated by D. Völter (*Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1892, pp. 10–14, 117–146) and others as to various interpolations is also due to a large extent to the difficulty of explaining the *τὰ αὐτά* of ch. 3 and its different tone, as is also Ewald's view that St. Paul wrote first chs. 1 and 2, and then after an interruption the remainder, possibly in two postscripts. This is in itself quite conceivable and less violent than the other theories of a similar kind.

Is there any external ground for holding to the theory of a double letter? We have already discussed the evidence in Polycarp (see above), of which so much is made, and have come to the conclusion that nothing definite can be found there to substantiate a double letter. Nor is the comparison with 2 Co 10–13 wholly convincing. There is nothing *a priori* improbable in the idea that St. Paul wrote more letters than one to Philippi; indeed, there is every reason to suppose this to have been the case, yet it goes no way towards proving that we have these communications fused together in our extant Epistle. If this theory can be established, it must be established on other grounds, and it must satisfy the facts better than the one-letter theory. The chief difficulty is to explain the *τὰ αὐτὰ γράφειν*. Does this refer to the contents of the letter itself, or to some special prominent thought in it? Some find this leading idea to be 'rejoicing.' This is Baur's idea: 'The *τὰ αὐτὰ γράφειν* refers to nothing but the *χαίρετε ἐν Κυρίῳ*, that is, to the contents of the Epistle generally, for the key-note and the leading thought of it are expressed in this constantly recurring *χαίρετε*' (*Paul*, Eng. tr.^{2}, vol. ii. p. 70). But it cannot be said that this is convincing although it is the most natural thought that one would gather from the words. The idea occurs often in the letter (Ph 1^{18} $2^{17.\,18.\,28}$ 3^{1} $4^{4.\,10}$; also $1^{4.\,25}$ $2^{2.\,29}$ 4^{1}), but why should there be special safety in repeating it?

Others say that the reference is to the dangers of dissensions already present in the Church at Philippi (1^{27} 2^{2-4}) (Lightfoot), and this agrees with the passage following, although the language (*ὀκνηρόν, ἀσφαλές*) is very strong considering the vagueness of the allusions to these previous dissensions. Some critics find the idea referred to in *δικαιοσύνη*, or in *ταπεινοφροσύνη* (so Maurice Jones, *Exp*, 8th ser., viii. [1914] 471), but both these suggestions are far from self-evident. The idea that perhaps St. Paul was referring to previous written communications accordingly suggests itself, and perhaps satisfies the conditions better, or the similar idea that he was interrupted, and that in the meantime he had received disconcerting news of probable Jewish aggressiveness in Philippi. It may, however, be explained on subjective grounds. If St. Paul himself was at this point suddenly arrested by the experience of Jewish fanaticism towards himself, it might very well occasion this outburst, which is undoubtedly characteristic of the Apostle, although it is difficult to account for *τὰ αὐτά* on such a view.

At any rate there is not here sufficient ground either for eliminating 3^{1} or, what is worse, discrediting the unity of the letter itself. This unity is apparent in spite of the admitted difficulty; and no one has recognized it more clearly than van Manen: 'The epistle as a whole does not present the appearance of patchwork. Rather does it show unity of form: we find a letter with a regular beginning and ending ($1^{1\text{f.}}$ 4^{20-23}); a thanksgiving at the outset for the many excellences of the persons addressed (1^{3-11}; cf. Ro 1^{8-12}, 1 Co 1^{4-9}), notwithstanding the sharp rebukes that are to be administered later; personalia; exhortations relating to the ethical and religious life; all mingled together yet not without regard to a certain order. Here and there some things may be admitted to interrupt the steady flow of the discourse; 3^{1} or 3^{1b} raises the conjecture of a new beginning; the "things" spoken of here are not different from those which we meet with elsewhere in other Pauline Epistles—even in Rom., 1 and 2 Cor., Gal. There also, just as here, we repeatedly hear a change of tone, and are conscious of what seems to be a change of spirit. Yet even apart from this, to lay too great stress upon the spiritual mood which expresses itself in 3^{2-6}, as contrasted with that of 1^{3-11}, or, on the whole, of 1–2, would be to forget what we can read in 1^{15-17} 2^{21} and the calm composure shown in 3*f.*' (*EBi* iii. 3708). What one has to remember is that in real letters we must expect such sudden changes. A recent editor (J. D. Duff) of Pliny's *Letters* (bk. vi., London, 1906, Introd. p. xix) says: '. . . these letters [*i.e.* Pliny's] are not genuine letters in the sense that they were not written merely for the information or pleasure of the person addressed but mainly with an eye to future publication. If they are compared with genuine letters such as Cicero's the difference is at once apparent. Pliny never repeats himself, never sends news which has to be corrected in a later letter, never betrays a sign of real excitement or depression. He never jumps from one subject to another, and then back again as everyone does in a natural letter to a friend. . . . Few people are so fortunate in their surroundings that their letters to intimate friends contain nothing but praise of the persons mentioned' (cf. Ph 2^{21}). If these be the criteria of a real letter, they are all present in this one—repetitions, excitement, depression, jumps from one subject to another, and possibly expectations that were not fulfilled.

The *τὰ αὐτὰ γράφειν* is not explained by fusion, for it is even more probable that a redactor would see the break sooner than St. Paul himself would. We must either hold that the reference is to earlier communications which have been lost, or, to explain it of our present letter, admit that we cannot be sure what exactly in it is spoken of, recognizing, however, that the change of tone is quite in the manner of St. Paul. The double *τὸ λοιπόν* (3^{1} and 4^{8}) might lend colour to the view of amalgamation, but it is possible that with St. Paul it is not very much stronger than *οὖν* (cf. Kennedy, *EGT*, 'Philippians,' *in locis*, and G. Milligan, *Thessalonians*, London, 1908, on 1 Th 4^{1}). At any rate in a letter one is not astonished to find such usages. There is nothing in the style either to suggest spuriousness or fusion. It is simple and artless, rising at times to a rhythmical height. This is clearly seen in $2^{6\text{ff.}}$ and also in 4^{11-13} (cf. J. Weiss, *Beiträge zur paulin. Rhetorik*, Göttingen, 1897, pp. 28, 29). One can naturally explain this as due to emotion such as even an ordinary preacher often feels and which produces a rhythmic poetic style. 3^{1b} is an iambic trimeter, *ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐκ ὀκνηρόν, ὑμῖν δὲ ἀσφαλές*—possibly a quotation, more probably due to accident and unconscious. Baur has noticed the repetition of the same word ($1^{9.\ 18.\ 25}$ $2^{17.\ 18.\ 27}$ 3^{2} $4^{2.\ 17}$) and the use of synonyms (1^{20} $2^{1.\ 2.\ 16.\ 25}$).

Certain words occurring nowhere else in St. Paul are suggestive, as *ἀρετή*, 4^{8}; *προκοπή*, 1^{12}; *προσφιλῆ* and *σεμνά* (only in Pastorals) as well as unusual combinations of common words, *e.g.* *θλίψιν ἐγείρειν*, *ἐξομολογεῖσθαι ὅτι*, *τὰ ἔμπροσθεν* (noun). The latter can be explained, however, by LXX usage; and possibly the former. There is nothing astonishing in St. Paul's acquaintance with such common words, which perhaps came to him through popular Stoic usage (see Lightfoot, *Philippians*^{4}, 'St. Paul and Seneca,' p. 270 f.), nor can any safe general inference be drawn from them as to a change in his style away from the LXX towards a more literary form.

A more thorough knowledge of inscriptions has revealed the fact that the Pauline vocabulary and style are largely the natural ones of his time There is no importance to be attached to the recurrence of *πλήν*, which in itself is a common word, occurring once in 1 Co 11^{11}. The quotations from the OT are mere echoes ($2^{10.\ 15.\ 16}$ $4^{3.\ 18}$), save 1^{19} from Job 13^{16}, which is evidently quoted with the original context clearly in view. Nothing is more precarious than arguments from style, and in this case account has to be taken of the directness and lack of dogmatic content which were uncalled for by the circumstances. All things considered, the style and vocabulary are genuinely Pauline.

6. Date and place of origin.—The solution of the second question largely determines the first. There is no definite *Abfassungsort* mentioned in the letter itself, so that we are thrown back on internal evidence, and have to determine what period of St. Paul's life best suits the circumstances. He was a prisoner (1^{7}). He had been a prisoner for some time, for the Philippians had sent Epaphroditus to him with a gift of money under the impression that he needed it. The messenger had arrived and fallen ill. The news of his illness had reached them (either orally or in writing), and they had again sent communications expressing their anxiety. Some change had taken place in St. Paul's circumstances since he became a prisoner, which they construed pessimistically. The Apostle informs them that already he had made his *apologia* with gratifying results (1^{7}), evidently a preliminary defence before the judicial authorities. The result was that the brethren were thereby encouraged to resume their preaching of Christ with greater freedom and boldness. Wherever he was, there were many preachers, some of them opposed to his views of Christianity, others favourable. He rejoiced in the renewed energy of both as far as objective results went, though he could not but deplore the motives of those who disagreed with him. He is confident that the issue of his affairs at present will be final deliverance, and that he will soon see them again (2^{23}). If, however, it should otherwise happen, then before he is finally condemned—the case is not yet settled—he will speak with such clearness and boldness that Christ shall be magnified in his body either by life or death. By death he would see Christ face to face (*σὺν Χριστῷ*), their faith already established would be perfected (2^{17}). The possibility of death is always a real one, imprisonment or no imprisonment, but it is no ground of despondency. At present he proposes to send Timothy to them, but let them be sure that his own coming will follow shortly thereafter, for he has every reason to regard hopefully his situation. In the whole Prætorium his imprisonment is viewed in the proper light. Misunderstandings regarding the nature of the charge against him have been removed owing to recent events, and this is the case generally. He is glad to tell them that, besides the brethren with him, the saints of Cæsar's household especially send their Christian greetings. He deplores that he had no one to send to them at present, as his associates at the time refused to go as envoys (2^{20}).

Of what place could these facts be spoken? The three main points are (1) his imprisonment, (2) Prætorium, (3) Cæsar's household.

(1) *St. Paul was often in prison* (2 Co 11^{23}): in Philippi itself (Ac 16^{23}), in Cæsarea (Ac 23), and in Rome (Ac 28). According to Clement (*ad Rom.* i.

56), he was no fewer than seven times in gaol: διὰ ζῆλον καὶ ἔριν Παῦλος ὑπομονῆς βραβεῖον ἐνέδειξεν, ἑπτάκις δεσμὰ φορέσας. Jerusalem and Philippi are ruled out, but there still remain the possibilities of Rome, Cæsarea, and Ephesus if we can be sure of an imprisonment there. The fact of imprisonment then is not decisive.

(2) *Prætorium.*—There is considerable divergence of opinion as to what this term means. Elsewhere it is used of the tower of Antonia (Mk 15^{16}), and of Herod's palace (Ac 23^{35}). It occurs nowhere else in St. Paul's writings. If a locality is meant (and this is not ruled out by the phrase καὶ τοῖς λοίποις πᾶσι; cf. *CIG* i. 1770), then the term indicates some princely building, the residence of a prince or procurator. There is no evidence, however, that the Palatium—the Roman Imperial residence—was so called, although it is possible that a provincial writing in Rome might loosely describe it by this term. Herod's residence where Felix stayed in Cæsarea was a prætorium. Or the reference is to the camp of the prætorian guards, built by Tiberius and situated at the Porta Viminalis. This is doubtful; at any rate there seems no evidence to prove that this camp was called *prætorium* (see Zahn, *op. cit.* i. 551).

It is possible, however, that the term is used of persons, and even so two views have found supporters:—(*a*) There is no doubt, after Lightfoot's researches, that the term 'prætorium' may mean the prætorian guard, and it would admirably suit St. Paul's case in Rome as we learn that from Ac 28. (*b*) Mommsen, however, believes that the *præfectus*(*-i*) *prætorii*(*-o*) and associates are referred to, in which case the term would mean the legal authorities. Ramsay (*St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 357) agrees with this (but he has latterly given his opinion in favour of the prætorian guard). The objection to it is that a large body is referred to—'in the whole prætorium'—and on the face of it this does not suit well the theory of the judicial authorities, nor is it clear that the term 'prætorium' *simpliciter* was so used. We are thus restricted either to the meaning, 'the soldiers of the prætorian guard' or else 'the provincial residence of a procurator,' so that this term does not definitely decide the origin of the letter, although the preponderance of evidence is in favour of Rome.

(3) *The saints of Cæsar's household.*—The meaning of this phrase seems clearly to be 'servants of the Imperial house,' not blood-relations of the Emperor. This appears to militate against the argument of many who uphold the Cæsarean origin, who equate this term with the prætorium; on the other hand, it is possible that such slaves existed in provincial towns like Cæsarea or Ephesus. It is, however, a strong evidence in favour of Rome.

We are thus largely thrown back on the evidence furnished by the Apostle's condition at the time of writing, or on the relation of this letter to other letters whose origin we know. On this ground many have defended the Cæsarean origin. St. Paul was undoubtedly in prison here for two years (Ac 23^{35}), and in a prætorium. He had been imprisoned through Jewish hostility, and in Philippians ($3^{1ff.}$) he writes with bitterness of the Judaizers. But this is surely no argument, because St. Paul's experience of this hatred was so uniform that such an outburst as Ph 3 is explicable at any period in his career. It is said that we have no proof that Timothy was ever in Rome with St. Paul (outside the imprisonment letters), but have we any direct proof that he was with him in Cæsarea? The greed of Felix was aroused, it is maintained, by the gift St. Paul received from Philippi. This involves a *circulus in probando.* The impression given in Acts is that Felix thought St. Paul a man of standing and substance. H. Böttger (*Beiträge zur historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die paulinischen Briefe*, Göttingen, 1837) urges strongly that we cannot conceive of such a delay in the judicial proceedings as is implied in the letter, taking place at Rome. It is sufficient to refer to what Lightfoot has said to the contrary (*Philippians*, p. 3 ff.; cf. also Neander, *Planting and Training of the Christian Church*, Eng. tr., 2 vols., London, 1864–80, i. 312). The strongest argument against Rome is the stylistic and doctrinal—the difference in doctrine and style between Philippians and both Colossians and Ephesians, and the affinities with Romans and 1 and 2 Corinthians. It was for this reason that Lightfoot, who gives an elaborate list of parallels between Philippians and Romans, placed our letter early in the Roman imprisonment in order to give time for doctrinal development, and Haupt also has felt the force of this argument so keenly as to say: 'wenn nur die Annahme einer römischen Abfassung möglich wäre, würde ich ohne weiteres die Echtheit der beiden Briefe preisgeben, obwohl die Annahme der römischen Abfassung bis in dies Jhdt. hinein die allgemeingültige gewesen und auch noch jetzt von einer grossen Anzahl von Gelehrten verteidigt ist.' He would give up unreservedly the genuineness of Colossians and Ephesians if he were compelled to regard them as written in Rome where Philippians was written, and that in spite of the fact that so many scholars still defend the Roman origin of all the three letters (Haupt in Meyer's *Kommentar*^{7}, p. 70).

But it is not clear that either of these views would in any way help us out of the difficulty, for on Lightfoot's view St. Paul changed his style within two years and his doctrine developed and deepened. Two years is too short a period for this. On Haupt's view St. Paul's profound style and doctrine in Colossians and Ephesians were due to his confinement in Cæsarea when he had time to brood and ponder such as he had not before. This enforced inactivity deepened and widened his views of Christ. But the weakness of this explanation is that St. Paul again goes back in Philippians to the old simple style.

Recently, however, a theory has been advocated which seems to solve this difficulty. The theory is that Philippians was written from Ephesus, and the other imprisonment letters from Rome or Cæsarea (so M. Albertz, in *SK* iv. [1910] 551 ff.). Thus the Philippian Epistle is ranged alongside Romans and the Corinthian Epistles; and the mission of Timothy (Ac 19^{22}, 1 Co 16^{11}) is explained. The initial difficulty, however, is to prove an Ephesian imprisonment. There is no mention of it by St. Luke, but does not St. Paul himself refer to it (1 Co 15^{32}, 2 Co 4^{8-10} 6^{9-10})? The extra-canonical arguments used by Albertz are of little value—the seven imprisonments mentioned by Clem. Rom. (*ad Cor.* I. v. 6), the account in Nicephorus Kallisti of St. Paul's fight in the arena, the testimony of the *Acts of Paul*, and the tower still in Ephesus known as 'Paul's Prison' (see art. PHILIPPI for references). The real argument is, however, the 'fighting with beasts at Ephesus' (1 Co 15^{32}).

The theory as advocated by H. Lisco (*Vincula Sanctorum*, Berlin, 1900) is sharply criticized by Albertz himself (especially his view that Rome was a *Hafengebiet* in Ephesus, which is a curiosity of criticism), though Lisco seems to have first raised the possibility of an Ephesian imprisonment. Deissmann, who claims for himself the originating of the theory (*Licht vom Osten*, p. 171 n., Eng. tr., p. 229 n.), unfortunately is surer of the Ephesian origin of Colossians and Ephesians than he is of the Ephesian origin of Philippians. The stylistic argument he explains on psychological grounds (*ib.*). Albertz's article is worthy of serious attention, and Kirsopp Lake claims a hearing for it (*Exp*, 8th ser., vii. [1914] 492 f.). On this view, it is held, it is easier to imagine St. Paul influencing the few prætorians in Ephesus than the 9000 in Rome. The house of Cæsar offers no difficulty, for slaves of the Imperial house were scattered all over the provinces, and there is epigraphic evidence for their existence in Ephesus (*q.v.*). St. Paul's intention of going to Philippi is explicable, whereas if the letter was written from Rome we would expect him to go farther west. His expression εἰς ἀπολογίαν εὐαγγελίου κεῖμαι (1^{16}; cf. v.^{7}) refers to a real trial—an appearance before the court. Then, if the letter is written from Rome, the reference to the Philippians' gift is sarcastic (ἤδη ποτέ), as ten years had elapsed since they had helped him, and this is unthinkable. The difficulties about this theory are to prove St. Paul's Ephesian imprisonment, and especially his fighting with beasts, for he was a Roman citizen, and this indignity would accordingly not be suffered by him. Luke's silence is again a serious matter; and, indeed, his account militates against an imprisonment, nor is it likely that St. Paul would take for granted that the Philippians would understand the references to the prætorium and the household of Cæsar without further explanation. Above all, his situation as described in Philippians does not easily fit anything we know of his stay in Ephesus. The doctrinal and linguistic argument, which is really the motive of all these theories, can well be explained on psychological grounds, and the different conditions of the churches addressed (cf. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 359; Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, p. 171, Eng. tr., p. 229; Moffatt, *LNT*, p. 170).

We know so little of the procedure in cases of appeal that it is difficult to be sure of the situation St. Paul was in when Philippians was written, but the present writer concludes that the Apostle wrote Colossians, Ephesians, and Philemon earlier than Philippians, that when he wrote Philippians most of his trusted associates (see Colossians and Philemon) had gone on missions to churches, and he had difficulty in finding any one to go to Philippi. It was thus either at the end of his two years' confinement in his hired house (Ac 28^{30}), or at a later date when he was more immediately occupied with his appearing before the judicial authorities. We believe that he had already made a preliminary defence and that he was actually set free shortly after this, either because the Jews had no case and failed to appear, or else because their case broke down on examination. Whether we can interpret Philippians as meaning that St. Paul had now to undergo a stricter custody than that described in Acts is doubtful though not improbable; if it took place it was not due to a breaking down of his case but to judicial arrangements. Thus the dating of the letter depends on the view which we take of Pauline chronology generally. The two points to be fixed are Gallio's governorship of Achaia and Festus' stay in Cæsarea (see C. H. Turner, *HDB* i. 415 ff., and Deissmann, *St. Paul*, Eng. tr., London, 1912, Appendix I.). The present writer is of the opinion that St. Paul came to Rome in 60 at the latest, and that he was liberated towards the end of 61. We must therefore place the authorship of Philippians in this year, and that of the other imprisonment letters earlier.

7. Contents of the letter.—(*a*) *The fellowship of the gospel* (1^{1-11} 4^{10-23}).—The teaching of the beginning and ending of the letter centres round the thought of fellowship (κοινωνία), and this central idea itself is suggested to the Apostle by the liberality of his Philippian converts. The foundation of this fellowship is the grace of Jesus Christ (4^{23}) or of God the Father (1^{2}), God being regarded as the source of this grace, and Christ as the agent through whom it is mediated. Peace is the result of grace, or grace viewed in relation to the quality of life which grace produces. Grace is this new relationship viewed as to its origin. The fellowship of Christians follows from their being in Christ. St. Paul and Timothy are His δοῦλοι—a term expressing dignity as well as humility. Some of those addressed are overseers and deacons of His flock, all are consecrated in Him. They are thus united in an indissoluble union with one another, under the Lordship of Christ—a Lordship of grace. This free redeeming favour is at once the origin, the atmosphere, and the ideal of Christian life. It is a subject at once of benediction and of prayer (4^{23}). It is a common Christian possession (συνκοινωνούς τῆς χάριτος), shown not only in trust in Christ, but also in suffering on His behalf (1^{29}; cf. v.^{7}). Grace as it comes with its lavish offer to men is the gospel, and the earnest endeavour to proclaim the good news, or the support of those entrusted with this proclamation, is the fellowship in the gospel (v.^{5}). The Philippians by sending monetary help to St. Paul have demonstrated their place in this fellowship. Their material gifts are effects of their spiritual communion-life, and the steady flow * of their liberality all along from their first acceptance of the gospel until now is a proof of their growing appreciation of this communion and a proof of its coming completed realization in them (vv.$^{3-6}$). Because they are in Christ, at the day of Christ they shall be perfect sharers of the rich life which He has in glory with God the Father, and which is mediated through Him to His people (4^{19}). This revelation of their character—through their liberality—is to St. Paul a theme of thankful prayer and rejoicing (v.^{3}), of prayer which shall be answered because he knows that it is really God Himself who began this work in them and He will complete it, of rejoicing also because they appreciate what the fellowship of the gospel is, and are not severed from it by afflictions (4^{14}). Their spiritual condition fills him with Christ-like yearning for them that their ἀγάπη—their spirit of Christian brotherhood—should develop along the Divinely appointed lines of practical wisdom and tactful discrimination, in a world where enthusiasm often fails in insight, and insight in kindly consideration of others (1^{10}).

His thankfulness and his joy are not due to his appreciation of their personal kindness to himself, nor yet to the betterment of their own material circumstances. It is more deeply rooted and grounded on deeper insight. For himself he can meet plenty or poverty in the sustaining power of Christ, who enables him and has enabled him hitherto to cope with all situations. He had no need of any further gift to prove their attachment to him. The past can supply rich evidence of that. Nor is it this exhibition of their material prosperity that makes him rejoice. It is the fact rather that thus he has a fresh proof of the reality of their fellowship in the gospel. It is given thus to them (as to him) to defend and strengthen the gospel, to offer to God an acceptable and pleasing sacrifice—to reap already the fruit of that uprightness of life which is produced through Christ (v.^{11}), and to sow the seeds of yet richer harvests. For their spiritual prosperity is really their willingness to support the gospel. Spiritual expenditure is the accumulation of spiritual capital. Spiritual liberality is the plan of campaign for God's successful stewards, for the supply will be according to the demand both here and hereafter. Their riches are with the glorified Christ, and these riches are increased for them by appropriation and use. They will receive full possession of the inheritance on His day.

---

* Any interruption of their liberality was due to necessity, either poverty or impossibility of transmission (4^{10}).

Never was Christian liberality so exalted and so spiritually interpreted, never were donors thanked in such a fashion save when the Master said: 'Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brethren, even these least, ye did it unto me' (Mt 25^{40}). On this is grounded his conviction as to their 'perseverance' and his assurance of their final salvation.

(*b*) *The furtherance of the gospel* (προκοπὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου) (1^{12-26}).—The Philippians were afraid that St. Paul's recent experiences boded ill for the success of the gospel. He dispels their pessimism (1) by an appeal to present facts. His present condition has not, as a matter of fact, hindered the progress of the gospel; it has extended it and enabled it—as far as he himself is concerned—to shine forth in its true light, sharply defined where it was apt to be mingled with other issues (1^{12-13}). It has quickened it also into fresh activity and vigorous boldness in the case of others—and these include the majority of his brother preachers. His chains have not insulated the Word of God, but are a vehicle of its diffusion. The fact that some preachers (these are not included in the τοὺς πλείονας of v.^{14}) are motived by partisanship and personal opposition to himself does not lessen his joy, because he rejoices in the preaching of Christ, and the gospel is relatively independent of the preacher's personal motives. The gospel then advances, and this advancement is due to his chains. Let them therefore rejoice with him. He dispels their pessimism in regard to the success of the gospel also (2) by a consideration of the future. A new reason is introduced in 1^{18b} (ἀλλὰ καὶ χαρήσομαι). At present the gospel is furthered by his chains, but should his condition change, what cause have they to fear that thereby Christ's cause shall suffer? As far as he is concerned a prolongation of his life on earth means the preaching of Christ, which shall be fruitful also in furthering the gospel; it means, besides, a strengthening of their own faith and a vindication of their Christian exultation in him. So convinced is he of their need of him that he is sure their prayers will thus be answered, and the rich supply of Christ's Spirit to him will enable him in life yet to magnify Christ among them. But if his trial should issue in his death even then also Christ's Spirit will enable him to speak freely and boldly, so that Christ shall be magnified in his death as in his life. This is his earnest hope, and it is a hope that will not be disappointed, that in either case Christ shall have the glory; yea, even they themselves also would thus have their faith completed, for his death would be a crowning of its reality and utter devotion (2^{17}). Besides, the present situation, whatever the issue, will bring nearer his own salvation either by his personal liberation or his reunion with Christ (σωτηρία possibly but not certainly = 'liberation'). The latter prospect is to him overpoweringly attractive, so much so that he cannot say what actually he would desire for himself. To depart and see Christ is far better than any earthly lot, but then he knows the will of God to be that he should yet continue here, because they need him.

(*c*) *The faith of the gospel* (ἡ πίστις τοῦ εὐαγγελίου) (1^{27}–2^{5} 3^{1}–4^{9}).—The Philippians were anxious as to how St. Paul's state would affect the cause of Christ, and he also is anxious for them, not so much as to their condition viewed by itself, but as to its effect on the gospel as a whole. If his coming is to bring them Christian exultation, then it is on condition that they live worthily of the gospel whether he be with them or not.

The gospel is the charter of the commonwealth to which they belong, and fidelity to it is therefore imperative. By faith here we are to understand not individual trust in Christ, but a communal *esprit de corps*. The community to which they really belong is not simply their own church in Philippi, but the heavenly. This is the ideal, yet it is through participation in it that all existing Christian communities receive their value. Besides, their Lord, whom they expect, will give them full possession of this commonwealth and prepare them for it by giving them each an organism freed from all the weaknesses and debasing associations of the present body. His power to do this is unlimited ($3^{20.\ 21}$).

Fidelity to the gospel then is imperative, and is to be exhibited negatively and positively. (1) Fidelity to the gospel is to be exhibited negatively by their presenting a strenuous united front to their enemies. They are to be as one single person. The elements of personality are spirit and soul, and both these in their communal life are to be unified in themselves and together in a determined stand against opponents. Their united determination will be a proof of their salvation—a Divine salvation—and will terrify their enemies into a hastening destruction. So then let them not be scared as horses are sometimes scared by shadows, for to suffer on Christ's behalf is a Divine favour—as they see in his own case—as surely as that Christ called them to rely on Him is a favour. Who these enemies were we are not told, but it is reasonable to believe that they are referred to in ch. 3, because there we have illustrations of their opponents, as in ch. 4 we have illustrations of the perils which threaten their inward unity. These passages are the illustrative exemplifications of the double warnings conveyed in 1^{27}–2^{5}. They were Jews and libertines. Of the former they are to beware. They have nothing to gain from them. Let them learn from his own case. He had all the privileges that these Jews could give, but for the excellency of Christ's friendship he parted with them all, and he is as convinced now, as when he first did this, that he did right.

For Christ gave him the power to get into right relations with God on the ground of faith, while Judaism trusts in a legal righteousness which cannot save. It is true that even he has not yet reached perfection, but Christ is leading him on, and he strenuously and lovingly follows Him. The power of Christ's Resurrection-life is being gradually realized in him, inasmuch as he is able to follow Him into sufferings; and the spirit which enabled Jesus to suffer as He did suffer is in St. Paul also, and when it takes complete possession of him then he shall perfectly participate in the glorified exalted life of the Redeemer. The righteousness which is in Christ is not a modification of the present earthly *status quo*—as the Jews thought—but a complete transformation of it by the power of Christ, who already has perfection and who shall bring His people into it as He Himself came into it through sufferings and death. It is thus a call—but not therefore like the longing of Tantalus, or the labour of Sisyphus; it is attainable, but it needs all the energy of the soul; it demands perfect absorption of interest, because it is their Lord's own grasp that is uplifting them out of spiritual death into a life of glory. This he can personally testify. Let them beware also of those who live for earthly things, forgetting their high calling, and their great hope, men who claim spiritual perfection, but are really concerned with earthly gratification and spiritual liberty, meaning thereby sensual licence. 'I call them,' says the Apostle, 'enemies of the Cross of Christ, for they fail to understand to my sorrow and their own woe that the flesh has no function in the spiritual commonwealth over which Christ is King and from which He shall come to prepare His people by furnishing them with bodies like His own present glorified body' (Ph $3^{18ff.}$).

(2) Positively they must show their fidelity to the gospel by inward union. In ch. 4 they are directly reminded of the variance between Euodia and Syntyche, and both these women are exhorted to practical unity in the Lord. Others are to help them to attain this end—recognizing their former diligence and associations with St. Paul and his fellow-labourers. This unity is enforced by their standing in Christ. From this vantage-point the Apostle can appeal to them with strong and tender persuasion. Are they not loving brethren and fellow-participators in the Spirit? He can also add his own personal appeal, for they are his beloved, his joy and his crown. Therefore let them abjure party-strife, and vainglory, and let them imitate their Lord in His self-denying humility for others. Let His example be their constant rule. Let them do all things without murmurings and disputings, for the word of life is theirs. Let their light shine before men, lest his labour among them end in shame instead of exultant joy, for he is ready even to be poured out as a libation to complete the self-denial of their faith, and he does this with joy; let them also with single and united effort imitate him; for none else but God Himself is energizing in them to effect the complete salvation they long for. Let them keep their eye on him and those who walk as he walks, maintaining their place in the way, waiting for God's light to shine on the path along which they now advance. 'Whatever they learned, and received, and heard from him, whatever they saw in him, let them do' (4^{9}). Let them also think constantly of those moral virtues which are everywhere recognized. Let them remember the nearness of their Lord's approach, and let them wait upon Him in prayer. Then shall their life be freed from the paralysis of distraction and graced with the calm sweetness and orderliness of the forward full vision, with the joy of singlemindedness. For God gives peace—*i.e.* a life full of self-sufficiency and inward security—and this peace shall like a garrison safeguard them in Christ (4^{4-7}). Let them then rejoice in the Lord. Let all men see the strength, the sweetness, and the sensibleness of their faith.

We have already dealt with St. Paul's references to Timothy and Epaphroditus (2^{19-30}). We must look a little more closely at their Great Example.

(*d*) *The imitation of Christ* (2^{5-11}).—This famous passage cannot be discussed with any fullness here. It is evident from the rhythmical structure that thought and language have been carefully arranged and elaborated, yet the whole statement is brought forward as a practical motive, not as an exhaustive theological statement.

Christ first comes into the Apostle's vision—as he considers Him in this passage in His pre-incarnate state—before His appearance on earth. In this state, the Apostle says, He was in the form of God. What does this mean? It must mean something that Christ could lay aside, of which He did empty Himself, something that forms a direct contrast to the 'form of a servant.' From the phrase ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν it is not too much to say that it is equipollent to 'Himself,' His personality. His personality then was essentially identical with that of God. Is it not absurd to say of any one, however, that he empties himself of his personality? Logically it is, but really it is not. We know what is meant by a denial of oneself, an effacement of oneself. The fact is that these ethical activities transcend the bare laws of logical consistency. The 'form of God' then seems to describe Christ's pre-incarnate personality in terms of the Divine nature. μορφή is, of course, not used here as an accurate *terminus technicus* of philosophy, but it does seem in St. Paul to express (cf. Ro 8^{29}, Gal 4^{19}, 2 Co 3^{18}, Ph 3^{10}) a personality with adequate means for the expression of personal activities, and to St. Paul Christ in His pre-incarnate state was a Divine Personality, with a spiritual organism perfectly adequate for the manifestation of His Divine glory. This is implied in μορφή, which still retains traces of its original perceptual reference. St. Paul does not say that this μορφή was identical with our Lord's post-Resurrection spiritual body, far less that He had a quasi-material σῶμα, but he does seem to say that it was functionally as perfect for the expression of His Divinity then as the latter is for the expression of His redemptive Lordship now. In this pre-incarnate state He did not grasp at equality with God (οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ). It is difficult if not impossible to find here a reference to our Lord's earthly life. That has yet to come before the Apostle's mind. Psychologically, of course, the self-denying life of Jesus on earth was the temporal *prius* from which the Apostle developed his view of Christ's nature, but here it is the *ordo eventuum* in the pre-earthly life of Christ which he describes, not the psychological order of his own thinking. What, however, does it mean to say that He did not consider equality with God a thing to be snatched? How could He seize on equality with God if He was already in the form of God? If the two phrases are identical is there not here a manifest absurdity? Lightfoot and others get out of this difficulty by translating —'did not consider equality with God as a prize to be retained, to be clung to'; but the phrase indicates more than retaining—it indicates a positive grasping. Others again refer this grasping to His future Lordship which God gave Him (as a gift) in virtue of His obedience. 'He might have used the miraculous powers inherent in His Divine nature in such a way as to compel men, without further ado, to worship Him as God' (Kennedy, *EGT*, 'Philippians,' p. 437^{a}).

But the insuperable objection to this opinion is that the phrase expresses a pre-incarnate activity and not an incarnate one. The truth in this view is that 'equality with God' is regarded as a relation—a recognition of Divine equality from others —spiritual beings. Christ did not think of claiming this in heaven before His appearance on earth. The redemption of men being in view He on the contrary voluntarily determined to undertake it, and thereby did not snatch at this Divine recognition. In one word the self-humiliation of our Lord was first transacted on the theatre of His own Divine mind above before it was concretely manifested here below, and it was not simply a renunciation touching Himself only, but a renunciation in spite of a positive essential nisus that heavenly beings might in virtue of His nature have expected Him to have exerted. The Apostle no doubt argued from Jesus' earthly activity, but he naturally projects this activity into the pre-incarnate state. As His action was on earth so it was formerly in heaven. The Apostle in the expression οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ is not concerned with defending Christ from blame, but with commending Him as the transcendent moral Example. He might—at any rate, all others would—have exercised self-assertion: it was, as it were, His right. But He did not do so. The difficulties here are not those of formal logic, but the ever-present difficulties of visualizing eternal infinite activities in finite temporal categories. Then the second vision which the Apostle has of His Master is on earth. 'He emptied Himself by taking the form of a servant, being or becoming in human likeness, and being found in human guise, He still humbled Himself unto death—yea the Cross-death.' Here we have the Apostle's description of our Lord's incarnate life. What is involved in His self-emptying we cannot say. The 'how' of it is beyond our understanding, but the fact of it and its absolute moral value are full of force. The Apostle does not mean by 'the likeness of men' or 'in fashion as a man' that Jesus was less than human, but that He was truly human, tried by all experimental tests—yet more. The ἐκένωσεν ἑαυτόν is not physical annihilation but moral effacement. To discuss theologically the possible theories that have been used to explain this is not called for here. They are neither useless, however, nor futile, but due to an essential thought-impulse in us. The difficulties of theory must not obscure the glory of the fact to be explained. Milton has this passage in mind when he says:

> 'That glorious Form, that Light unsufferable,
> And that far-beaming blaze of Majesty,
> Wherwith he wont at Heav'n's high Councel-Table,
> To sit the midst of Trinal Unity,
> He laid aside; and here with us to be,
> Forsook the Courts of everlasting Day,
> And chose with us a darksom House of mortal Clay'
> (*On the Morning of Christ's Nativity*, 8–14).

Men saw Him here as they saw other men, subject to the limitations to which man as man is subject.

The third vision is the Exalted Christ—yet still the same Person, but now freed from earthly limitations, highly exalted, gifted with universal Lordship by God because of His obedience, possessing now the ineffable Name in recognizing which all are to worship to the glory of God the Father. The Apostle's view of the imitation of Christ is not a slavish copying of His earthly habits or actions but a possession of His Spirit as the spirit of humility and obedience to the will of God. This Lordship of Christ is central in St. Paul's teaching. It gives duty its obligation, for Christ is the law and light of the individual conscience. It supplies virtue with striving and sustaining power, guarantees it with the sure hope of ultimate success and reward in the day of Christ, the day when His Lordship shall be known and recognized. It supplies the good with its content, for the glory of the Lord—the riches of that glory—is the true inheritance and life of the saints. It gives moral judgment a norm and a finality, for the Lord is the ultimate Judge. It gives evangelism its programme of advance. It enforces sanctification because it sees in Christian men God Himself at work. It assures salvation. It gives life on earth a purpose and robs death of its terror and transforms suffering into a grace. The day of the full revelation of this Lordship is the day of Christ. Its date is not told, but it is near. The measurement used is the prophetic not the chronological. To the Apostle death means to be with the Lord—to see His face. There is no word here of a sleep of the saints (κοιμᾶσθαι). The coming of Christ means the transformation of the body of humiliation into the likeness of Christ's own body of glory, so that in contrast with that glorious life this life of striving, 'pent in the body,' is like death. Whether this happens immediately after death or after an interval is not said. St. Paul does not say that the Philippian community will be alive at Christ's coming, but he seems to regard it as a possibility (1^{10}).

For these reasons it is held by some that St. Paul changed his view of eschatology, that he gave up the idea of a κοιμᾶσθαι of the saints, and favoured the idea of immediate reunion with Christ after death (W. Beyschlag, *NT Theology*, Eng. tr., 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1895, ii. 267 ff.). The influence under which this change took place, according to this view, is the sure prospect of his own death. But many others had died in Christ before him, and it is impossible to think that St. Paul had not considered that question seriously. He is working with the resurrection of Christ Himself as the norm of his thinking on this subject as far as the case of Christians is concerned. He believes in a general resurrection for all (Ro 2^{8} 14^{10}, 2 Co 5^{10}), but for the Christian the Resurrection means a glorified body like to Christ's own, which shall be given him at Christ's coming. How he is clothed in the interval is not said. That St. Paul regarded this Parousia of Christ as near at hand is evident, but it is equally evident that he did not claim to know the date and that he did not lay stress on it. What is of value for practice and for hope is that 'Jesus Christ is Lord' and that 'He shall come.'

LITERATURE.—There is no attempt to give an exhaustive bibliography. For exegesis the following commentaries are useful: J. B. Lightfoot, *Philippians*^{4}, London, 1878; M. R. Vincent, *ICC*, 'Philippians and Philemon,' Edinburgh, 1897 (strong philologically); C. J. Ellicott, *Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon*^{5}, London, 1888; but especially E. Haupt, in Meyer's *Kommentar über das NT*^{7}, Göttingen, 1902, and H. A. A. Kennedy, *EGT*, 'Philippians,' London, 1903. The history of the exegesis before 1859 is given in B. Weiss, *Der Philipper-Brief*, Berlin, 1859; M. R. Vincent, *op. cit. supra*, p. xi ff., has a good select list. J. Moffatt (*LNT*, Edinburgh, 1911, p. 165^{a}) gives a very full list of commentaries since Calvin.

Homiletics and Theology:—R. Rainy, *Expositor's Bible*, 'Philippians,' London, 1893; H. C. G. Moule, *Cambridge Greek Testament*, 'Philippians,' Cambridge, 1897, *Philippian Studies*, London, 1897 (full of sympathetic insight); C. J. Vaughan, *Lectures on Philippians*^{2}, Cambridge, 1864, *Greek Text with Notes*, London, 1885; J. Eadie, *Commentary to the Ep. to the Philippians*, do., 1857 (still very useful); H. von Soden, *Der Brief des Apostels Paulus an die Philipper*, Freiburg i. B., 1889 (^{2}Tübingen, 1906).

There is a whole library on 2^{5-11}; see Meyer's *Kommentar*^{7} for list of earlier books. Note esp. E. H. Gifford, *The Incarnation*, London, 1897 (very thorough but explains terms too rigidly); A. B. Bruce, *The Humiliation of Christ*^{2}, Edinburgh, 1881; D. Somerville, *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, do., 1897, p. 188 f.; J. B. Lightfoot, *Philippians*^{4}, pp. 127–137; W. Weiffenbach, *Auslegung der Stelle Philipper*, 2^{5-11}, Karlsruhe, 1884; and indeed all commentaries.

For criticism a good account is given in R. A. Lipsius, in *Handkommentar zum NT*^{2}, Freiburg i. B., 1891; T. Zahn, *Introduction to the NT*, Eng. tr., 3 vols., Edinburgh, 1909, vol. i. (excellent); and the problems are luminously set and answered in J. Moffatt, *op. cit. supra*, p. 165 ff., where the literature is also given. J. Weiss, *Die Schriften des NT*^{2}, Göttingen, 1906–07, ii. 372–390, gives a good popular exegesis; see also *Exp*, 8th ser., vii. [1914] 481 ff., viii. [1914] 143 ff., 457 ff., ix. [1915] 235 ff., 481 ff.

D. MACKENZIE.

PHILO.—Philo of Alexandria, the Jew, a contemporary of the apostles, was so highly esteemed by early Christian theologians as to be counted among the Christian authors (Jerome, *de Vir. Ill.* 11), and his significance for the Apostolic Age is no less clearly recognized by modern scholars.

1. Life.—About the life of Philo we have only very scanty information; apart from occasional remarks in his own writings (in particular *in Flaccum* and *de Virtut. et Leg. ad Gaium*) one has to refer to Josephus, *Ant.* XVIII. viii. 1 [259 f.], and, for the background, to the papyri dealing with persecutions of the Jews in Alexandria.[*] The Rabbinical literature does not mention this Hellenistic leader of Alexandria.

Philo belonged to one of the noblest and wealthiest Jewish families of Alexandria. His brother Alexander was alabarch (or arabarch, *i.e.* in control of the custom-houses on the Arabian frontier), and he presented the magnificent brazen doors for the inner court of the Temple in Jerusalem (Jos. *BJ* V. v. 3 [205]). His nephew Tiberius Alexander took service with the Romans, and, renouncing his Judaism, became a high official; he was governor of Judæa before A.D. 48, and afterwards governor of Egypt. In 69–70, at the siege of Jerusalem, he was chief commander in Titus' headquarters (Jos. *Ant.* XX. v. 2 [100]; *BJ* II. xv. 1 [309], xviii. 7 [492]; IV. x. 6 [616]; V. i. 6 [45], xii. 2 [510]; VI. iv. 3 [237]). Philo had had the usual training of a Greek boy of good family: he had studied grammar, mathematics, music, and rhetoric; he had acquired a good knowledge of Greek literature and obtained a fairly profound philosophical education. His style is near to Attic classicism; he imitates Plato so much that people said: ἢ Πλάτων φιλωνίζει, ἢ Φίλων πλατωνίζει (Jerome, *de Vir. Ill.* 11): the one must have copied the other. But, in accordance with the prevailing literary taste, he uses any kind of style that may be appropriate to his purpose. He had also heard Jewish interpreters of the Torah, probably in the synagogue; and it seems as if, like other serious young men, *e.g.* Josephus and Seneca, he had entered into temporary retreat and held intercourse with ascetic circles in order to gain perfection in theosophy (*de Spec. Leg.* iii. 1 [ed. Mangey, ii. 299]). Incidentally he mentions a pilgrimage to Jerusalem (*de Providentia* [*ap.* Eus. *Præp. Evang.* VIII. xiv. 64]). In his later life he came into publicity much against his own desire. In consequence of the anti-Semitic riots at Alexandria under Flaccus, Philo, as the leader of a Jewish embassy, went to Rome to see the Emperor Caligula. His mission, according to his own report, was not successful. His opponent was the same Alexandrian littérateur, Apion, against whom Josephus wrote his two books.

---

[*] E. von Dobschütz, 'Jews and Antisemites in Ancient Alexandria,' *AJTh* viii. 4 [1904] 728–755.

From Eus. *HE* II. xviii. 8 one might infer that Philo remained at Rome until the time of Claudius (Jerome thinks rather of a second voyage), and that under the new régime Philo was honoured by the Senate, while his works (in particular *in Flaccum* and *de Legatione ad Gaium*) found a place in the public library. That Philo, while at Rome, met the apostle Peter (*ib.* xvii. 1) is a legend of the same kind as the legends of an exchange of letters between St. Paul and Seneca, or of relations between St. Luke or Mary Magdalene and Galen the famous physician. The papyri report, in the time of Claudius, a hearing of the Alexandrian anti-Semites against King Agrippa, but do not mention Philo.

Philo's significance does not rest so much upon his personality as upon his numerous writings. He represents a mode of thought evidently widespread at the time.

2. Works.—Philo is (1) an interpreter of Holy Scripture, (2) an apologist for Judaism. The earlier editions of his works contain a large number of individual treatises of which Eusebius (*HE* ii. 18) and Jerome (*de Vir. Ill.* 11) * give a long list. But it has been shown by Schürer, Massebieau, and Cohn that they fall into two or three groups. The first and largest deals with the Pentateuch under three heads: a short interpretation, a long allegorical commentary, and an exposition in systematic order (the second and third of these may be called, with O. Holtzmann, a kind of Midrash and Mishna). The second consists of philosophical tractates in dialogue form, probably belonging to the earliest period of Philo's literary activity. The third contains apologetic works of a later period. They may be tabulated as follows:

I. EXEGETICAL WORKS ON THE PENTATEUCH:

1. Questions and Answers, 6 bks. on Gen., 5 bks. on Ex. (preserved partially in Armenian and in Latin): short verbal interpretations with allegorical additions.

2. Legum Allegoriæ, i.–viii.: a scientific commentary on Gn 2–40.

i.–iii.	Gn 2^{1}–3^{19}
<iv.	3^{20-23}>
<v.> *de Cherubim*	3^{24}–4^{1}
<vi.> *de Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*	4^{2-4}
<vii. ?	4^{5-7}>
<vii. (viii.)> *Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat*	4^{8-15}
<viii. (ix.)> *de Posteritate Caini*	4^{16-25}

So far the commentary is continuous; the following are individual tracts:

de Gigantibus (2 bks.) (ii. = *Quod Deus sit immutabilis*)	6^{1-12}
<*de Fœderibus* (2 bks.)	9^{20}>
de Agricultura (2 bks.) (ii. = *de Plantatione Noë*)	
de Ebrietate (2 bks.) (ii. only fragments)	9^{21}
de Sobrietate	9^{24-27}
de Confusione Linguarum	11^{1-9}
de Migratione Abrahami	12^{1-6}
<*de Præmio*	15^{1}>
Quis rerum divinarum heres sit	15^{2-18}
de Congressu Eruditionis Gratia	16^{1-5}
de Fuga et Inventione (*de Profugis*)	16^{6-14}
de Mutatione Nominum	17^{1-22}
<*de Deo*	18^{2}>
de Somniis (5 bks.) (extant only iv. and v. = i., ii.)	28^{10-17} 31^{11-13} 37^{7-11} 40^{9-17} 41^{17-24}

Possibly some titles are wanting; some are tentatively put into the list in < >. Philo seems to have dealt only with selected passages from ch. 6 onwards.

3. Systematic delineation of the Law.

(*a*) *de Opificio Mundi.**

(*b*) The unwritten Law as represented by the lives of the Fathers.

Abraham	(virtue as acquired by learning)
<Isaac	(virtue as innate)>
<Jacob	(virtue as practised)>
Joseph	(*politicus*)

(*c*) The written Law.
de Decalogo
de Specialibus Legibus (i.–iv.)
i. *de Circumcisione*
de Monarchia i., ii.
de Præmiis Sacerdotum
de Victimis
de Victimas Offerentibus
ii. *de Septenario*
de Cophini Festo
<*de Colendis Parentibus*>
iii. *de Adulterio*
de Nece
iv. *de Judice*
de Concupiscentia
de Virtutibus
de Fortitudine
<*de Pietate*>
de Humanitate†
de Pœnitentia†
de Nobilitate
[*de Vita Contemplativa*]
de Præmiis et Pœnis
de Exsecrationibus

II. PHILOSOPHICAL TREATISES IN FORM OF DIALOGUES:
{ <*Quod omnis nequam servus*>
{ *Quod omnis probus liber*
de Providentia (2 bks.) (?)
Alexander vel quod rationem habeant bruta animalia.

III. APOLOGETICAL WORKS:
Vita Mosis (3 or rather 2 bks.)
Hypothetica (*i.e.* moral advices)
de Judæis (*apologia*)
de Virtutibus (5 bks.)
<i. *Introductio*>
<ii. *Sejanus, Pilatus*†>
iii. *in Flaccum*
iv. *de Legatione ad Gaium*
<v. *Palinodia*>

IV. WORKS OF DOUBTFUL ORIGIN:
de Vita Contemplativa
de Incorruptibilitate Mundi
de Mundo
Interpretatio Nominum Hebraicorum.

V. SPURIOUS WORKS:
de Sampsone
de Jona.

The text of Philo's works has come down to us in an extremely unsatisfactory condition, some tractates being specially unfortunate. As some treatises are known only from one MS, others may still await discovery; about some we know nothing but the title; of others we have only fragments; some are preserved only in Armenian or in Latin. It is entirely due to the Christian Church that Philo's works have been preserved. Cohn thinks he can prove that all our MSS go back to the famous library of Pamphilus at Cæsarea, or rather

---

[*] This later list has no value whatever; see C. A. Bernoulli, *Der Schriftstellerkatalog des Hieronymus*, Freiburg i. B., 1895, pp. 115 f., 182 ff. It was, however, translated into Greek, and thus came to be used by Suidas and Photius.

[*] In MSS and early editions this stands with the group I. 2; but, since Gfrörer, the above arrangement is generally adopted.

[†] Some critics, as, *e.g.*, Dähne, Gfrörer, Massebieau, would transfer these two pieces to the *Life of Moses* (see III.); but Wendland and Schürer have adduced strong reasons for keeping them in their present place.

to the work of the two presbyters Acacius and Euzoïus, who about A.D. 350 copied the papyrus rolls of this library into parchment books. This shows the importance of the indirect transmission by quotations in the works of early Church Fathers, as, *e.g.*, Eusebius and Ambrosius, and by *Catenæ* and *Florilegia*.

3. Religion.—'Philo the Jew'—that is his main characteristic. He is a faithful, nay an enthusiastic, adherent of Judaism, both as a nation and as a religion. He is an apologist of Judaism, trying to convert the heathen or at least to destroy their prejudices. He is a Jew in his strict monotheism, his faith in God's providence, and his high moral standard. As a Jew he is devoted to the Law and the Lawgiver. Most of his writings are given up to the glorification of the Law. Notwithstanding his allegorical interpretation, he firmly believes the biblical stories to be historically true; and he protests against the inference that the Law loses its claim to be observed in the letter once it is understood spiritually. Philo's position does not differ much in this respect from that of the Palestinian Rabbis. He knows and uses their Halākhā as well as their Haggādā. One may prove from his writings a close affinity between the Hellenistic and Palestinian parts of Judaism.

On the other hand, Philo is a typical Jew of the Diaspora. He feels as a Greek. To him Greek is his mother tongue; his Bible is the Greek translation of the Pentateuch. We do not know whether he knew Hebrew, or, if so, how much. His Judaism is weakened and enlarged; it has lost its strictness and national narrowness. In the former respect it is notable how little attention Philo pays to the Temple at Jerusalem (he never mentions the temple at Leontopolis in Egypt); he is concerned with the cultus only in so far as it is prescribed in the Law; the true sacrifice is prayer. Still more surprising is his neglect of the national hope. The Messiah is mentioned only occasionally (*de Præmiis et Pœnis*, xvi. 95 [ed. Mangey, ii. 423]; cf. *de Exsecr.* viii. 164 [ed. Mangey, ii. 435]). His religion has lost its national limitation: it has become a universal reasonable religion.

But Philo's religion has borrowed new features from Hellenism, as, *e.g.*, the notion of mystery (*i.e.* a hidden wisdom to be revealed only to the initiated [or, with Philo, the susceptible]), and the mystical ecstatic visions. True, there are examples of this in Palestinian Judaism (*e.g.*, the *Merkaba*, God's chariot in Ezekiel; for visions of Paradise cf. 2 Co $12^{2.4}$ and *Baba Ḥagiga*, xiv. 6), but these are exceptions; with Philo such things are the rule: all religion comes to perfection in the vision of God (*Quis rer. div. her. sit*, ed. Mangey, i. 508).

In *de Vita Contemplativa* Philo describes his own ideal; and it is of no consequence whether the ascetic circles there described really existed in Egypt or whether he is drawing an ideal picture. It is unnecessary and incorrect to think that Christian monks are in view, as the Fathers did, who praised Philo as the oldest authority for Christian monasticism; modern critics do the same even when they deny Philo's authorship of the treatise. From the existence of Essenes in Eastern Palestine known to Philo himself (*Quod omnis probus liber* and *Apologia pro Judæis* [*ap.* Eus. *Præp. Evang.* viii. 11]) we may infer how many possibilities there were in Judaism at this period.

4. Philosophy.—Philo was no prophet; he is interested not so much in religion as in philosophy. Philo the Jew has a place among the Greek philosophers. To be sure, he is not an original thinker. He belongs to the eclectics, deriving his notions from all the different schools and combining them. Sometimes, indeed, he does not go direct to the primitive sources but to selections.* The way, however, in which he combines Platonic, Pythagorean, Stoic, Aristotelian, and Sceptic elements is very significant—significant also for contemporary philosophy. Some elements Philo probably found already combined by Posidonius of Apamea, the leader of later Stoicism, in whose philosophy the religious element is very prominent. The characteristic feature with Philo is the combination with Jewish religion: as this rests on revelation, a certain character of authority alien to ancient philosophy is impressed upon Philo's speculations.

From Plato, whom he mentions next to Moses and with nearly equal reverence, Philo borrows the doctrine of the Ideas, combining them, however, with the Stoic doctrine of the Logos and the *logoi*, and clothing it in the form of the biblical doctrines of Wisdom and of angels (it is still disputed whether in this late Jewish theory, as well as in the Stoic theory, there is a reminiscence of polytheism, ancient gods being turned into divine attributes, or only a poetical mode of personification).† Platonic is the dualistic view of the world: spirit being strictly opposed to matter. With Philo, besides the one transcendental God, who rules over all without mixing in it, there stands a second Divine Being, the Logos, sometimes viewed as God's plan of the world, but more frequently as a personal creative being: he calls it a second God, God's firstborn son, or archangel, begotten, produced, created by God. This Logos is the maker of the world (Demiurge) and at the same time its preserver: He forms the cosmos by dividing, and sustains it by keeping it together. He is the mediator between God and man: revealing God to man, and protecting man against God through priestly intercession—a true paraclete. He guards and governs man, being the norm of his ethical behaviour. In this way the Logos is pre-eminent in all departments of philosophy and human life. From the Logos come the individual *logoi*, or Ideas or Angels. Entering the material world and forming it, they produce the visible cosmos. Matter is not created: it is eternal in the shape of an unformed substance (chaos). Creation means form-giving (cosmos).

From the Pythagoreans comes the symbolism of numbers, which finds ample support in the Pentateuch: God has ordered everything according to measure, number, and weight, as already in Wis 11^{20}. The *monas* (one) is the divine number, the *dyas* (two) the number of creature and of sin; the *trias* (three) is the number of the body; *tetras* (four) and *dekas* (ten) mean perfection, possible and real ($10=1+2+3+4$); five signifies senses, sensuality; there is no end of speculation on seven.

From the Sceptics Philo borrows the criticism of sense perception; their doubts at the same time are helpful for refuting Stoic fatalism, which is incompatible with the Jewish faith in God.

In ethics Philo accepts the doctrine of the four main virtues as proposed by Plato, and the Stoic principle of life according to nature; he discovers both in the Mosaic Law, which represents to him the true reasonable morality. But his religion inclines him towards asceticism: the ideal man is created sexless; sin arises when unity is split into male and female.

Complicated as this system may seem owing to its eclectic character, it appears to its author as a unity. And it is this unity which Philo finds represented in his Bible, *i.e.* in the Pentateuch, compared with which the books of the prophets, Psalms, and other books are of but secondary importance.

---

* P. Wendland, *Eine doxographische Quelle Philo's*, Berlin, 1897, pp. 1074–78.

† R. Reitzenstein, *Zwei religionsgeschichtliche Fragen*, Strassburg, 1901.

5. Philo as interpreter.—The most important point to note in Philo is his method of reading the above system into the Law of Moses or the Pentateuch by means of allegorical interpretation. He did not invent this allegorical method: he borrowed it from the earlier Stoics; but he makes the most ingenious use of it. The Rabbis of Palestine were no less skilful in finding their own thoughts in the biblical text by means of their interpretations. But Philo's allegory is of a different type. They try to extract from every word all that is possible; he has a complete philosophical system ready for combination with whatever words he is explaining. With the Rabbis one never knows what fresh and surprising combination will spring from their unlimited imagination. With Philo one can tell beforehand what result he will reach, if only one is familiar enough with his writings. It is, in fact, one and the same system all through; it is his philosophy, his doctrine of the Logos, that he finds everywhere; but the method of combination varies, and thus there is scope for ingenuity. Philo pays attention to every point in the text, even the smallest feature, and by skilful combination he always discovers fresh light. Long before Astruc he remarked the interchange of the two Divine names in the Law—'God' (θεὸς = Elohim) and 'Lord' (κύριος = Jahweh); he explains them as indicating the two main powers in God—goodness and might, the former creating and saving, the latter judging and punishing. He sees that there are two accounts of creation in Gn 1. 2: he understands the first of the ideal man. The use of the plural in Gn 1^{26} proves that there is a Logos beside God; he is the likeness of God; and it is after this likeness that man is formed. It is the Logos along with the two main powers of God which together appear to Abraham as three angels. The Logos is represented by Melchizedek; the manna and the water from the rock both represent the Logos. The two powers of God are represented by the two cherubim. Paradise, ark, tabernacle are representations of the world. Man himself is microcosmus. It is by his identifications in connexion with the manifold significance of the Logos that Philo's interpretation gains further variety by application to physical cosmology, to anthropological psychology, and to human ethics. This variety is not, however, thereby reduced to a system. By this method the Law is spiritualized, on the presupposition that nothing could be contained in it which would not be in harmony with the supreme thought of God. It would be unfair, according to Philo, to understand the laws regarding food literally, whereas, in the case of other laws, he tries to prove that even the literal meaning witnesses to practical wisdom, while the allegorical interpretation brings out the true philosophy. Philo does not approve of the polygamy of the patriarchs—he would prefer celibacy!—so he declares the wives to represent something spiritual: Hagar general culture (ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία), Sarah true philosophy: the wise man must have intercourse with both. Etymology of names is of course indispensable for this method of interpretation: the beginnings of the *Onomastica sacra* may be found with Philo, who almost always gives 'seeing God' as the meaning of the name when he speaks of Israel, or 'confession' when he mentions Judah.

It is owing to this method of interpretation that Philo had such an astonishing vogue in later centuries: almost all Christian writers of the early and mediæval Church followed in his footsteps, in particular the interpreters of the Alexandrian School, from the author of the so-called *Epistle of Barnabas* down to Cyril. There is but one difference: Christianity, while maintaining the underlying allegory, nevertheless insists upon the historicity of the facts; for it rests upon historical revelation. So Origen systematizes the various ways of applied interpretation, by means of the anthropological trichotomy: historical, moral, and mystical interpretation are combined in the Scripture as body, soul, and spirit are combined in man. Historical feeling, a prerogative of the Semitic race as compared with the Greeks, is still more predominant with the Antiochene School of interpretation: here typological interpretation is favoured. The result is another combination: the theory of the four-fold meaning of Holy Scripture. It was through Augustine that this theory entered the Western Church.

6. Philo's significance for the Apostolic Age.—The Fathers esteemed Philo as a witness in favour of early Christian monasticism; besides, they used his doctrine of the Logos and his method of interpretation for their Christological constructions. His influence is undeniable, from the apologists of the 2nd cent. onwards. It is open to question, however, how far his influence extended in earlier Christianity, *e.g.* on St. Paul and St. John, and in particular on the author of Hebrews. Former generations of critics, *e.g.* Gfrörer and the Tübingen School, made the mistake of taking Philo as the one exponent of Hellenistic thought. They did not realize that he was neither the only nor the earliest representative of a Jewish philosophy of religion. They did not know, nor could they, that non-Jewish Hellenism had produced something similar, and that it also influenced early Christianity independently. As for St. Paul, it is not Philo but at best his forerunner, the Book of Wisdom, that accounts for certain Hellenistic thoughts; but even this has not been proved (see, against, E. Grafe, 'Das Verhältnis der paulinischen Schriften zur Sapientia Salomonis,' in *Theologische Abhandlungen, C. von Weizsäcker zu seinem 70ten Geburtstage gewidmet*, Freiburg i. B., 1892, pp. 251–286; F. Focke, 'Die Entstehung der Weisheit Salomos,' in *Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, new ser., v. [1913] 113–126). Apollos, a certain Jew born at Alexandria, an eloquent man, mighty in the Scriptures (Ac 18^{24}), was not necessarily a pupil of Philo; there were other interpreters of the Scriptures at Alexandria besides him, as Philo himself mentions occasionally.* Hebrews after all shows more traces of Palestinian than of Alexandrian interpretation. In recent discussion the *Corpus Hermeticum* (or the writings collected under the name of Hermes Trismegistos) and Posidonius of Apamea are often referred to where scholars in former times would have referred to Philo. The prologue of the Fourth Gospel (Jn 1^{1-18}), treated for a long time by many scholars almost as a Philonean piece, is often interpreted now without any reference to Philo, by recurring immediately to the popular philosophy of the time. Thus Philo's importance is becoming less and less prominent, even with those scholars who are prepared to find foreign influence active in primitive Christianity. Nevertheless, Philo will always be a good witness to the amalgamation of OT religion with Hellenistic thought. He is not a source of but a parallel to the same mixture in early Christianity; and it is certain that he prepared the soil for its seed.

---

* In *de Abrahamo*, xx. 99 (ed. Mangey, ii. 15), he quotes φυσικοὶ ἄνδρες; in *de Josepho*, xxvi. 151 (ed. Mangey, ii. 63), τροπικώτερον ἀκριβοῦντες; in *de Circumcisione*, ii. 8 (ed. Mangey, ii. 211), θεσπέσιοι ἄνδρες οἳ τὰ Μωυσέως οὐ παρέργως διηρεύνησαν.

LITERATURE.—(1) Editions of Philo's works: T. Mangey, 2 vols., London, 1742; L. Cohn and P. Wendland, Berlin, 1896 (in course of issue, 6 vols.; 2 or 3 more to follow); C. E. Richter, 8 vols., Leipzig, 1823–30; Tauchnitz ed., 8 vols., do., 1851–53; J. R. Harris, *Fragments of Philo Judæus*, Cambridge, 1886; P. Wendland, *Neuentdeckte Fragmente Philos*, Berlin, 1891; F. C. Conybeare, *Philo about the Contemplative Life*, Oxford, 1895; Germ. tr. by L. Cohn and others, 2 vols., Breslau, 1909–10; Eng. tr. by C. D. Yonge, 4 vols., London, 1854–55.

(2) G. L. Grossmann, *Quæstiones Philoneæ*, Leipzig, 1829; A. Gfrörer, *Philo und die alexandrinische Theosophie*², Stuttgart, 1831–35 (=*Kritische Geschichte des Urchristentums*, i.); C. Siegfried, *Philo von Alexandria als Ausleger des Alten Testaments*, Jena, 1875; H. Windisch, *Die Frömmigkeit Philos und ihre Bedeutung für das Christentum*, Leipzig, 1909; J. Réville, *Le Logos d'après Philon d'Alexandrie*, Paris, 1877, *La doctrine du Logos dans le quatrième Évangile et dans les œuvres de Philon*, do., 1881; M. Heinze, *Die Lehre vom Logos*, Leipzig, 1872; A. Aall, *Der Logos*, do., 1896–99; T. Simon, *Der Logos*, do., 1902; H. J. Flipse, *de Vocis quæ est Λόγος significatione atque usu*, Leiden, 1902; L. Cohn, 'Die Lehre vom Logos bei Philo,' in *Festschrift Cohen* (*Judaica*, Berlin, 1912, pp. 303–331); E. Bréhier, *Les idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie*, Paris, 1907; M. Freudenthal, *Die Erkenntnislehre Philos von Alexandria*, Berlin, 1891; L. Massebieau, *Le classement des œuvres de Philon*, Paris, 1889; L. Cohn, 'Einteilung und Chronologie der Schriften Philos' (*Philologus*, Suppl. vii.), Leipzig, 1899; H. von Arnim, *Quellenstudien zu Philo von Alexandria*, Berlin, 1888; B. Ritter, *Philo und die Halacha*, Leipzig, 1879; P. Krüger, *Philo und Josephus als Apologeten des Judentums*, do., 1906; P. Heinisch, 'Der Einfluss Philos auf die älteste christliche Exegese,' *Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen*, Münster, 1908; E. Schürer, *GJV* iii.⁴ [Leipzig, 1909] 633–716; W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums*², Berlin, 1906, pp. 503–524.

E. VON DOBSCHÜTZ.

PHILOLOGUS (Φιλόλογος, a Greek name, common among slaves and freedmen and frequently found in inscriptions of the Imperial household).—Philologus is the first of a group of five persons 'and all the saints that are with them' saluted by St. Paul in Ro 16^{15}. Philologus is coupled with Julia (*q.v.*), and they may have been brother and sister or more probably husband and wife. If this be so, Philologus and Julia were perhaps the parents of 'Nereus and his sister and Olympas,' and this family were the nucleus of the Christian community which met under their leadership in their house (cf. the salutation to Prisca and Aquila, a married couple, 'and the church that is in their house' [vv.$^{3-5}$]; see, however, J. A. Robinson, *Ephesians*, 1909, p. 281). The relationship of Philologus to the persons mentioned also by name is, however, purely conjectural, as nothing further is known of any member of this group. Another group of five persons (none of whom are women) 'and the brethren that are with them' are saluted in the preceding verse, and it is reasonable to suppose that in each case the persons named were, by virtue of seniority as Christians, either leaders of a single ἐκκλησία, or heads (jointly if a married couple) of separate churches. The locality to which we shall suppose these churches belonged will depend upon whether we think the destination of these salutations was Rome or Ephesus.

T. B. ALLWORTHY.

PHILOSOPHY.—This word (φιλοσοφία = 'the love and pursuit of wisdom') is found only once in the NT (Col 2^{8}). But, as Christianity claims the whole realm of human thought and life as its sphere, it could not be indifferent to so important a subject. Nevertheless, the gospel is supremely a proclamation of salvation, and hence its relation to philosophy in apostolic days was incidental and dependent on special circumstances. Moreover, as Hatch points out, the majority of those to whom Christianity was preached were not concerned with philosophy, and the former appealed to a standard which the latter did not recognize (*Influence of Greek Ideas*, p. 124).

St. Paul's only recorded contact with philosophers occurred in Athens, where he met some Epicureans and Stoics (Ac 17^{18}). Unfortunately, nothing certain is known of this interview, though many believe that in his subsequent speech he showed friendliness towards the Stoics. In his Epistles several references are found to certain forms of 'wisdom' or philosophy. In 1 Co 1^{17}–2^{6} he asserts the superiority of the gospel ~~to~~ human wisdom, but the gospel wisdom was only for the mature. In the later Epistles to the Col., Tim., and Tit. he attacks false teaching of a philosophical nature. This insisted on some obsolete Jewish practices, inculcated 'a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels' (Col 2^{16-18}), and was concerned with fables and genealogies, knowledge 'falsely so called,' and asceticism (1 Ti 1^{4} $4^{1-4.\ 7}$ 6^{20}, Tit 1^{14} 3^{9}). Some suppose that we are here confronted with the Gnosticism of the 2nd cent., and that these writings belong to that period; but this is improbable. The ideas and practices condemned are partly Jewish, and the philosophy is in an undeveloped state. Nor does Essenism give us the clue, as it had not as yet extended so far. The errors are probably an amalgam of later Jewish speculations regarding an angelic hierarchy (cf. *Book of Enoch*) and the Oriental speculations which were at that time very prevalent in Asia Minor. The result was to endanger the purity and simplicity of faith in Christ, hence the Apostle's alarm.

The writer (or writers) of the Gospel of John and 1 John deals with the contention that Jesus Christ did not come 'in the flesh' (1 Jn 4^{1-3})—a theory which is perhaps to be attributed to Cerinthus, a contemporary of St. John.

The Epistles of Jude (vv.$^{4.\ 7.\ 10.\ 19}$) and 2 Peter ($2^{2.\ 10.\ 21.\ 22}$) denounce a specially obnoxious type of antinomianism. And from the description of the Nicolaitans in Rev $2^{6.\ 15}$ it is easy to perceive Docetism again, and probably an early stage of Gnosticism.

From these passages it appears that the writers of this period alluded to philosophy only when it was opposed to their teaching concerning Christ and the purity of the Christian life, and that in such cases it met with their uncompromising condemnation. See, more fully, artt. EPICUREANS, GNOSTICISM, STOICS, etc.

LITERATURE.—Comm. on Epp., etc., mentioned above, also artt. on same in *HDB*, *EBi*, *EBr*¹¹; artt. on 'Philosophy,' in *HDB*, Smith's *DB*; on 'Gnosticism' in *HDB*, *EBr*¹¹; on 'Gnosis' in *EBi*; on 'Wisdom' in *DCG*; P. Wernle, *Beginnings of Christianity*, Eng. tr., 1903–04; C. v. Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age*, Eng. tr., 1894–95; A. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, Eng. tr., 1894–99; E. Hatch, *Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church*, 1890; F. J. A. Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, 1894; A. C. McGiffert, *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, 1897; W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, 1895.

J. W. LIGHTLEY.

PHLEGON (Φλέγων, a Greek name).—Phlegon is the second of a group of five names (all Greek) of persons 'and the brethren with them' saluted by St. Paul in Ro 16^{14}, probably as forming a household church at Rome or Ephesus under the leadership of Asyncritus, the first mentioned (cf. the group saluted in v.^{15}, of which Philologus and Julia were perhaps the joint heads). Possibly all were greeted by the Apostle as leaders of the congregation by virtue of seniority as Christians. See artt. ASYNCRITUS, PATROBAS.

T. B. ALLWORTHY.

PHŒBE (Φοίβη, a Greek name).—Phœbe is a woman introduced by St. Paul to his readers in Ro 16^{1-2}, presumably as the bearer of the letter. She is not mentioned again in the NT, and nothing further is known of her than may be gathered from this reference. The name is that of the moon-goddess, the sister of Phœbus (Apollo). It is interesting to notice that a Christian woman in the Apostolic Age did not think it necessary to discard the name of a heathen deity. Two men among those saluted in Ro 16 also bore the name of a god (Hermes, v.^{14}; Nereus, v.^{15}). The martyrologies and inscriptions testify to a similar indifference at least in the first three centuries.

Phœbe is described (RV) as 'our sister, who is a servant of the church that is at Cenchreæ' (*τὴν ἀδελφὴν ἡμῶν, οὖσαν [καὶ] διάκονον τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Κενχρεαῖς*) and as one who 'hath been a succourer of many and of mine own self' (*αὐτὴ προστάτις πολλῶν ἐγενήθη καὶ ἐμοῦ αὐτοῦ*).

Cenchreæ (*q.v.*), a small town on the Saronic Gulf, was the eastern port of Corinth, about seven miles from the city. It is natural to suppose that the local church was founded during St. Paul's first visit to Corinth. At the close of his stay of eighteen months he sailed from Cenchreæ on his way to Syria (Ac 18[18]) and (unless the latter part of the verse refers to Aquila) before setting out he shaved his head, 'for he had a vow.' It was during his second (recorded) visit to Corinth that he wrote the letter containing Phœbe's introduction. A Jewish plot prevented him from sailing again from Cenchreæ, and he returned to Syria *via* Macedonia (20[3]).

We shall suppose that Phœbe herself was sailing eastward from Cenchreæ or westward from Lechæum, the port on the Corinthian Gulf, according to the view we take of the probable destination of Ro 16 (or vv.[1-2], detached by some scholars from the rest of the chapter). If these verses are an integral part of the Epistle to the Romans, the letter which Phœbe carried was this most important of the apostolic letters and her journey was to Rome. The Imperial post was not available for private correspondence, and such a letter could be sent only by special messenger or by a trusted friend who happened to be travelling. St. Paul bespeaks for Phœbe not only a welcome 'in the Lord' but assistance 'in whatsoever matter she may have need' (*ἐν ᾧ ἂν ὑμῶν χρῄζῃ πράγματι*). If *πρᾶγμα* bears here its common forensic sense (1 Co 6[1] [G. A. Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, Eng. tr., 1901, p. 233]), business at the law-courts necessitated for her a visit to Rome (E. H. Gifford, 'Romans,' in *Speaker's Commentary*, iii. [1881] 231), and the Apostle, hearing of her projected journey, seized the opportunity of writing and dispatching his letter. The impossibility, however, of determining the object of Phœbe's journey from the use of *πρᾶγμα* may be illustrated by Mt 18[19]. The 'matters' in which she would require assistance might well have been connected with the church, and indeed she may have been specially sent to Rome by St. Paul, charged with the duty of 'reinforcing and supplementing the Apostolic message' with which she was entrusted (G. Milligan, *Thessalonians*, 1908, p. 130). If, on the other hand, Ro 16[1-21] (or [1-23]) was addressed to the Church at Ephesus, Phœbe's destination was that city. According to some scholars who hold this opinion, these verses are only a part of a letter the remainder of which has been lost. Others regard them as forming a complete letter of recommendation (2 Co 3[1]), written expressly for the purpose of introducing Phœbe, whatever her errand may have been, to the persons greeted in it (C. von Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age*, Eng. tr., i.^{2} [1897] 381), among whom, it may be noted, were a number of Christian women. Such letters were a characteristic feature of the Apostolic Church, as were the frequent journeys which necessitated them and the generous hospitality which they called forth. They were a protection against impostors and false teachers. They formed one of the strongest bonds which held together the separate and scattered Christian communities. The verb used by St. Paul (*συνίστημι δὲ ὑμῖν Φοίβην*) is the regular technical term in classical Greek and in the Greek of the papyri for introductions by letter. If we suppose that Phœbe was commissioned by the Apostle to visit the Ephesian Christians, we may perhaps find in the warning which he included in the letter (vv.[17-20]) the reason for her mission.

That Phœbe was evidently preparing to travel alone suggests that she was a widow (Conybeare-Howson, *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, new ed., 1877, ii. 189 n.). The term *προστάτις* indicates that she was a woman of means. *Προστάτις* is the fem. of *προστάτης*, in its strictly legal sense the wealthy and influential citizen who acted as representative and guardian of the *μέτοικοι* ('resident aliens') and others who had no civic rights. It corresponds to the Latin *patronus*. The term is not found again in the NT nor does it occur in the LXX. It was, however, in use to denote the 'patrons' of the pagan religious societies, 'who were frequently ladies of rank and wealth' (T. M. Lindsay, *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries*, 1902, p. 124 n.). It is closely related to the terms *προϊστάμενος* and *προεστώς*, applied to leadership in the Church in 1 Th 5[12], Ro 12[8], 1 Ti 5[17]. Descriptive of Phœbe's relation to 'many,' presumably at Cenchreæ (perhaps at Corinth also), *προστάτις* must mean at the least that, in a special degree made possible by her circumstances, she discharged the duties of 'communicating to the necessities of the saints' and of 'pursuing hospitality,' which belonged to all Christians alike (Ro 12[13]). Gifford (*op. cit.* p. 231) conjectures that the personal reference ('and of mine own self') may be to an illness in which Phœbe ministered to St. Paul at Cenchreæ, and that his recovery was the occasion of his vow. Certainly we may assume that she received him into her home when he visited or passed through Cenchreæ (cf. Lydia at Philippi, Ac 16[15. 40]), and that she 'mothered' him as did the mother of Rufus (Ro 16[13]). The house in which the Apostle stayed naturally became a centre for the community, and if it was also used as the meeting-place of the church (cf. Gaius at Corinth, 'my host and of the whole church,' Ro 16[23]), the owner must have been looked up to as a kind of 'president,' to whom the term 'patron' might suitably be applied. In some such way as this Phœbe devoted herself and her means to the service of the Church, and earned thereby the title of *διάκονος*, which no more means 'deaconess' in the later sense than it means 'deacon' when used to describe Apollos, Tychicus, Epaphras, Timothy, or the Apostle himself. The case of Phœbe may not be cited as evidence of the inclusion of women in the technical diaconate. With that of Prisca and others, it witnesses to the very important part played by women in the organization of the Church before informal ministries had given place to definite offices, and when rule and leadership were based only upon willingness to 'serve' (cf. the household of Stephanas at Corinth, 1 Co 16[15-16]). Parallel with the term *διάκονος* is the term *ἀδελφή* (F. J. A. Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, 1897, p. 208, where the *καί* is said to be 'almost certainly genuine'). 'Brother' and 'sister' in the NT simply mean 'fellow-Christian.' St. Paul uses the term here and calls Phœbe 'our' sister, *i.e.*, ours and yours, to remind those to whom he would introduce her that all Christians, whether personally acquainted or not, are already members of the same great spiritual family, of which God is Father and Jesus Christ the Elder Brother, and that they only need to be made known to one another to realize their close relationship in mutual love and helpfulness.

T. B. ALLWORTHY.

PHŒNICIA (AV 'Phenice,' *Φοινίκη*).—Phœnicia, the coast-land between Mt. Lebanon and the Mediterranean Sea, was about 120 miles in length and rarely more than 12 in breadth. It presented to the eye a succession of hills and valleys, well-watered and fruitful; and it had the best harbours in the whole Syrian coast-line. It became the home of one of the great civilizations of the ancient world, achieving success chiefly owing to the skill of its people in the art of navigation, 'in which the Phœnicians in general have always excelled all nations' (Strabo, XVI. ii. 23). The OT (like Homer) styles them 'Sidonians,' from the name of their principal town (Jg 3^{3}, Dt 3^{9}, etc.). They established colonies and commercial agencies all along the Mediterranean, and exerted a great influence on Western culture. From the time of Alexander the Great onward, the country was one of the stakes in the chronic warfare between the Seleucids and the Ptolemys. In 65 B.C. Pompey made Syria-Phœnicia a Roman province under a proconsul or proprætor. He did not, however, deprive of autonomy the ancient cities of Tyre and Sidon, or the recently founded Tripolis. For centuries the people had been gradually adopting the language, manners, and customs of Greece. 'From the beginning of the imperial period the sole rule of Greek is here an established fact' (T. Mommsen, *The Provinces of the Roman Empire*, Eng. tr., 1909, ii. 122).

No detailed account is given in the NT of the introduction of Christianity into Phœnicia, but hints are not wanting. The dispersion which followed Stephen's death brought travellers thither, 'speaking the word to none save only to Jews' (Ac 11^{19}). St. Paul and Barnabas at the end of their first missionary tour 'passed through Phœnicia and Samaria, telling the whole story (*ἐκδιηγούμενοι*) of the conversion of the Gentiles' (15^{3}). At the end of the third journey St. Paul sailed for Phœnicia and spent a week among 'the disciples' of Tyre (21^{2-6}; see TYRE and SIDON). It should not be forgotten that many Phœnicians had come to Galilee to hear Christ Himself (Mk 3^{8}), that He returned their visit by going into 'the borders of Tyre and Sidon' (7^{24}), and that He expressed the conviction that the people of this country could have been more easily moved to repentance than those of the most highly favoured cities of His native land (Mt 11^{21}).

Phœnicia continued to flourish under the Romans, but ceased to have any political importance, and gradually lost its national identity. The conflict between the old and the new civilizations lasted long, and down to the 2nd cent. A.D. Greek and Phœnician characters sometimes appear together on coins, while Latin was the language of government and law. In the end, however, it was neither of the Western tongues, but Aramaic, that displaced Phœnician, which was still spoken in North Africa till the 4th or 5th century. The fragmentary writings of Philo of Byblos—of the time of Hadrian—contain an interesting attempt to trace the mythology of Greece to that of Phœnicia, which was itself largely Babylonian.

LITERATURE.—F. C. Movers, *Die Phönizier*, 1841–56; G. Rawlinson, *Phœnicia*, 1889; G. Maspero, *Histoire ancienne des peuples de l'orient*^{4}, 1886; E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Alterthums*, 1884 ff.; W. von Landau, *Die Bedeutung der Phönizier im Völkerleben*, 1905; K. Baedeker, *Palestine and Syria*^{4}, 1906.

JAMES STRAHAN.

PHŒNIX (Φοίνιξ).—When the lateness of the season made it dangerous for an Alexandrian cornship, which had lain weather-bound for 'much time' in Fair Havens, to continue her voyage to Italy, the question of a wintering-place arose (Ac 27^{12}). Following the advice of the majority (*οἱ πλείους*), who had the experts—the captain and the ship-master ('owner' [RV] conveys a wrong idea)—on their side, and disregarding that of St. Paul, who thought it would be more prudent to remain where they were, the centurion, who was the senior officer in an Imperial corn-ship, decided to make a run for the haven of Phœnix in order to winter there. Taking advantage of a soft south wind, they set sail, but had no sooner rounded Cape Matala, and entered the Gulf of Messara, than they were caught by a hurricane, which drove them far out of their course and ultimately wrecked them on the coast of Malta. The harbour which they thus failed to reach has to be identified from data supplied by ancient geographers and modern navigators.

Strabo says: 'Then there is an isthmus of about 100 stadia [the narrow part of Crete to the west of Mt. Ida], having the settlement of Amphimalia on the northern shore, and Phœnix of the Lampeans on the southern' (X. iv. 3). Ptolemy names a harbour, Phœnikous, and a town, Phœnix, on the S. coast (III. xvii. 3); and Hierocles (*Synecdemus*, 14) speaks of Phœnix as near Aradena, which still retains its name, while Stephanus Byzantinus makes Aradena synonymous with Anopolis ('Upper City'), a name which is now attached to ruins slightly farther north. As Aradena is a little over a mile, and Anopolis about 2 miles, from the harbour of Loutró, the latter is naturally identified with the haven of Phœnix. It is on the east side of the neck of land which ends in Cape Muros. Captain Spratt maintains that it is 'the only bay to the westward of Fair Havens in which a vessel of any size could find any shelter during the winter months' (J. Smith, *The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*^{4}, 1880, p. 92); and G. Brown, the discoverer of Lasea, also convinced himself that Phœnix 'is the only secure harbour in all winds on the south-coast of Crete' (*ib.* p. 261). Brown found at Loutró an inscription of the time of Trajan, containing a record of some work done by the crew of a ship which evidently wintered in the haven. The inscription contains the words *gubernator* and *parasemum*, corresponding to *κυβερνήτης* and *παράσημον*, which are used by St. Luke (Ac 27^{11} 28^{11}).

But there is a serious objection to the proposed identification. St. Luke describes the harbour of Phœnix as *βλέποντα κατὰ λίβα καὶ κατὰ χῶρον* (Ac 27^{12}). This is one of the most discussed phrases in Acts. If it is translated 'looking toward the south-west and north-west' (AV), it is quite inapplicable to Loutró, which opens eastward. It would verbally fit the Bay of Phenika, on the other side of the promontory, facing the west; but navigators deny that this affords any shelter worthy of the name of haven. The RV translates the phrase 'looking north-east and south-east,' *i.e.* in the direction to which the S.W. and N.W. winds blow—looking *down* these winds. No satisfactory parallel to such an idiom is found in any ancient writer, and it is difficult to imagine an educated Greek expressing his meaning in that manner; still it is possible that St. Luke is faithfully reproducing the peculiar language of men of the sea. Conybeare and Howson (*The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, new ed., 1877, ii. 400) note that 'sailors speak of everything from their own point of view, and that such a harbour does "look"—*from the water towards the land which encloses it*—in the direction of "south-west and north-west."' It is surmised by W. M. Ramsay (*St. Paul the Traveller*, 1895, p. 326) that as St. Luke never saw the harbour in question, but merely described it from hearsay, he may have received the wrong impression that it looked N.W. and S.W.

JAMES STRAHAN.

PHRYGIA (Φρυγία).—Phrygia, the land of the Phryges, was the western part of the central plateau of Asia Minor. Its boundaries were vague and varying. At one time it extended from the Ægean to the Halys, and from the mountains of Bithynia to the Taurus, but it was gradually contracted on every side. To the early Greeks Phrygia was the home of a heroic and conquering race, who have left in the country drained by the upper Sangarius many astonishing monuments of their greatness.

> 'In Phrygia once were gallant armies known
> In ancient time, when Otreus filled the throne,
> When godlike Migdon led his troops of horse'
> (Hom. *Il.* iii. 185 f.).

But to the later Greeks and the Romans Phrygia was politically unimportant, and the once illustrious names of Midas and Manes were given to Phrygian slaves. The Kimmerian inundation in the 7th cent. broke the spirit of the race, who sank into a state of peaceful indolence, disturbed only by fits of wild religious excitement. Their land became an easy prey to every spoiler, and in 278 B.C. the Gauls took possession of N.E. Phrygia, which was henceforth known as Galatia. Attalus I. of Pergamos (241–197 B.C.) seized the territory in which lay the towns of Kotiaion and Dorylaion, and which was thereafter called 'Acquired Phrygia' (*Phrygia Epictetus*). In the S.E. was Iconium (*q.v.*), which the natives continued to regard as Phrygian, while Roman writers assigned it to Lycaonia. In the S. was Pisidian Phrygia (Ptol. V. v. 4) or Phrygia towards Pisidia (πρὸς Πισιδίᾳ [Strabo, xii. pp. 557, 566]), the most important town of which was called Antioch towards Pisidia; but as Pisidia gradually extended northwards this Antioch ceased to be Phrygian and was called Pisidian Antioch (*q.v.*). Only in the S.W. did the Phrygians show any sign of expansion. Hierapolis was apparently once Lydian, and Laodicea Carian; but in the Roman period all the cities of the Lycus Valley were regarded as Phrygian. 'The Gate of Phrygia' was below the junction of the Lycus and Mæander; Polemon of Laodicea was known as 'the Phrygian'; and 'Phrygian powder' was a Laodicean preparation.

In the Roman provincial system of government Asia Minor was cut and carved with but little regard for old national and historical distinctions. While the eastern part of Phrygia (with Iconium) and the southern (with Pisidia) were attached to the province of Galatia, the western part, which was much the larger, was included in the province of Asia. The former was called Phrygia Galatica and the latter Phrygia Asiana.

Phrygia was traversed by the great route of traffic and intercourse which joined the Ægean with Syria and the Euphrates. Along this line the early Seleucids planted a series of Greek cities for the defence of their Empire and the diffusion of Hellenic culture. Here the Greek language gradually displaced the Phrygian, which was 'perhaps similar in character to the Armenian' (T. Mommsen, *The Provinces of the Roman Empire*, Eng. tr., 1909, i. 328), but the latter continued to hold its ground in the rural districts down to the 3rd cent. of our era. A striking feature in the life of these cities was the presence of Jews in large numbers.

Their status is indicated by Josephus (*Ant.* XII. iii. 1). 'The Jews also obtained honours from the kings of Asia, when they became their auxiliaries; for Seleucus Nicator made them citizens of those cities which he built in Asia . . . and gave them privileges equal to those of the Macedonians and Greeks, who were the inhabitants, insomuch that these privileges continue to this very day.' Antiochus the Great (223–187 B.C.) 'thought proper to remove 2000 families of Jews, with their effects, out of Mesopotamia and Babylon' to Lydia and Phrygia (XII. iii. 4).

In these Hellenistic cities the Jews relaxed their strictness so much that the orthodox counted them degenerate. There is a bitter saying in the Talmud to the effect that the baths and wines of Phrygia had separated the 'Ten Tribes' from the brethren (A. Neubauer, *La Géogr. du Talmud*, 1868, p. 315). This very liberalism, however, probably made the reaction of the Jews on their environment all the greater, and St. Paul found in the cities of Phrygia numerous proselytes, whose minds proved the best soil for the seed of the evangel. The case of Timothy of Lystra, the son of a Greek father and a Jewish mother, uncircumcised and yet acquainted from his childhood with the Scriptures, was probably typical.

Phrygia was one of the first parts of Asia Minor to be generally Christianized. Not a few Christian monuments of the 2nd cent., and very many of the 3rd, have been found in the country. Eusebius (*HE* viii. 11) says that in the time of Diocletian there was a Phrygian city in which every single soul was Christian. The enthusiasm with which the pagan Phrygians were in the habit of throwing themselves into the worship of Cybele re-appeared in the Phrygian type of Christianity, which gave birth to Montanism with its spiritual ecstasies and prophetic visions.

For the difficult phrases *τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν* (Ac 16^{6}) and *τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν* (18^{23}) and the rival theories of the North and South Galatians see GALATIA, and GALATIANS, EPISTLE TO THE, § 5.

LITERATURE.—C. Ritter, *Die Erdkunde von Asien*, 1822–59; W. M. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, 1893, p. 74 f., *St. Paul the Traveller*, 1895, p. 194 f., *Hist. Com. on Galatians*, 1899, *The Cities of St. Paul*, 1907; G. and A. K. Körte, *Gordion*, 1904; C. v. Weizsäcker, *The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church*, Eng. tr., 1894–95, i. 273 f.; A. C. McGiffert, *A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, 1897, p. 235; J. Moffatt, *LNT*, 1911, p. 93 f.

JAMES STRAHAN.

PHYGELUS.—Phygelus is mentioned with **Hermogenes** in 2 Ti 1^{15} as among the disciples in proconsular Asia who had turned away from (*i.e.* repudiated) the writer, afraid or ashamed to recognize him (being a prisoner), and are thus contrasted with Onesiphorus (*q.v.*). The pseudo-Dorotheus of Tyre makes both Phygelus and Hermogenes to belong to the seventy disciples, and the former to be a follower of Simon Magus and afterwards bishop of Ephesus, and the latter bishop of Megara. In the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, Demas and Hermogenes are named as Paul's fellow-travellers, full of hypocrisy, when he fled from Antioch to Iconium and enjoyed the hospitality of Onesiphorus.

W. F. COBB.

PHYSICIAN.—Our sources of knowledge of Greek medicine and physicians are (1) works of ancient physicians; (2) notices of early writers concerning Greek medicine and physicians, as Plato, Aristotle, Plutarch, Pausanias, and Galen; (3) various medical instruments in the great museums of Athens, Berlin, Paris, and London, such as knives, probes, needles, balsam cups; (4) inscriptions and papyri; (5) altars, temples, and caves; (6) images of gods and votive offerings.

Our earliest account of Greek medicine and physicians is in the Homeric poems. There were two sources of disease—supernatural, referred to the wrath of gods, as plague and melancholia; and natural, as from drugs or wounds. Already physicians were called demiurges and were recognized as public servants. The most famous were Asklepios and his two sons. According to Homer and Hesiod, Asklepios was a Thessalian prince who had learned from Cheiron about drugs. Later, Apollo was assigned as his father, and a snake became the symbol of his healing power. His two sons—'the cunning leeches'—were Machaon, to whom he taught surgery, and Podaleirios, to whom he taught medicine, which he himself preferred. Homer said, 'a physician outweighs many other men' (*Il.* xi. 514). Drugs were used for poison, charms, soothing pain, and healing wounds. Battles were occasion for many bodily injuries and became an incentive for medical and surgical tact. Anatomical knowledge was slight, and was gained from sacrificial victims and from those wounded in battle.

There was no connexion between priests and medical men; only as priest was Calchas summoned during the plague. Women, as Helen and Agamede, had medical knowledge.

The cult of Asklepios flourished widely in Greece and Asia Minor. In the traditions concerning him, that which associated him with Epidauros finally prevailed. Shrines were dedicated to him; one might even call these *asklepia* hospitals, *Heilstätte.* Of these there were more than 300 at Athens, Cnidos, Cos (the ruins of which have been uncovered within the last few years), Delphi, Pergamos, Rhodes, and Troezen. They were usually situated in salubrious places, on mountain-sides, by pure fountains or streams, by mineral or hot springs. They were cared for with fastidious cleanliness. None could get the benefit of them without preliminary rites—shampooing, baths, friction, fasting, abstinence from food and wine; nor were religious rites of an impressive character, including music, overlooked. Those who were to be treated were shown votive offerings and inscriptions of those who had been healed. To the divinity there was the sacrifice of a goat or ram, a cock or hen, accompanied by fervent prayer for succour. In an attitude of intense expectancy the sufferer slept in the *abatons* near the statue of Asklepios on a bed, or in the neighbourhood of the temple on a skin of the sacrificial victim, where, as he fell into a deep slumber, the divinity awaited him. Whatever of surgery was applied, as of binding or anointing, was probably performed by temple attendants, whom the patient's dream identified with supernatural power. Theurgy was thus joined to natural means of cure. The death of a patient was attributed to his lack of confidence. In the *asklepia* were case-books left by the patients which recorded symptoms, treatment, and result.

Gymnasia existed in Greece before the Asklepiadæ began to practise medicine. These provided three orders of service: the director-gymnasiarch; the subordinate who had charge of pharmacy with reference to the sick; those who gave massage, put up prescriptions, bled, dressed wounds and ulcers, and reduced dislocations. Gymnasts by reason of their experience were often called in to treat injuries, dislocations, or fractures before the arrival of the physician. Naturally the influence of these men increased. They were of special use where baths, dietaries, and physical manipulations were indicated.

In addition to the priests and the gymnasts, there were earlier Asklepiadæ—hereditary physicians whose medical art was handed down from father to son. Later, promising youths from outside were trained for this practice. Physicians were put in charge during epidemics, gave expert testimony in courts, accompanied armies and fleets, and practised at places provided at public expense. Anatomy was learned from oral and written tradition, from sacrifices and domestication of animals, injuries in the gymnasia, from bodies long exposed to the elements or to wild animals, and from dissection of wild animals. Many gatherers and distillers of roots and herbs set themselves up in business. Druggists also with various remedies claimed the curative worth of their prescriptions. There were survivals of folk-medicine. Women practised as midwives, when they were past the age of child-bearing. They treated diseases which it was not proper for men to know or for women to divulge to men. Some of these announced themselves as 'beauty' doctors.

The chief centres of medicine were Cyrene, Crotona, Cnidos, and Cos—the last the home of the dogmatists. Pythagoras (born *c.* 575 B.C.), founder of a gild at Crotona, appears to have studied the structure of the body and reproduction, but knew very little of surgery, advocated poultices and salves, inculcated dietetic and gymnastic practices, and advised a limited amount of meat but no fish or beans. The Pythagoreans were the first to visit their patients at home; they also went from city to city, and thus gained the name of ambulant physicians. Following Pythagoras, whose order was dissolved by law about 500 B.C., were Alkmaion of Crotona, who from his dissection of animals was reported to be the first Greek anatomist, and Demokles (*c.* 520 B.C.), the first physician of whom we have a reliable account. He migrated from Crotona to Ægina, where he was made medical officer with a salary of one talent (about £240) a year. Later, at Athens, he received £406; later still, at Samos under Polykrates, £480. Afterwards, taken captive and brought to the court of Dareios, he cured the king of a sprained ankle and treated his gum for mammary abscess.

Particular occasion for the rapid advance in Greek medicine is contact with Egypt and the East, knowledge of drugs, rivalry of centres of culture, and separation of the priestly class from medicine.

An account of the history of physicians in general would be incomplete without at least a cursory reference to the great philosophers of the 5th and 4th centuries B.C. They furnished the philosophy on which physicians often based their theories of disease. Aristotle (384–322 B.C.), descended from a long line of physicians, investigated anatomy, embryology, and physiology, and for the first time held that animal life is spontaneous movement. Anaxagoras of Clazomenæ (*c.* 555 B.C.) practised dissection of animals and even dissected the brain. Empedokles (490–430 B.C.) followed Pythagoras, and also professed magical powers of healing. He resolved all conditions into warm, cold, moist, and dry; held the doctrine of the four substances, fire, air, water, and earth, to which he assigned a soul—hylozoism. Love and hate rule development and dissolution. At Selinos and Agrigentum he put an end to two pestilences by seeking for and remedying the natural causes. He discovered the labyrinth of the ear.

The name, however, which stands out above all others in the history of Greek medicine is that of Hippokrates. Born at Cos about 460 or 459 B.C., son of Herakleides, his descent was traced on his father's side from Asklepios, on his mother's from Herakles. He was the second of seven of this name. He was a contemporary of Pheidias, Perikles, Sophokles and Euripides, Thukydides, Praxiteles and Zeuxis. Plato assigned him a place alongside of Pheidias and Polykleitos. Aristotle called him 'the Great,' Galen, 'the Divine'; and from that day to this he has been acclaimed 'the Father of Medicine.' Of the writings attributed to him in the *Corpus Hippocraticum*, it seems impossible to decide which portions are genuine, and which belong to an earlier or later period. They form, however, a tolerably compact body of writings, and for 2,000 years have turned attention away from speculation to observation, and thus have profoundly influenced the medical ideal. So far as his character can be made out from these treatises and from tradition, he was a man of great genius and noble character, with an unsullied regard for his art, his patients, and his pupils. The peculiarities of his system may be summarized. (1) He followed Empedokles in holding to the four elements and the four conditions, but added the four humours—black bile, yellow bile, blood, and phlegm. He recognized no supernatural cause of disease: 'none is more divine or human than another,' and 'none arises without a natural cause.' (2) He held a theory of *crises* or critical days. Diseases pass through three stages to a climax; the crude humours are 'cooked,' and finally resolved, either being excreted or causing death. Sometimes nature eliminates the disease by sweating or vomiting, sometimes the physician aided by bleeding, or administering purgatives and diuretics. (3) To *physis* and *dynamis*, which is really the *vis medicatrix naturæ*, in distinction from the power of the gods, all recovery is referred. 'Natural powers are the healers of disease.' The task of the physician is to observe the progress of the disease, to interfere, direct, divert. 'Nature suffices for everything under all conditions.' (4) *Prognosis* is recommended for securing and retaining the esteem of others, for freeing the physician from blame which might arise, and as an aid towards effecting a cure through its appeal to expectancy. By prognosis is meant a complete knowledge of the patient together with the tendency of the disease. 'The best physician is the one who is able to establish a prognosis, penetrating and exposing, first of all at the bedside, the present, past, and future of his patients, and adding what they omit.' An essential aspect of his practice was appeal to suggestion in the patient. One-eighth of the entire *Corpus Hippocraticum* is occupied with the subject of prognosis. (5) Hippokrates emancipates medicine from all but practical aims. In his hands it was freed from theurgy and speculation, and placed on a secure empirical basis, not that of casual observation, but of taking account of all facts which have bearing on the case. He left forty-two histories of clinical cases, twenty-five of which cases issued fatally—a practice almost wholly neglected for 2,000 years until the 17th century. His treatises on 'Fractures' and 'Dislocations' have been claimed as the ablest works ever written by a physician. A Hippokratic maxim runs, 'Life is short, art is long, opportunity fleeting, experiment fallacious, and judgment difficult.' He laboured under serious limitations. Naturally he had no knowledge of either elementary and physiological chemistry or of bacteriology; he took no account of pulse, temperature, respiration, or analysis of urine. Owing to customary reverence for bodies of the dead, autopsies were unknown, unless indeed a criminal or a traitor may have furnished material, and anatomical knowledge, apart from that concerning bones, had to be derived from dissecting animals, from sacrificial animals, and surgical cases. Two significant designations have survived: 'Hippokratic succession,' and *Facies Hippocratica*.

The Hippokratic Oath is herewith given:

> 'I swear by Apollo, the physician, by Asklepios, by Hygeia, by Panakeia, and by all gods and goddesses, that I will fulfil religiously, according to the best of my power and judgment, the solemn vow which I now make. I will honour as my father the master who taught me the art of medicine; his children I will consider as my brothers, and teach them my profession without fee or reward. I will admit to my lectures and discourses my own sons, my master's sons, and those pupils who have taken the medical oath; but no one else. I will prescribe such medicines as may be best suited to the cases of my patients, according to the best of my judgment; and no temptation shall ever induce me to administer poison. I will not give to a woman an instrument to procure abortion. I will religiously maintain the purity of my character and the honour of my art. I will not perform the operation of lithotomy, but leave it to those to whose calling it belongs. Into whatever house I enter, I will enter it with the sole view of relieving the sick, and conduct myself with propriety towards the women of the household. If during my attendance I happen to hear of anything that should not be revealed, I will keep it a profound secret. If I observe this oath, may I have success in this life, and may I obtain general esteem after it; if I break it, may the contrary be my lot.'

The other school of medicine in Greece, the Cnidian—empiric—were adepts in clinical examinations, auscultations of the chest, and gynæcology. They were, however, handicapped by lack of anatomical and physiological knowledge. They employed analogy of men with cosmic, vegetable, and animal existence. The two chief physicians were Euryphon and Ktesias. Euryphon described pleurisy as affection of the lungs, explained the cause of disease as insufficient elimination of waste products, and hæmorrhage as from the arteries as well as from the veins, contrary to the general opinion. He was probably influential in compiling the *Cnidian Sentences*. Ktesias (after 398 B.C.), for seventeen years a prisoner at the Persian court of Artaxerxes Mnemon, showed a general interest in poisons, and wrote a book on hellebore.

In the Alexandrian era under the Ptolemys medicine was transplanted from Cos and Cnidos to Alexandria. As a literary and commercial centre it offered great attractions. Here was one of the largest libraries of the world, with 600,000 MSS, and here philosophers of all sects had established themselves. Commerce brought from all quarters a vast supply of new medicaments. Interest in botany, zoology, and mineralogy flourished. Physical discoveries were made which could be pressed into the service of medicine. At the beginning of the 3rd cent. B.C. the collection of books attributed to Hippokrates had been brought together and edited by scholars commissioned by the Ptolemys; other medical MSS also invited study. Patients from many quarters were attracted by the treatment offered by Greek, Jewish, and Egyptian practitioners. Fresh inquiry had opened up a deeper interest in diagnosis, pharmacology, and toxicology. Anatomy received an impulse hitherto unknown. Not only animals but cadavers were dissected; vivisection was reported as performed on criminals. The Ptolemys encouraged and even themselves engaged in dissections. Objects exhumed in Pergamos disclose the accuracy of anatomical knowledge. In Alexandria medicine was divided into surgery, dietetics, and rhizotomy or pharmacy.

Two names stand out in this period (*c.* 300 B.C.). Herophilos of Chalcedon in Bithynia, one of the most distinguished physicians of antiquity, followed closely the methods of Hippokrates. With him anatomical science may be said to have had its beginning; he investigated the brain, the nerves, the eye, the vascular system, the liver; he named the duodenum. He first regarded the nerves as the organs of sensation, and first operated for cataract by extracting the crystalline lens. He made use of the amazing number of new drugs available by commerce. He practised venesection freely. He taught obstetrics and wrote a book for midwives. 'The most perfect physician is he who distinguishes between the possible and the impossible.' Erasistratos of Julis, of the island of Ceos, son of a physician, left the court of Seleucus Nicator and went to Alexandria, where he wrote on fevers, paralysis, hygiene, and therapeutics. He was an anatomist, and described the brain as seat of the soul and centre of the nerves, distinguished the cerebrum from the cerebellum, and gave the trachea its name; disease was 'plethora'—an overfilling of the vessels of the body with alimentary matter, giving rise to fever. He opposed venesection.

By reason of the special conditions of the time, toxicology exerted a powerful fascination over very many experimenters in Asia Minor. Krateros at the court of Mithridates VI., Eupator, a rhizotomist, Mithridates himself, Nikandros of Colophon, dealing with animal and vegetable poisons, cultivated and experimented with various toxic agents.

Greek physicians and midwives made their appearance in Rome in the 3rd. cent. B.C. Pliny, writing in the 1st. cent., said that for 600 years Rome had been without physicians. The Romans were a sturdy race and had had little occasion for the physicians who flourished elsewhere; in this respect they were behind all other civilized peoples.

Sickness was referred to supernatural agencies. The cult of Asklepios was transferred to Rome in 291 B.C., and the worship was with 'superstitious rites and ceremonies.' Every function of life was presided over by a divinity; therapeutic agencies were magical, through sin-offering, invocations, omens, and the like. There was no scientific medicine. In his *Natural History* Pliny devotes many pages to a description of the ancient popular medicine, a crude empiricism mingled with fantastic and superstitious formulæ; but even he makes no distinction between scientific and purely traditional domestic methods. Medicine was partly in the hands of priests, and partly consisted of popular practice and rough surgery. Votive offerings of bronze and alabaster disclose the limitations in Etruscan anatomical knowledge. Gymnastic assistants in Greece came to Rome and set up in the practice of their profession. Other Greek arts had come to Rome, but owing to Roman prejudice medicine lagged behind. Archagathos was among the first, although not the first Greek physician, as Pliny states (*HN* xxix. 6), to come from the Peloponnesos; he arrived in 219 B.C. Extraordinarily successful, and at length emboldened by his fame, he undertook so many serious cases of cutting and burning that he was dubbed 'carnifex' and driven from the city. Later, Asklepiades of Prusa (Bithynia), born about 124 B.C., reconciled the Romans to Greek medicine. An adherent of atomism, he won the favour of the influential Epicureans at Rome. He rejected the Hippokratic axiom that nature is the healer of disease; often nature does not help but even hinders recovery. His principal significance lay in therapeutics; he relied mainly on diet, hygiene, and physical and medical treatment.

In 49 B.C. all Greeks, and therefore Greek physicians, were made freedmen by Julius Cæsar. This action led to two results: it increased the number of Greek physicians in Rome, and it gave them a prestige which they had not before enjoyed. In his *Natural History* (xxix. 8) Pliny wrote that those who adopt the Greek language in their prescriptions, no matter what their pretensions, nor how serious the peril, are fully believed. For a century and a half after 25 B.C. a galaxy of Greek physicians practised in Rome, all of whom were natives of Asia Minor. Themison of Laodicea (born *c.* 50 B.C.), founder of the methodic sect, sought for the symptoms of disease with a common sign, in distinction from Asklepiades, who inquired after the cause. He recognized only three forms of disease—rigidity or congestion, relaxation, and a combination of these two with one or other condition preponderating. The treatment was to relax for congestion, to constrict for relaxation. Prophylactic measures were also practised. He was the first to make use of leeches. The strict methodists conceded neither specific disease nor specific remedies, and disallowed such medicines as purgatives, emetics, diuretics, and emmenagogues. The school increased rapidly, since it was so easy to complete the preparation. Thessalos of Tralles in Lydia announced himself as able to train physicians in six months. Among his pupils were smiths, dyers, and cobblers. He dedicated to Nero his writings, in which he treated of diet, chronic disease, and surgery. He taught his pupils at the bedside of his patients. Scribonius Largus (*c.* A.D. 47) dedicated to Claudius, whom he had accompanied on an expedition to Great Britain, a collection of 271 formulæ for treatment of every portion of the body, from head to foot. These were in part from Greek sources, and in part from secret remedies got by bribery from physicians and quacks at health resorts; some were popular, others magical and fantastic. He was the first to describe the method of abstracting opium and of applying electricity for severe headache. Dioskurides of Anazarba near Tarsus in Cilicia, perhaps a contemporary of Pliny, simplified pharmacology, relieving it of all superstitious remedies, and wrote the first book on this subject, *Περὶ ὕλης ἰατρικῆς*, in A.D. 77 or 78. This consisted of five books, and included the three kingdoms. He also wrote on poisons and antidotes, and on poisonous beasts. He was familiar with all the plants of Arabia and Asia Minor, and in a single book he describes these with such exactitude that they have been identified by modern botanists. To him we owe descriptions of ginger, pepper, gentian, aloes, and wormwood, and also metallic agents such as quicksilver, acetate of lead, and copper oxides. A. Cornelius Celsus, not indeed of Greek birth, drew all his inspiration from Greek sources. Probably not a practising physician, not perhaps even medically trained, he wrote in the first half of the century eight books on medicine, including diet and hygiene, general and special pathology, and surgery. Particularly famous are his descriptions of lithotomy, operation for cataract, and obstetrics.

In the middle of the 1st cent. there arose a new school, the Pneumatics, who would explain all diseases by reference to 'vital air'; pneuma takes the place of humours in disease and health. The school was founded by Athenaios of Attaleia in Pamphylia. He paid much attention to air, water, food-stuffs, influence of different climates on health, exercise, baths, mineral waters, dietetics rather than drugs. For the sake of its value in sexual development he advocated physical as well as mental training for youth. Women were to find in their domestic and social activity a means of health. Archigenes of Apamea in Syria completed the study of the pulse, wrote on drugs, especially hellebore. He was skilful as a surgeon and pharmacologist. In therapeutics he made use of amulets for their value in suggestion. He was not above preparing hair-dye for ladies of high rank. He operated for cancer and used the vaginal speculum. Aretaios (at the close of the 1st cent.) was equalled only by Hippokrates in the description of diseases and in the principles of therapy. For the most part he advocated mild remedies, and held that even if the patient were hopelessly and protractedly ill, the duty of the physician toward him was not relaxed. Rufus of Ephesus, who also practised medicine in the reign of Trajan, was educated at Alexandria. He derived his anatomical knowledge from the dissection of monkeys. Soranos of Ephesus, who received his medical and anatomical training in Alexandria, was the most famous obstetrician of antiquity. One learns from him what were the most approved methods of practice in this department of medicine. In him the methodic school culminated.

If Luke was a physician (Col 4^{14}), as Harnack has adduced strong reasons for maintaining (*Lukas der Arzt*, Leipzig, 1906, p. 122 ff., Eng. tr., *Luke the Physician*, London and New York, 1907, Appendix, p. 175 ff.; cf. W. K. Hobart, *The Medical Language of St. Paul*, Dublin, 1882; T. Zahn, *Einleitung in das NT*, Erlangen, 1897–1900, ii. 435 ff., Eng. tr., *Introduction to the NT*, Edinburgh, 1909, iii. 160 ff.), and, further, if Luke was a Greek either of Antioch or of Antiochian descent, he may have had such training as was characteristic of Asia Minor at that time.

LITERATURE.—Hippokrates, *Genuine Works*, Eng. tr., London, 1849; Edward Meryon, *The History of Medicine*, do., 1861; H. E. Handerson, *Outlines of the History of Medicine and the Medical Profession*, New York, 1889; T. Puschmann, *History of Medical Education*, Eng. tr., London, 1891; A. Harnack, *Medicinisches aus der ältesten Kirchengeschichte*, Leipzig, 1892; Edward Berdoe, *The Origin and Growth of the Healing Art*,

do., 1893; J. Pagel, *Einführung in die Geschichte der Medicin*, Berlin, 1898; Max Neuburger and J. Pagel, *Handbuch der Geschichte der Medizin*, Jena, 1901–05; Roswell Park, *An Epitome of the History of Medicine*, Philadelphia, 1906; Max Neuburger, *Geschichte der Medizin*, Stuttgart, 1906; J. S. Milne, *Surgical Instruments in Greek and Roman Times*, Oxford, 1907; W. M. Ramsay, *Luke the Physician*, London, 1908; David Allyn Gorton, *The History of Medicine*, New York, 1910; J. E. Sandys, *A Companion to Latin Studies*, Cambridge, 1910, p. 715 ff. C. A. BECKWITH.

PILATE, PONTIUS.—The name of the Roman procurator of Judæa, Samaria, and Idumæa (A.D. 26–36), whose part in the crucifixion of Jesus is recounted in the Gospels, occurs four times elsewhere in the NT, and always in reflexions upon that event. Its first mention (Ac 3^{13}) is in the speech of Peter after the healing of the lame man at the Temple gate. There the emphasis is laid upon the sin of the Jews in denying Jesus and delivering Him up to Pilate, of whom it is said, in exoneration, that he was determined to let Him go. Some extenuation of their guilt, however, is found in the fact that they sinned in ignorance; and, as God has glorified Jesus and made their wickedness to serve the fulfilment of His purpose in Him, the hope of pardon is presented to them. With this reference may be taken that (Ac 13^{28}) in Paul's address at Antioch in Pisidia, which somewhat resembles the earlier speech of Peter. Here, while the same view is taken of the Divine significance of Christ's death and its fulfilment of prophecy, the sin of the Jews is not so strongly insisted upon, and on the other hand a less favourable conception of Pilate's action seems to be implied. Of the Jews it is only asserted that, though they found no cause of death in Jesus, yet they desired Pilate that He should be slain; to Pilate no determination to release Him is ascribed, or even a disinclination to yield to their request. The Jews accused Christ wrongly through not understanding their own Scriptures; Pilate, so far as appears, callously put Him to death at their bidding. His guilt is accentuated in the remaining reference to him in Acts (4^{27}). The context is a prayer of the early believers on the release of Peter and John from prison, which proceeds upon a Messianic interpretation of Ps 2 and its application to the death of Christ. Pilate is represented as a ruler of the earth who conspired with King Herod (Lk 23^{12}), the Gentiles, and the people of Israel against the Lord's Anointed. Again his action is conceived as overruled by God for His own purpose; but his guilt is neither extenuated nor left to be inferred. It is explicitly stated and regarded as consisting, not merely in the sacrifice of an innocent person, but in an act of rebellion against God. This view of Pilate's conduct, with regard to Christ, probably prevailed in the inner circles of the gospel, since it found expression so early in the intimacy of their religious fellowship. It would be strengthened by the appearance of Divine retribution in the disgrace that befell Pilate in A.D. 36, when he was recalled to Rome at the instigation of Vitellius, and in later years would help to mould the legends that gathered round his name. The last mention of him in the NT (1 Ti 6^{13}) is unimportant, so far as he is concerned. It is an allusion to Christ's virtual confession of His Messiahship in Pilate's presence, when He claimed to be a king. D. FREW.

PILGRIM.—See STRANGER.

PILLAR.—The pillar (*στύλος*) is the symbol of stability and firmness, that which upholds and sustains. Its figurative use is confined to the NT, in the following passages.

1. Gal 2^9.—*Ἰάκωβος καὶ Κηφᾶς καὶ Ἰωάνης, οἱ δοκοῦντες στύλοι εἶναι*, 'James and Cephas and John, they who were reputed to be pillars.' *στύλοι*, which was used quite commonly as a descriptive title for the great Rabbis, here refers to those already mentioned (Gal 2^2) 'who were of repute'—the recognized leaders, and (v.^{6}) 'those who were reputed to be somewhat'—considerable persons, 'those who are the great authorities with you Galatians now' (Ellicott, *in loc.*).

2. 1 Ti 3^{15}.—*ἥτις (sc. οἶκος) ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία θεοῦ ζῶντος, στύλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα τῆς ἀληθείας*, 'which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground (stay) of the truth.' *ἑδραίωμα* is *ἅπαξ λεγ.* in both classical and NT Greek. 'House of God' in the OT denoted, in the first place, the Temple, and then, by metonymy, the covenant people—*familia Dei*. Here it stands for the congregation of believers among whom God dwells. Hort (*The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 172 ff.) renders, 'a household of God, which is an Ecclesia of a living God, *a* pillar and stay of the truth,' and contends that the absence of the article is *not* immaterial, and says, in opposition to the rendering in the RV: 'There is no clear evidence that the rare word *ἑδραίωμα* ever means "ground" = "foundation." It is rather, in accordance with the almost universal Latin rendering *firmamentum*, a "stay" or "bulwark." St. Paul's idea then is that each living society of Christian men is a pillar and stay of "the truth" as an object of belief and a guide of life for mankind, each such Christian society bearing its part in sustaining and supporting the one truth common to all' (cf. *ExpT* viii. [1896–97] 471). The reference would then be to the local Church of Ephesus. But a large body of interpreters favour the rendering of the AV and the RV—the whole society of believers, the Church universal, is regarded as the ground and stay of the truth (cf. J. Strachan, *Westminster NT*, 'The Captivity and the Pastoral Epistles,' London, 1910, p. 218). The Church is first pictured as a house, inhabited by a living God, and then, by a quick change of metaphor, is described as *στύλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα*, holding up the truth, the saving truth of the gospel. Attempts have been made to avoid the mixture of metaphor by referring 'pillar' and 'stay' to Timothy himself. But, though there is no insuperable objection to this, it is not needful. 'There is no intolerable mixture of metaphors in speaking of Christians first as a house and then as a pillar, any more than in speaking of any one as both a pillar and a basis. In 1 Ti 6^9 we have the covetous falling into a *snare* and hurtful lusts such as *drown* men' (A. Plummer, *Expositor's Bible*, 'The Pastoral Epistles,' London, 1888, p. 131 n.).

3. Rev 3^{12}.—*ὁ νικῶν ποιήσω αὐτὸν στύλον ἐν τῷ ναῷ τοῦ θεοῦ μου, καὶ ἔξω οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃ ἔτι*, 'He that overcometh, I will make him a pillar in the temple (sanctuary) of my God, and he shall go out thence no more.' The letter to the Church of Philadelphia 'gives the pledge of safety from the hour of trial, of steadiness like the pillar of a temple, of everlasting guarantee against disaster and eviction, of exaltation above the enemies who now contemn and insult. . . . It was always in dread of the last *hour of trial*, and was always *kept from* it. It stood like a pillar, the symbol of stability and strength' (Ramsay, *The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia*, p. 411 f.). The history of Philadelphia does not belie the splendid promise made to its church. It stood like a pillar against the troubles of the times, and a bulwark of civilization. The town is still largely Christian (cf. *EBi* iii. 3692). 'Philadelphia alone has been saved by prophecy, or courage. . . . Among the Greek colonies and churches of Asia, Philadelphia is still erect, a column in a scene of ruins: a pleasing example that the paths of honour and safety may sometimes be the same' (E. Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, vii.^{2} [1902] p. 27).

It has been said that among the few ruins of Philadelphia there are four strong marble pillars standing in one spot, and on the sides of these pillars inscriptions are found. W. M. Ramsay (*op. cit.*) traces in the promise to this church suggestive references, which, he thinks, a Philadelphian could not fail to discover, *e.g.* to the disasters and earthquakes common to the district: 'he that overcometh shall never again require to go out and take refuge in the open country. The city which had suffered so much and so long from instability was to be rewarded with the Divine firmness and steadfastness.'

Augustine (quoted by R. C. Trench, *Commentary on the Epistles to the Seven Churches in Asia*^{3}, London, 1867, p. 188) says: 'Quis non desideret illam civitatem, unde amicus non exit, quo inimicus non intrat?'

The majority of commentators, followed by the RV, take the name as written upon the victor and not on the pillar (the metaphor being dropped), but De Wette adopts the latter rendering, so that *στῦλοι* become also *στῆλαι*. As to the inscription itself, Ramsay (*op. cit.*) contends that there are not three names, but one 'which has all three characters, and is at once the name of God, the name of the Church, and the new name of Christ.'

LITERATURE.—F. J. A. Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, London, 1897; W. M. Ramsay, *The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia*, do., 1904; P. Brooks, *The Candle of the Lord*, do., 1881, p. 60 f.; C. J. Ellicott, *NT Commentary*, 1884, *in loc.*

W. M. GRANT.

PIPE, FLUTE (*αὐλός*, from *αὐεῖν* 'to blow').—The word and its cognate forms appear five times in the NT. Two of these have been noted under art. MINSTRELS, where it is pointed out that *αὐλητής* in Mt 9^{23} is translated 'minstrel' and in Rev 18^{22} 'piper,' though in each case the RV has the more correct 'flute-player.' *αὐλός* and *αὐλούμενον* occur in 1 Co 14^{7}: '. . . whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction in the sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or harped?' By this musical illustration St. Paul expounds his teaching regarding the apostolic gift of speaking with tongues. *αὐλέω* occurs in Mt 11^{17} and its parallel in Lk 7^{32}: 'we have piped unto you, and ye have not danced. . . .'

The three traditional wind instruments of Hebrew music (which must guide us in a discussion of the instruments of the Apostolic Age) were the flute, horn, and trumpet; and of these the flute was most often used. From very early days the 'peaceful flute' had an important part in the observance of Jewish ritual. As we learn from Is 30^{29}, it was played during the procession to the Temple of the pilgrims who kept the Feast of Tabernacles, and its use at other national festivals can be proved. On the more domestic occasions of rejoicing, such as marriages and dances, the flute-player was also considered necessary for their proper celebration; and Mt 11^{17} shows that the musical accompaniment of festivity was continued in NT times. But the flute was also the characteristic instrument in the ritual of mourning. Evidence of this may be found in the literature of most ancient nations. Amongst the Romans the *designator* and his *lictores* made the *tibicines* and other musicians take the forefront of the funeral processions. As Ovid, in *Fasti* vi. 657 ff., wrote:

> 'Temporibus veterum tibicinis usus avorum
> Magnus, et in magno semper honore fuit.
> Cantabat fanis, cantabat tibia ludis,
> Cantabat mæstis tibia funeribus.'

In Jer 48^{36} there is allusion to funereal flute-playing, and there were minstrels, as we have seen, at the raising of Jairus' daughter (Mt 9^{23}). In the time of Christ even the poorest households provided flute-players at the funerals of their dead. Perhaps the best instance of this use of the flute is given by J. Wellhausen in his Appendix to *Psalms* (Haupt's *PB*, 1898, p. 219), where he cites the Jewish lamentation at the fall of Jotapata as recorded in Josephus, *BJ* III. ix. 5.

When we attempt to describe these flutes, we must not think of the modern keyed flute introduced by Theodore Boehm, but of something much more primitive. Yet there were in the earliest times several distinct varieties of flute-like instruments which roughly correspond to the *flûte à bec* and the *flûte traversière*. These were made of reed and wood, though in later times bone and ivory were used; and they varied in length as in the number of their finger-holes. Ancient monuments, Egyptian and Assyrian, have representations of the long flute blown at one end—a type that has developed into the flageolet—and of the kind that had a lateral hole near the end of the instrument. Double flutes are also depicted, *i.e.* a variety that consisted of two fairly long tubes united at the one mouthpiece, which probably made possible notes of considerable compass.

It cannot be said with certainty which types are represented by the חָלִיל and the עוּגָב of the Jews. According to tradition, the latter was in the form of a Pan's pipe.

ARCHIBALD MAIN.

PISIDIA (*Πισιδία*).—Pisidia was a rugged and mountainous country in the south of Asia Minor, bounded on the N. by Phrygia, on the S. by the coast-land of Pamphylia, on the W. by Lycia, and on the E. by Isauria. Its length from W. to E. was about 120 miles, and its breadth 50 miles. It was a land of beautiful lakes—Limnai, Caralis, Ascania, and others—and of torrents growing into rivers—the Cestrus, the Eurymedon, and the Melas—which discharged themselves into the Pamphylian Sea. The semi-savage Pisidians, wholly untouched by the Hellenizing influences which were gradually affecting the other Anatolian races, had their homes in the upper valleys and strong fastnesses of this secluded region. Strabo (XII. vii. 1–3) gives details which enable us to realize their life. 'Among the summits of Taurus is a very fertile tract capable of maintaining many thousand inhabitants. Many spots produce the olive and excellent vines, and afford abundant pasture for animals of all kinds. Above and all around are forests containing trees of various sorts.' The mountaineers were 'governed by hereditary chieftains,' and followed 'a predatory mode of life,' carrying on a continual warfare with the kings to the N. and the S. of their territories.

The task of subjugating them was at first entrusted by the Romans to Amyntas, a brave and capable Galatian officer whom Mark Antony made king of Galatia in 36 B.C. His work was advancing towards success, when he lost his life in an expedition against the Homonades, to the W. of Lycaonia (25 B.C.). The Romans themselves were then obliged to complete the task of reducing the refractory highlanders. About 6 B.C. Augustus established a series of garrison towns on the flanks of Pisidia and Isauria. Supplying Antioch with veterans and re-organizing it in Roman fashion, he built one military road to connect it with the *coloniæ* which he planted in Olbasa, Comama, and Cremna for the control of the western region, and another to join it with Parlais and Lystra, which were intended to hold the eastern tribes in check.

'The newly-founded towns remained indeed unimportant, but still notably restricted the field of the free inhabitants of the mountains, and general peace must at length have made its triumphal entrance also here' (T. Mommsen, *The Provinces of the Roman Empire*^{2}, Eng. tr., 1909, i. 337).

In St. Paul's time Pisidia formed part of the province of Galatia. In his first missionary journey he traversed this wildly picturesque region (Ac 13[14]), then comparatively settled, but still by no means free from 'perils of robbers' (see 2 Co 11[26]). His route through it can only be conjectured. Conybeare and Howson (*The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, new ed., 1877, i. 204) think that he chose the steep pass leading from Attalia to Lake Ascania (*Buldur Göl*). W. M. Ramsay (*The Church in the Roman Empire*, 1893, p. 19) holds that 'the natural, easy, and direct course is along one of the eastern tributaries of the Cestrus to Adada.' On the return journey St. Paul and Barnabas 'passed through Pisidia' (*διελθόντες τὴν Πισιδίαν*, Ac 14[24]), a phrase which, according to Ramsay, implies that some missionary work was attempted on the way. But it must have been difficult to get into touch with mountain tribes who did not know the Greek language, and apparently no church was founded in this part of Roman Galatia till a much later date. Yet a trace of the journey seems to be found in the name of *Kara Bavlo*—the modern equivalent of 'Paul'—which is borne by the ruins of Adada. It is impossible to decide whether the name is based upon a genuine tradition or is merely a conjecture hazarded after the town was Christianized, but the latter supposition is perhaps the more likely. In a forest about 1 mile S. of Adada stand the ruins of a church of early date. The modern town, 5 miles S. of the ancient site, is also called *Bavlo*.

In A.D. 74 Vespasian transferred a great part of Pisidia to the new double province of Lycia-Pamphylia. The name Pisidia was gradually extended northward till it included most of Southern Phrygia. Thus Antioch, which in St. Paul's time was not strictly 'Pisidian' (though St. Luke so describes it in Ac 13[14]) but only 'Antioch towards Pisidia' (*Ἀντιόχεια, ἡ πρὸς Πισιδίᾳ* [Strabo, XII. viii. 14]), was at a later time correctly designated 'Antioch of Pisidia' (*τῆς Πισιδίας*; so the TR of Ac 13[14], following the Codex Bezæ, which reflects the usage of the 2nd century).

The mountainous parts of the country are to-day inhabited by Karamanians who are as wild and rapacious as the Pisidians of two thousand years ago.

LITERATURE.—C. Lanckoronski, *Les Villes de la Pamphylie et de la Pisidie*, 1890; W. M. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*^{5}, 1897, p. 18 ff.

JAMES STRAHAN.

PIT.—See ABYSS.

PITY, COMPASSION.—The noun 'pity' occurs only once in the AV of the NT (Mt 18[33], RV 'mercy'), and once in RV (Ja 5[11]). The adjective 'pitiful' occurs in AV (Ja 5[11] and 1 P 3[8], RV 'tender-hearted'). The Greek equivalents for these words are *ἐλεεῖν* (*ἐλεᾶν*), *εὔσπλαγχνος*, *πολύσπλαγχνος*. The word 'compassion' is of much more frequent occurrence, being represented in the following 21 passages of the two versions: Mt 9[36] 14[14] 15[32] 18[27] 20[34], Mk 1[41] 5[19] (RV 'mercy') 6[34] 8[2] 9[22], Lk 7[13] 10[33] 15[20], Ro 9[15], Ph 2[1] (AV 'mercies'), Col 3[12] (AV 'mercies'), He 5[2] (RV 'bear gently') 10[28] (AV 'mercy') 10[34], 1 Jn 3[17] (AV 'bowels'), Jude [22] (RV 'mercy'). The adjective form 'compassionate' occurs in 1 P 3[8] (AV 'having compassion'). The Greek words corresponding to these are *σπλάγχνα*, *σπλαγχνίζεσθαι*, *οἰκτείρειν*, *οἰκτιρμός*, *ἐλεεῖν* (*ἐλεᾶν*), *συμπαθής*, *μετριοπαθεῖν*. It should be noted that the noun *σπλάγχνα* is found in the original with different translations in the following cases: Lk 1[78] ('tender mercy'), 2 Co 6[12] (AV 'bowels,' RV 'affections'), Ph 1[8] (AV 'bowels,' RV 'tender mercies'), Philem [7. 12. 20] (AV 'bowels,' RV 'heart'). The noun *οἰκτιρμός* occurs in Ro 12[1] ('mercies'), 2 Co 1[3] ('mercies'), the adjective *οἰκτίρμων* in Ja 5[11] (RV 'merciful,' AV 'of tender mercy'). *ἐλεεῖν* and *ἔλεος* occur numerous times with the standing translation 'to have mercy,' 'mercy.' *συμπαθεῖν* occurs in He 4[15] ('to be touched with the feeling of').

Of these several Greek words *μετριοπαθεῖν* may be left out of account, since in the one passage where it occurs (He 5[2]) it has nothing to do with compassion. It signifies literally 'to have a medium-emotion.' While this may be in contrast to utter lack of sympathy, the context in our passage compels us to understand it in contrast to excess of indignation against sin. Hence RV has the correct rendering 'who can bear gently,' whereas AV, 'who can have compassion,' translates the word as if it were equivalent to *συμπαθεῖν*.

The other words are distinguished in their meaning as follows: *σπλαγχνίζεσθαι* is from *σπλάγχνα* = the *viscera nobilia* of the chest (heart, lungs, liver, spleen). This word denoted in classical Greek the seat of all violent passions, and the passions themselves, but the Hebrew רַחֲמִים for which the LXX *σπλάγχνα* is the equivalent, stands only *sensu bono* for the seat of the tender affections and then for the affections themselves. Both in classical and in biblical Greek, therefore, *σπλάγχνα* covers more than 'compassion.' Tittmann (*de Synonymis in Novo Testamento*, p. 68) is quite correct in claiming this wider sense for Lk 1[78] and Col 3[12], where *σπλάγχνα* is the generic concept, which is more specifically determined by the genitives *ἐλέους* and *οἰκτίρμων*. We may add Ph 2[1], where *σπλάγχνα* and *οἰκτιρμοί* are co-ordinated ('bowels and mercies'). *σπλάγχνα* is also used in a general sense in 2 Co 6[12] 7[15], Philem [7. 12. 20]. The verb *σπλαγχνίζεσθαι* seems to be a coinage of the later Greek. It does not even occur in the LXX except in the active form *σπλαγχνίζειν* in 2 Mac 6[8] = 'to eat the inwards.' Its specific sense in the NT is that of a strong inward movement of sympathetic feeling aroused by the sight of misery. The notion of intentness upon affording relief remains in the background, much more so than in *ἐλεεῖν*. From this strong emotional colouring of the word is to be explained the fact that in the Gospels it does not occur in the appeals addressed by suffering persons or their friends to Jesus, except in Mk 9[22], where the critical nature of the case necessitates an appeal to the profoundest compassion of Jesus. In ordinary cases the appeal naturally employs the word in which the impulse to help is most clearly connoted, and this is *ἐλεεῖν*. To express the strength and inward character of the feeling the English versions often render 'to be moved with compassion,' but neither AV nor RV consistently (cf. the two versions in Mt 20[34] and Mk 6[34]). The verb is predicated both of God (Jesus) and of man. Its object is not merely physical but also spiritual distress (cf. Mk 6[34], Mt 9[36] with 14[14]). *Ἐλεεῖν* and *ἔλεος* are distinguished from *σπλαγχνίζεσθαι* by the implication of the intent to help. The same difference exists between *ἐλεεῖν* and *οἰκτείρειν*, the latter being the word that in classical Greek comes closest to *σπλαγχνίζεσθαι*. So far as the element of feeling is concerned, both *σπλαγχνίζεσθαι* and *οἰκτείρειν* are stronger words than *ἐλεεῖν*. *οἰκτείρειν* is connected with *οἴ* and *οἶκτος* and denotes such sympathetic feeling as seeks expression in tears and lamentation. On the other hand, *ἐλεεῖν*, being connected with *ἵλαος*, *ἱλάσκεσθαι*, is the stronger word, so far as the impulse and readiness to afford relief require expression. A criminal begs *ἔλεος* of his judge, whereas hopeless suffering can be the object of *οἰκτιρμός* (cf. Grimm-Thayer^2, 1890, p. 203). This is, however, a valid distinction between *ἐλεεῖν* and *οἰκτείρειν* for classical Greek only. In biblical Greek it scarcely holds true that *οἰκτείρειν* carries no implication of the intent to help. In the LXX it is not seldom equivalent to *ἐλεεῖν* in this respect (cf. Ps $102^{13.14}$). For the NT *οἰκτείρειν* is almost a negligible quantity, the verb occurring only in Ro 9^{15} (=Ex 33^{19}). It is there predicated of God; the adjective occurs of men in Lk 6^{36}, of God in Ja 5^{11}.

That *ἔλεος*, notwithstanding its strong practical connotation, has none the less a rich ideal content appears from its frequent equivalence to חֶסֶד, 'lovingkindness.' It is not bare pity aroused by the sight of misery, but has a background of antecedent love and affection. In this respect it also differs from *οἰκτείρειν*, which in the LXX stands usually for רחם. This feature is of importance soteriologically. Trench (*Synonyms of the NT*^{9}, pp. 166–171) represents the *ἔλεος* as preceding the *χάρις* in the movement of the Divine mind towards the sinner, whereas in the order of manifestation the *χάρις* would come first. This overlooks the association of *ἔλεος* with חֶסֶד. The word was not colourless but had acquired from חֶסֶד the sense of pity inspired by affection. Inasmuch as the same element of affection is present in *χάρις* likewise, the latter also can be said to underlie the *ἔλεος* (cf. Eph 2^4: God is rich in *ἔλεος διὰ τὴν πολλὴν ἀγαπήν*). The order in the epistolary salutations (*χάρις καὶ ἔλεος*) is therefore not merely the order of manifestation, but also a reflex of the order in the Divine mind (1 Ti 1^2, 2 Ti 1^2, 2 Jn ^{3}). As in the case of *σπλαγχνίζεσθαι* so with *ἐλεεῖν*, the exciting cause can be spiritual distress as well as physical. Heine (*Synonymik des neutest. Griechisch*, p. 82) observes that *ἔλεος* cannot have reference to sin. It would be more accurate to say that *ἔλεος* has no reference to sin as such, but can have reference to sin in its aspect of misery, as is proved by Mt 5^7 (*ἐλεηθήσονται*, eschatologically) 18^{33} (with parabolic allusion to God's forgiveness), Ro $9^{15.16.18}$ $11^{30.31.32}$, 2 Co 4^1, 1 Ti $1^{13.16}$, 1 P 2^{10}. Particularly in the Epistle to the Hebrews the 'sympathy' of Christ has primary reference not to the suffering of believers in itself, but to the suffering in its moral aspect as exposing to temptation, whence also its first effect is the shielding from sin or the propitiation of sin: $2^{17.18}$ ('a merciful . . . high priest to propitiate the sins of the people') $4^{15.16}$ ('that we may obtain mercy and grace') $5^{8.9}$ (sympathetic appreciation of the nature of obedience on Christ's part for the benefit of those who have to obey). Wherever *ἔλεος* is applied to spiritual salvation the aspect of sin as misery inevitably enters into the conception, and with this the further idea of the unworthiness of the recipient and the gracious character of the Divine mercy. It is perhaps different, as regards the latter element, in the miracles of the Gospels. Here the question may be raised, whether the regular translation by 'mercy' does not unduly suggest the moral unworthiness of those who were helped, and whether 'pity' would not more faithfully reproduce the associations of the original.

LITERATURE.—Cremer-Kögel, *Bibl.-theol. Wörterbuch der neutest. Gräzität*^{10}, 1912 ff., pp. 420–423; J. A. H. Tittmann, *De Synonymis in Novo Testamento*, 1829–32, i. 68–72; R. C. Trench, *NT Synonyms*^{9}, 1880, pp. 166–171, 393; J. H. H. Schmidt, *Handbuch der lat. und griech. Synonymik*, 1889, pp. 750–755; G. Heine, *Synonymik des neutest. Griechisch*, 1898, p. 82; B. B. Warfield, 'The Emotional Life of our Lord,' in *Princeton Biblical and Theological Studies*, 1912, pp. 40–45.

GEERHARDUS VOS.

PLACE (HIS OWN).—The expression occurs in the ordination prayer for Matthias (Ac 1^{25}) where St. Peter states that Judas, into whose place he was being appointed, 'fell away' (*παρέβη*, Vulg. *prævaricatus est*) from the ministry and apostleship, to 'go to his own place.' The phrase seems to remind us of the frequent OT phrase 'to go (*or* return) unto his place,' though no doubt with a special significance of its own here, to which the case of Balaam (*ὃς μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἠγάπησεν*, 2 P 2^{16}) supplies the nearest but still inexact parallel (Nu 24^{25}); cf. also Job 2^{11}, where the three friends came each 'from his own place.' In both passages Rabbinic interpreters appear to have taken this to mean hell, though, of course, without any justification according to our modern methods (see J. Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.*, ed. Oxford, 1859, iv. 19). In the present passage, nevertheless, the proper place of the apostate is evidently conceived to be that spoken of by our Lord Himself (Mt 25^{41}; cf. Lk 12^9). A. Plummer has pointed out (*HDB* ii. 798) that some of the early Fathers, notably Origen (*Com. in Matt.* 35) with his characteristic ingenuity and large-heartedness, have suggested that Judas's motive for hurrying away from this world to the other was not remorse but contrition; having failed to obtain Christ's pardon here, he hastened to meet Him and obtain it in the place of the departed. At all events, if, as St. Matthew seems to indicate, the act of suicide took place before the Crucifixion, it is a striking thought to dwell upon, that the souls of the Saviour and His betrayer did meet for a brief space and perhaps held commune *ἐν φυλακῇ* (1 P 3^{19}); and if so, with what merciful consequences to the latter, who shall say?

C. L. FELTOE.

PLAGUE.—The word *πληγή*, 'stroke,' occurs in the NT only in the Apocalypse (8^8 $9^{18.20}$ 11^6 $13^{3.12.14}$ $15^{1.6.8}$ $16^{9.21}$ $18^{4.8}$ 21^9 22^{18}). It was used by the LXX for the 'plagues' of Egypt and the later visitations of God upon His people and their enemies, which made a profound impression upon the Hebrews (cf. Lv $26^{2.24}$, Nu $25^{8\text{f.}}$, 2 S 24^{21}). In the Apocalypse the plagues are unforeseen, sudden occurrences, greater and more terrible than those in Egypt, which will disclose God's purpose and providence concerning His own. However violent the opposition, or bitter the persecution, or extreme the danger to which God's people are exposed, they have nothing to fear. The Seer beholds successive Divine judgments fall upon the earth, the sea, the rivers, the sun, moon, and stars. Instruments of Divine punishment are insects, beasts, angels, hail-stones, death, mourning, want, and fire. In a word, all the forces and agencies of the world which are naturally friendly to man are turned into hostile and destructive action against those who dishonour God and would destroy His Kingdom. Even the people of God are secure against the same fate only by faith and obedience.

C. A. BECKWITH.

PLAITING.—See HAIR.

PLEROMA.—See FULNESS.

PLOT.—See CONSPIRACY.

POETS.—See QUOTATIONS.

POISON.—The poison referred to in Ro 3^{13}, Ja 3^8 is animal, not vegetable. From the first the Hebrews had been but little interested in the medicinal, military, or malicious use of poisons. Their experience of venomous reptiles had furnished them with a vivid symbol of sin (cf. Nu 21^{6-9}, Dt 8^{15}, Jn 3^{14}, Ps 58^4 140^3). The NT singles out for mention the part of the body which corresponds to the serpent's weapon of attack, the mouth, *i.e.* the lips and tongue. Here the poison is concentrated and active. Attention is directed to the stored-up venom which awaits its chance to inject itself into its victim, the insidiousness and sting of the attack, the fierce and uncontrollable pain, the violence and deadliness which mark its effects. C. A. Beckwith.

POLITARCH.—See Magistrate.

POLLUTION (ἀλίσγημα, only found as noun in Ac 15^{20}; as verb in Dn 1^{8}, Mal 1$^{7.12}$, Sir 40^{29} [LXX]).—ἀλίσγημα is probably from a root meaning 'smear with fat or blood' (cf. ἀλίνειν, Lat. *linere*), and is therefore a natural word for Jews to use of idol offerings (Lv 3^{17}). It is a real 'Jewish Greek' word, very rare, and is a *translation* of גָּאַל (*gā'al*, root-meaning 'loathe,' afterwards 'pollute'). Possibly it is also a partial *transliteration* of גָּאַל, combining this and the Greek root ἀλιν-. It would then be a similar formation to Eng.-Fr. 'crayfish,' 'Rotten Row' (for instances of this principle see F. J. A. Hort, *1 Peter I. 1–II. 17*, 1898, p. 77, LXX translation of Jer 9^{5}, A. Edersheim, *LT*^{4} i. 448, n. 3; cf. also ἀγαπή as a sound- as well as sense-translation of אַהֲבָה). This would make St. James use a peculiarly biting word, 'a loathed smearing.' Its use in the LXX suggests also that it referred to the ordinary food of Gentiles (Dn 1^{8}, Sir 40^{29}) as well as to idol offerings. The Council did not adopt it, and changed it to the more colourless εἰδωλόθυτον, 'idol offering,' wishing perhaps to avoid a racial word which might suggest a separation in the matter of ordinary food between Jew and Gentile, such as afterwards actually happened (Gal 2^{9}) under the influence of those who 'came from James.'

Literature.—R. J. Knowling, in *EGT*, 'Acts,' 1900, p. 324; Conybeare-Howson, *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, new ed., 1889, ch. vii. esp. pp. 162, 172. Sherwin Smith.

POLLUX.—See Dioscuri.

POLYCARP.—**1. Life.**—In a polemic treatise entitled Περὶ μοναρχίας and addressed to a Roman priest named Florinus, Irenæus (*c.* A.D. 190) speaks of Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna (the part relating to Polycarp is given in Eus. *HE* v. xx. 4–8). Irenæus remonstrates against the doctrines professed by Florinus, which Florinus cannot boast of having received 'from the presbyters who were before us and who lived with the apostles.' Irenæus states that he knew Florinus formerly ἐν τῇ κάτω Ἀσίᾳ παρὰ Πολυκάρπῳ ('in Lower Asia in company with Polycarp'). Irenæus was quite young (παῖς ἔτι ὤν) when Florinus, while still a layman but older than Irenæus, endeavoured to ingratiate himself with Polycarp. Irenæus remembers Polycarp very clearly; he can describe the very place in which the blessed Polycarp used to sit when he discoursed, how he came in and went out, his personal appearance, the speeches that he addressed to the Christian community, how he would describe his intercourse with John and with the rest who had seen the Lord (τὴν μετὰ Ἰωάννου συναναστροφὴν . . . καὶ μετὰ τῶν ἑορακότων τὸν κύριον), how he recalled their words and the things that he had heard them relate concerning the Lord, His miracles, and His teaching, how Polycarp had received all that from eye-witnesses of the Word of life. Irenæus affirms that he has neither lost nor given up any of the teaching of Polycarp, and that, if Polycarp were still alive and heard the things that Florinus teaches, he would stop his ears, as he did before, and say, as he often said: 'O good God, for what times hast thou kept me that I should bear all this?' Irenæus adds as confirmation that 'the letters which Polycarp sent to the neighbouring churches to strengthen them, and to certain brothers to warn them and arouse them, show it clearly.' Again, Irenæus (*Haer.* III. iii. 4, reproduced by Eusebius, *HE* IV. xiv. 3–8) knows that Polycarp, who was taught by the apostles and who lived with several persons who were eye-witnesses of the Lord, received his appointment in Asia from the apostles as bishop in the Church of Smyrna (ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων κατασταθεὶς εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐν τῇ ἐν Σμύρνῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπίσκοπος). It is hardly possible to take these words literally: Polycarp could not have been old enough to be made bishop by the apostles (in the plural); the apostle John at the most could have taken part. Nor was Polycarp made bishop for Asia, since Asia had other bishops in other cities besides Smyrna. These words of Irenæus therefore are not without verbal emphasis. The fact remains that Irenæus is the principal historical witness of Polycarp. He knew him at a time when he himself was a youth. As the birth of Irenæus cannot have been before 130, and must, to all appearances, be placed *c.* 140, it would therefore be about the year 150 that Irenæus as a child could have known Polycarp as an old man at Smyrna. If, as we shall see, Polycarp was eighty-six years old when he died in 155, his birth must be dated A.D. 69.

We may compare this information of Irenæus with that of Papias (Eus. *HE* III. xxxix. 4) on the apostles and the presbyters whose evidence he has collected. Papias knew Polycarp; so, at least, Irenæus assures us (*Haer.* V. xxxiii. 4, quoted in Eus. *HE* III. xxxix. 1): 'Papias,' he says, 'was a hearer of John and a companion (ἑταῖρος) of Polycarp.' When Irenæus quotes as evidence of the Catholic doctrine words of the presbyters who were disciples of the apostles, and especially of the apostle John, it may be taken for granted that he sometimes quotes the words of Polycarp (see the 'Presbyterorum reliquiæ ab Irenæo servatæ,' collected in F. X. Funk, *Patres apostolici*^{2}, Tübingen, 1901, i. 378–389). What is possible for Irenæus is equally possible for Papias, who among the presbyters that he mentions as hearers of John could name Polycarp (see the 'Papiæ fragmenta,' Funk, *op. cit.* pp. 346–379). But critics should give up identifying what may properly be from Polycarp in the various quotations (A. Harnack, *Chronologie der altchr. Litt.*, Leipzig, 1897, i. 333–340).

In a letter to Victor, bishop of Rome, Irenæus mentions the fact of the journey to Rome of Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, in the time of Anicetus, *i.e.* at the very end of Polycarp's life and just at the beginning of the episcopate of Anicetus, as Polycarp must have died at the beginning of 155, and the promotion of Anicetus to the See of Rome must have been about 154–155 (see below). At that time the controversy about the date of Easter was in progress: Polycarp, who could only be a quartodeciman, came to confer with the Roman Church. The text of Irenæus, cited by Eusebius (*HE* v. xxiv. 16 f.), states that the blessed Polycarp himself also paid a visit to Rome in the time of Anicetus (ἐπὶ Ἀνικήτου). (On the use of the names of the Roman bishops as chronological marks in the time of Irenæus and Tertullian see L. Duchesne, *Le Liber Pontificalis*, i. [Paris, 1884] 2.) Anicetus and Polycarp had several other disagreements between them of very little importance, continues Irenæus; they immediately made peace with one another; but on the subject of the date of Easter they did not fall out. As a matter of fact, Anicetus could not persuade Polycarp not to observe what he had always observed in conformity with the apostle John and the other apostles with whom he had lived (μετὰ Ἰωάννου . . . καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀποστόλων οἷς συνδιέτριψεν). Polycarp, on his side, did not convert Anicetus to an observance contrary to that of the presbyters who (at Rome) had preceded him (τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ πρεσβυτέρων). Matters remained thus. They communicated with each other, and in the Church (at Rome) Anicetus conceded to Polycarp as a mark of respect the honour of presiding at the Eucharist. They parted from each other in peace.

Irenæus (*Haer.* III. iii. 4) says that Polycarp when in Rome attracted to the Church of God a number of heretics belonging to the sects of Valentinus and Marcion. He taught them, says Irenæus, that there was only one truth left by the apostles and transmitted by the Church. These words of Irenæus are quoted by Eusebius (*HE* IV. xiv. 5). Irenæus reports in the same passage that one day, when Polycarp met Marcion, the latter said to the bishop, 'Recognize us,' and the bishop answered, 'Ay, ay, I recognize the first-born of Satan' (*ib.* 7). Irenæus does not say that this meeting of Marcion and Polycarp took place at Rome. As Marcion flourished about 140–150, it is possible that Polycarp had quarrelled with him long before coming to Rome to visit Anicetus. As regards the reply given by Polycarp to Marcion, it is quite in the manner of Polycarp (cf. the following words in his letter to the Philippians [vii. 1]: 'Whosoever shall not confess the testimony of the Cross is of the devil; and whosoever shall pervert the oracles of the Lord to his own lusts and say that there is neither resurrection nor judgment, that man is the first-born of Satan').

The death of Polycarp is exceedingly well known through the letter written by the Church of Smyrna to the Church of Philomelium and 'to all the Churches of the holy and catholic Church in all places' (see Harnack, *Ueberlieferung der altchr. Litt.*, Leipzig, 1893, pp. 74–75). Parts of the *Martyrium Polycarpi* are quoted at some length by Eusebius (*HE* iv. 15). At the end of the 4th cent. a hagiographer, who writes under the name of Pionius, a martyr at Smyrna at the time of the Decian persecution, composed a *Vita Polycarpi*, devoid of any historical value, in which he inserted the complete text of the *Martyrium Polycarpi*. This Greek *Vita*, mentioned as early as 1633 by Halloix, published in Latin by the Bollandists in 1734, was edited in Greek by L. Duchesne in 1881: the Greek text will be found in Funk, ii. 291–336, and in Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, pt. ii.^{2} vol. iii. pp. 433–465). The text of the *Martyrium Polycarpi*, complete and not connected with the *Vita*, is given besides in several Greek MSS, which have been utilized for critical editions of the *Martyrium*, that of Zahn in the *Patrum apostolicorum opera*, ii. (Leipzig, 1876) 132–168, that of Lightfoot, *op. cit.* ii. 947–986, that of Funk, *op. cit.* i. 314–345. It is reproduced in O. von Gebhardt, *Acta martyrum selecta*, Leipzig, 1902, pp. 1–12. This beautiful fragment forms the oldest known example of acts of martyrdom. As early as 177 the letter of the Christians of Lyons relating the martyrdom of Lyons and Vienne depends for several editorial details on the *Martyrium Polycarpi*. The authenticity of the *Martyrium* is no longer contested (Harnack, *Chronologie*, i. 341).

Among the minute details which the *Martyrium Polycarpi* gives on the arrest, the trial, and the execution of the bishop of Smyrna, there appears a valuable date: 'The martyrdom of the blessed Polycarp,' we read in 21, 'took place on the second day of the first part of the month Xanthicus, on the seventh day before the Kalends of March, on a great Sabbath, at the eighth hour. He was apprehended by Herodes, when Philip of Tralles was high-priest, in the proconsulship of Statius Quadratus, but in the reign of the Eternal King Jesus Christ.' The martyrdom took place, therefore, on a Saturday which fell on 23rd February. The proconsul Statius Quadratus is identified with the person of the same name who was consul in 142 and who, according to inscriptions, was proconsul of Asia between 151 and 157: the year 155 is the only one in which the 23rd of February falls on a Saturday (Harnack, *Chronologie*, i. 334–356, completed by Stählin, *Christl. griech. Litteratur*, Munich, 1914, p. 977).

The proconsul, interrogating Polycarp, said to him (ix. 3): 'Swear the oath, and I will release thee; revile the Christ'; to which Polycarp replied: 'Fourscore and six years have I been His servant (*ὀγδοήκοντα καὶ ἓξ ἔτη δουλεύω αὐτῷ*), and He hath done me no wrong. How then can I blaspheme my King who saved me?' We conclude from these words that Polycarp was eighty-six years old at the time of his martyrdom, not that he had been a Christian for eighty-six years (Harnack, *Chronologie*, i. 323, 342 ff.).

Other Christians suffered martyrdom at Smyrna at the same time as Polycarp; cf. the data supplied by Wright's *Martyrologe*: 'Und am xxiii. (Feb.) in Asia von den früheren Märtyrern, Polykarpos der Bischof, und Azotos und Koskonios und Melanippos und Zenon' (H. Lietzmann, *Die drei aeltesten Martyrologien*, Bonn, 1903, p. 10). The *Martyrium Polycarpi* (1–4) mentions the tortures that were inflicted on them, and gives the name of one of them, Germanicus, whose heroism went the length of attracting the wild beast to him and inciting it to devour him, whereupon the pagan multitude shouted with fury: 'Away with the atheists' (*αἶρε τοὺς ἀθέους*). This is the cry by which popular hatred designated the Christians as enemies of the gods. The people loudly demanded Polycarp (*ζητείσθω Πολύκαρπος*); the people therefore knew Polycarp as the most notable of the Christians of Smyrna, as their chief (iii. 2). Polycarp remained at Smyrna, in spite of the advice that his friends gave him to flee secretly. He retired to a small farmhouse (*ἀγρίδιον*) near the town. There 'night and day he did nothing but pray for all men and for the churches of the inhabited world (*τῶν κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐκκλησιῶν*), as he had been accustomed to do' (v. 1). Polycarp was arrested on the Friday towards evening in a house (*ἔν τινι δωματίῳ*) in which he had found shelter: the bystanders marvelled 'at his age and his constancy,' and wondered 'why there should be so much eagerness for the apprehension of an old man like him' (vii. 1–2). The bishop requested one hour to pray before following them; they consented. Then Polycarp 'stood up and prayed, being so full of the grace of God, that for two hours he could not hold his peace' (vii. 3), and in his prayer he mentioned 'all who at any time had come in his way, small and great, high and low, and all the universal Church throughout the world' (*καὶ πάσης τῆς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας*). At last he was taken to Smyrna on the Saturday morning (viii. 1). Herod the irenarch (the chief of the municipal police) pressed him to do sacrifice: 'What harm is there in saying: *κύριος καῖσαρ* ("Cæsar is lord")?' He evidently wanted to suggest an equivocation to Polycarp, to save him (cf. Tertullian, *Apol.* 34, 'Dicam plane imperatorem dominum, sed more communi, sed quando non cogor ut Dominum Dei vice dicam'). Polycarp was brought *εἰς τὸ στάδιον*, where the people were assembled and the proconsul was present (ix. 1). Let us remark in passing that this appearance of Polycarp before the proconsul in the open stadium is very unusual from the point of view of the forms of proconsular justice. This is not the only surprising detail, for, as P. Allard says: 'Tout dans cette procédure est irrégulier' (*Histoire des persécutions*, i. [Paris, 1885] 303). The proconsul called upon Polycarp to swear by the fortune of Cæsar (*ὅμοσον τὴν καίσαρος τύχην*) and to say: 'Away with the atheists' (*αἶρε τοὺς ἀθέους*). Polycarp, casting his eyes on the multitude of pagans who filled the stadium, 'sighs, and, raising his eyes towards heaven, says, "Away with the atheists!"' But he refused to curse the Christ (ix. 2–3). The proconsul insisted in vain. 'I am a Christian,' replied the bishop; 'if thou wouldest learn the doctrine of Christianity, assign a day and give me a hearing.' 'Prevail upon the people,' answered the Roman magistrate sarcastically. 'As for myself,' said Polycarp, 'I should have held thee worthy of discourse; for we have been taught to render, as is meet, to princes and authorities appointed by God such honour as does us no harm; but as for these, I do not hold them worthy, that I should defend myself before them' (x. 2)—a reminiscence of St. Paul, Ro 13^{1-7}. The proconsul threatened to throw him to the wild beasts if he did not abjure. 'Call for them,' answered the bishop, 'for the repentance from better to worse is a change not permitted to us; but it is a noble thing to change from untowardness to righteousness' (xi. 1). The proconsul threatened him with the stake; Polycarp replied: 'Thou threatenest that fire which burneth for a season and after a little while is quenched: for thou art ignorant of the fire of the future judgment and eternal punishment, which is reserved for the ungodly. But why delayest thou? Come, do what thou wilt' (xi. 2). The proconsul ordered his herald to proclaim in the middle of the stadium: 'Polycarp hath confessed himself to be a Christian' (xii. 1). The whole multitude, composed of pagans and of Jews living in Smyrna (Ἰουδαίων τῶν τὴν Σμύρναν κατοικούντων) (on the hostility of the Jews towards the Christians see Harnack, *Mission und Ausbreitung*, Leipzig, 1906, i. 400), began to shout: 'This is the teacher of Asia (οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τῆς Ἀσίας διδάσκαλος), the father of the Christians, the puller down of our gods, who teacheth numbers not to sacrifice nor worship!' Notice the expression ὁ πατὴρ τῶν Χριστιανῶν to denote the bishop. The multitude begged that Polycarp should be burned at once (xii. 2–3). They brought fuel; the Jews were in the greatest haste. When the pile was ready, the bishop laid aside his clothes and was placed against the stake. They wanted to nail him to it; he refused: 'Leave me as I am,' he said, 'for He that hath granted me to endure the fire will grant me also to remain at the pile unmoved, even without the security which ye seek from the nails' (xiii. 3). Fixed to the stake, his hands behind his back, he was 'like a noble ram out of a great flock for an offering' (xiv. 1). The account goes on to say that the bishop then repeated in a loud voice a very remarkable prayer, for it is in the manner of a eucharistic prayer, and gives the impression of what we call a *praefatio* (xiv. 1–2). While dying, the bishop prayed in the ritual from which the liturgy is derived. Thus died 'the glorious martyr, Polycarp, who was found an apostolic and prophetic teacher (διδάσκαλος ἀποστολικὸς καὶ προφητικός), bishop of the holy Catholic Church which is in Smyrna (ἐπίσκοπος τῆς ἐν Σμύρνῃ καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας). For every word which he uttered from his mouth was accomplished and will be accomplished' (xvi. 2) (on the gift of prophecy attributed to the bishops see Harnack, *Mission*, i. 289).

The *Martyrium Polycarpi* adds that, at the instigation of the Jews, the Christians were refused permission to take away the body of Polycarp (xvii. 2), which was burned by the soldiers of the proconsul, according to the pagan custom (xviii. 1). The Christians therefore got nothing but the ashes, which they interred 'in a suitable place,' says the *Martyrium* in terms which do not reveal the *locus depositionis*: 'Where the Lord will permit us to gather ourselves together, as we are able, in gladness and joy, and to celebrate the birth-day of his martyrdom for the commemoration of those who have already fought in the contest' (xviii. 3). Here we have the most ancient evidence of the custom of celebrating the birthday of a martyr (τὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου αὐτοῦ ἡμέραν γενέθλιον). We have also the testimony that a similar anniversary would be celebrated for Polycarp when possible; that means that it had not been possible at the time when the *Martyrium* was edited—which proves that this redaction was made shortly after Polycarp's death.

The supplementary paragraphs of the *Martyrium Polycarpi* state that Polycarp was the twelfth to suffer martyrdom at Smyrna, counting the Christians of Philadelphia, but that the martyrdom of Polycarp was the most memorable, 'so that he is talked of even by the heathen in every place' (xix. 1). By his suffering, Polycarp glorifies God and 'our Lord Jesus Christ, saviour of our souls, pilot of our bodies, shepherd of the Catholic Church in the whole inhabited world' (ποιμένα τῆς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας, xix. 2; cf. verses 3–5 of the epitaph of Abercius: Οὔνομ' Ἀβέρκιος ὤν, ὁ μαθητὴς ποιμένος ἁγνοῦ, ‖ ὃς βόσκει προβάτων ἀγέλας οὔρεσι πεδίοις τε, ‖ ὀφθαλμοὺς ὃς ἔχει μεγάλους πάντῃ καθορῶντας). The appendix (xxii. 1–3), which seems to be entirely a forgery by the hand of pseudo-Pionius, author of the *Vita*, has no historical interest.

Must we believe that the mention on several occasions of the Catholic Church is an indication of later touches? We might get rid of this difficulty if the phrase ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία had not already occurred in Ignatius, and moreover in his Epistle to the Smyrnæans (viii. 2), with the meaning of 'universal Church,' geographically universal, in contrast to 'local Church.' This same geographical meaning is the one which the *Martyrium Polycarpi* retains in all the passages where the Church qualified by 'Catholic' is that which is over the whole inhabited world (καθολική = κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην; *Martyrium Polycarpi, inscriptio*, viii. 1, xix. 2). Once only (xvi. 2) the Church seems to be qualified by 'Catholic' as a legitimate predicate: Polycarp is called ἐπίσκοπος τῆς ἐν Σμύρνῃ καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας. This is the earliest example of the use of καθολικός in contrast with αἱρετικός. This early occurrence may be surprising, but it is clear that every formula appears somewhere as the need for it arises. At the time of Polycarp the heretics were fairly numerous and so far separated from the great Church that the great Church distinguished itself from them by calling itself 'the Catholic.' There is therefore no reason for seeing signs of interpolation in the use of καθολικός with this new meaning.

We need not be surprised that the *Martyrium Polycarpi* takes up the task of comparing the Passion of Christ and the martyrdom of the bishop. It endeavours to show that the martyrdom is 'according to the Gospel' (i. 1, xix. 1). It is a model martyrdom, and the author explains this by saying that Polycarp 'waited to be given up, as the Lord also did' (περιέμενεν γὰρ ἵνα παραδοθῇ, ὡς καὶ ὁ κύριος), to teach the faithful not to think only of their individual safety, but to think of all the brethren (i. 2). He waited to be given up, *i.e.* he did not accuse himself and present himself before the magistrate of his own free will. The ardour of the faithful had to be restrained in times of persecution, and they had to be warned against presumption. The author of the *Martyrium Polycarpi* explains it (4): 'But one man, Quintus by name, a Phrygian newly arrived from Phrygia, when he saw the wild beasts, turned coward. He it was who had forced himself and some others to come forward of their own free will. . . . For this cause therefore, brethren, we praise not those who deliver themselves up, since the Gospel doth not so teach us.' It is impossible to establish a comparison between the death of Christ and the death of a martyr. The Christ 'suffered for the salvation of the whole world of those that are saved — suffered though faultless for sinners' (xvii. 2). We love the martyrs because they are 'the disciples and the imitators of the Lord,' and they are worthy of our love for their 'unconquerable fidelity to their real king and their master. May we share their fate and be their co-disciples' (xvii. 3).

2. Writings and doctrine.—We noted above that Irenæus mentions several letters of Polycarp, either to churches or to individuals. It is not impossible that Irenæus really knew several letters of Polycarp. Only one has been preserved, however—the letter of Polycarp to the Philippians.

We know that Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, during the journey that led him a prisoner to Rome, stopped at Smyrna. We have a letter of Ignatius to the Smyrnæans, in which the prisoner, on arriving at Troas, thanks them for the kindness with which they received him: 'You have lavished all kinds of comforts on me: may Jesus Christ reward you for it! Both far and near you have shown me your kindness: I pray God to recompense you' (*ad Smyrn.* ix. 2). Ignatius thanks them also for the welcome which they accorded to his three companions (x. 1). He requests them to send a messenger to Antioch with a letter congratulating the Christians of Antioch on having restored concord in their church (xi. 2). We may note in passing that a similar letter must have been written by the bishop of Smyrna. Further, Ignatius wrote: 'I salute the bishop worthy of God (*ἀσπάζομαι τὸν ἀξιόθεον ἐπίσκοπον*), who is your bishop.' He adds several other salutations to certain Christians of Smyrna whom he names—Tavia, Alke, Daphnos, Euteknos (13). In the *Martyrium Polycarpi*, xvii. 2, an Alce is mentioned, whose brother Niketes is an influential Smyrnæan pagan, and very hostile to the Christians. Before leaving Troas, Ignatius wrote his epistle to 'Polycarp, bishop of the church of the Smyrnæans.' The tone of this letter recalls the Pastoral Epistles: Ignatius gives Polycarp advice, as Paul did to Timothy, but in it the authority of Ignatius is tempered by a tender reverence for the bishop of Smyrna, who was evidently still a young man. 'I give exceeding glory,' says Ignatius to Polycarp, 'that it hath been vouchsafed me to see thy blameless face' (*ad Polyc.* i. 1). And again: 'In all things I am devoted to thee—I and my bonds which thou didst cherish' (ii. 3). We must be careful not to think that the virtues which Ignatius recommends to Polycarp are so many virtues wanting in the latter! Ignatius insists that the Christians of Smyrna should send a messenger to Antioch: 'It becometh thee, most blessed Polycarp, to call together a godly council and to elect some one among you who is very dear to you and zealous also, who shall be fit to bear the name of God's courier—to appoint him, I say, that he may go to Syria and glorify your zealous love unto the glory of God' (vii. 2). Ignatius apologizes for not being able to write to all the churches. 'Thou shalt write to the churches in front, as one possessing the mind of God, to the intent that they also may do this same thing' (viii. 1). The letter ended with salutations to some Smyrnæan Christians, the house of Epitropos, Attalos, and Alke once more. We shall see how the Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians fits in with the story of Ignatius.

This epistle is attested by the mention of it and the extracts from it made by Eusebius (*HE* III. xxxvi. 13–14), and better still by the description given of it by Irenæus (*Haer.* iii. 3, 4), cited by Eusebius (*HE* IV. xiv. 6): 'There is another letter of Polycarp to the Philippians, which is very important. Those who wish and who have any care for their salvation may learn from it the character of his faith and his *κήρυγμα τῆς ἀληθείας*.' Jerome mentions the Epistle to the Philippians and claims that 'usque hodie in Asiæ conventu legitur' (*de Vir. Ill.* 17)—which means that at the end of the 4th cent. the Epistle of Polycarp was read in the liturgical assemblies of the province of Asia; but the assertion remains unconfirmed, and everybody knows that Jerome often wrote very hurriedly. The written tradition of the Epistle of Polycarp is very deficient, for the Greek MSS of it which are extant all stop at ch. 9; chs. 10–14 (with the exception of 12, which is cited by Eusebius) have been preserved only in the old Latin version of the Epistle (Harnack, *Ueberlieferung der altchr. Litt.*, pp. 69–72). The Latin text was edited for the first time in 1498 by Lefèvre d'Etaples, the Greek text in 1633 by Halloix. The critical editions are those of Zahn, Funk, and Lightfoot. These editors have retranslated into Greek the parts which existed only in Latin. The authenticity of the Epistle of Polycarp, formerly contested by the same authors who contested the Epistles of Ignatius, has now been firmly established. The same may be said of the Epistles of Ignatius (Stählin, *Christl. griech. Litt.*, p. 977).

Polycarp addressed this letter to the Philippians a short time after hearing of the reception which the Church of Philippi had given Ignatius and his companions in captivity: 'I rejoiced with you greatly in our Lord Jesus Christ, for that ye received the followers of the true Love and escorted them on their way, as befitted you—those men encircled in saintly bonds which are the diadems of them that be truly chosen of God and our Lord' (i. 1). He exhorts the Philippians to show that enduring patience which they have seen 'in the blessed Ignatius and Zosimus and Rufus' (ix. 1)—apparently Ignatius' companions in captivity. The Philippians invited Polycarp to write to them (iii. 1); they wrote to him at the same time as Ignatius, and charged him with a letter to Antioch (xiii. 1). They asked him to send to them the letters that he had received from Ignatius: 'The letters of Ignatius which were sent to us by him, and others as many as we had by us, we send unto you, according as ye gave charge; the which are subjoined to this letter; from which ye will be able to gain great advantage. For they comprise faith and endurance and every kind of edification, which pertaineth unto our Lord' (xiii. 1–2). Polycarp adds: 'Concerning Ignatius himself and those that were with him, if ye have any sure tidings, certify us' (xiii. 2). These last words prove that Polycarp did not know the fate of Ignatius at the time when he wrote to the Philippians, and it has been concluded from this that Ignatius had quite recently left Philippi *en route* for Rome. The text (ix. 2) often alleged as a sign that Ignatius must have been already dead is not, in the present writer's opinion, convincing. Ignatius' journey from Antioch to Rome belongs to the last years of the reign of Trajan (A.D. 98–117); the Epistle of Polycarp is contemporaneous with this journey.

The historical interest of the Epistle of Polycarp is very great, inasmuch as it is a proof of the existence of letters of Ignatius. The literary interest of the epistle is mediocre, especially if it is compared with the exceptional value of the Ignatian epistles. The style of the bishop of Smyrna is without personal character. His epistle is in reality something like a cento. For that very reason, however, it is a witness, since the majority of the texts which it utilizes can be recognized—the three Synoptics, the Fourth Gospel, the Acts, the principal Pauline Epistles (Rom., 1 and 2 Cor., Gal., Eph., Phil., Col., 2 Thess., 1 and 2 Tim.), the Epistle to James, 1 Peter, 1 and 2 John. From the fact that Polycarp says (iii. 2) that the apostle Paul wrote letters to the Philippians (*ὑμῖν ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολάς*), it would be unwise to conclude that Polycarp knew several letters of Paul to the Philippians. The OT, which Polycarp confesses he does not know well (xii. 1), is represented by only a few references (Is., Jer., Ps., Prov., Job, Tob.). Polycarp knew 1 Clem., and made numerous very evident borrowings from it (Harnack, *Ueberlieferung*, p. 40 ; Funk, i. pp. xli–xliii).

The address reads : 'Polycarp and the presbyters who are with him to the Church of God which is in Philippi.' The letter speaks (v. 3) of the subjection of the Philippians to their presbyters and their deacons, to whom they submit 'as to God and to Christ.' This is a very Ignatian thought, but Ignatius would have spoken of the bishop also, while Polycarp does not once mention the word 'bishop' in his letter. It has been concluded from this that the Church of Philippi did not at that time have a bishop distinct from the *πρεσβύτεροι* (A. Michiels, *L'Origine de l'épiscopat*, Louvain, 1900, p. 367 f.). This is a possibility which cannot be altogether ignored. The non-mention of a bishop at Philippi, however surprising it may be after the Ignatian language, may be a sign that in Thrace the distinction between the *ἐπίσκοπος* and the *πρεσβύτεροι ἐπισκοποῦντες* had not yet ended in the monarchical episcopate so clearly realized in Antioch, in Smyrna, in the churches made known to us in the Ignatian epistles (cf. P. Batiffol, *Études d'histoire et de théologie positive*^{5}, 1st ser., Paris, 1907, pp. 258–266). C. Gore (*The Ministry of the Christian Church*^{2}, London, 1889, p. 329) says : 'The hypothesis of a superior order in the Church, such as Clement's letter has been seen to imply, of which no representation was yet localized in the Church at Philippi, seems to meet the conditions of the problem. . . . This would postulate a state of things at Philippi which Ignatius could at once have recognized as agreeable to his standard of apostolic requirements. . . . What we would suggest is not exactly that Philippi was in the diocese of Thessalonica or of some other see, but that we have still to do with a state of things which is transitional.' Harnack (*Entstehung und Entwickelung der Kirchenverfassung*, Leipzig, 1910, p. 59 f.) also thinks that Philippi has a collegial government, and that the bishop or bishops are included in the *πρεσβύτεροι*.

Among these *πρεσβύτεροι* Polycarp mentions one called Valens who greatly horrified his colleagues by his greed (xi. 1) ; the wife of Valens was as guilty as he (xi. 4). 'He who cannot govern himself in these things,' writes Polycarp, 'how doth he enjoin this upon another?' (xi. 2). Polycarp exhorts the presbyters to bring back Valens and his wife as members who were weak and had gone astray, for the good of the whole community (xi. 4). The sinner, though offensive, is not to be despaired of and abandoned by the community. The presbyters must be merciful to all, bring back the erring, visit the weak, neglect neither the widows, the orphans, nor the poor ; avoid unjust judgments, not believe evil readily (vi. 1). The deacons must be beyond reproach, remembering that they are 'deacons of God and Christ and not of men,' avoid evil-speaking, duplicity, cupidity (v. 1). Married women must be faithful to the virtues of faith, charity, chastity, love their husbands, bring up their children in the fear of God (iv. 2). Widows are the altar of God, *θυσιαστήριον θεοῦ* (iv. 3), in the sense that there must be nothing in them that would not be worthy of being offered to God, and also in the sense that they live on the offerings of the charity of the faithful. H. Achelis (*Das Christentum in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, Leipzig, 1912, i. 192) shows that widows are always in the first rank of the people to whom alms are given. Virgins (*i.e.* young Christian girls in general, not virgins consecrated to God) must lead a perfectly pure life (v. 3). Young people must flee from all evil, all the sordid pagan vices branded by St. Paul in 1 Co $6^{9f.}$, and they must be under the subjection of the presbyter and the deacons (v. 3). The Epistle of Polycarp is above all a moral exhortation, which recalls the manner of 1 Clem. more than that of the Ignatian epistles. It undoubtedly gives a fairly accurate idea of what ought to be the preaching of a bishop (*νουθεσία*).

Its speculative and dogmatic contents are very poor, but there are some elementary features worthy of notice.

God is called 'the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,' as Jesus Christ is said to be the 'Son of God,' and 'Eternal Pontiff' (*sempiternus pontifex* [xii. 2]). Cf. the doxology with which in the *Martyrium Polycarpi* (xiv. 3) the prayer of Polycarp ends : 'For all things I praise Thee, I bless Thee, I glorify Thee, through the eternal and heavenly High-priest, Jesus Christ, Thy beloved Son, through whom with Him and the Holy Spirit be glory both now [and ever].' The idea of the Priesthood of Christ is also found in Ignatius, *ad Phil.* ix. 1, and in Clem. *ad Cor.* xxxvi. 1, lxi. 3, lxiv. ; it is the fundamental idea of Hebrews. Jesus Christ deigned to descend even to death for our sins (i. 2). Give up vain speeches and the errors of the majority, *i.e.* paganism, to believe in the Risen One to whom God has given a throne at His right hand, and to whom all has been subjected in heaven and on earth : God will demand an account of His blood from those who do not believe in Him (ii. 1). God will also raise us from the dead if we observe the precepts of Christ (ii. 2). The error of Docetism is denounced by Polycarp as an imminent danger : 'Whosoever shall not confess the testimony of the Cross, is of the devil' (vii. 1) ; so also is the perversion of Christian morality by false teachers : 'Whosoever shall pervert the oracles of the Lord (*τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου*) to his own lusts and say that there is neither resurrection nor judgment, that man is the first-born of Satan' (vii. 1). Let us avoid 'the false brethren and them that bear the name of the Lord in hypocrisy, who lead foolish men astray' (vi. 3).

Faith is our mother in all things, 'while hope followeth after and love goeth before—love toward God and Christ and toward our neighbour' (iii. 3). Let us reject the folly of the majority (*i.e.* paganism) and false teaching (*ψευδοδιδασκαλίας*, the new doctrines of the heretics), and return to the teaching which has been given us from the beginning (*ἐπὶ τὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἡμῖν παραδοθέντα λόγον*, the teaching of the apostles and of the gospel), tradition being the criterion of Christian truth (vii. 2). Let us have our eyes constantly fixed on our hope and the pledge of our justice, *i.e.* on Jesus Christ, who has 'endured all things, that we might live in Him' (viii. 1). Lastly, let us pray for all the saints, for the magistrates and princes, for our persecutors, and for the enemies of the Cross (xii. 3). The Church is not mentioned, but Polycarp says : 'May God give you a share in the inheritance of the saints, may He let us participate in it with you, we and all those who are under heaven, who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ and in His Father' (xii. 2). Prayer does not go without fasting (vii. 2). The prayer recommended is the Lord's Prayer (vi. 2, vii. 2).

The eschatology is confined to the resurrection of the dead (ii. 2, v. 2, vii. 1), to the judgment of the living and the dead by the Christ who comes, ὃς ἔρχεται (ii. 1; cf. vi. 2, vii. 1, xi. 2), to the reward of the just in heaven (v. 2, ix. 2).

The Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians closes with the mention of Crescens, whom Polycarp presents as the bearer of the letter; and whom he recommends, as well as his sister, to the hospitable reception of the faithful of Philippi.

In the editions of Zahn (p. 171 f.) and Lightfoot (pt. ii. vol. iii. p. 421 f.) will be found five Latin fragments attributed to Polycarp: they were first published by the editor of Irenæus, Feuardent (1639), who found them in a group now lost, which itself gave them as quoted in Victor of Capua († 554). Supposing that these five fragments of scholia on the Gospels are ancient (3rd cent. ?), they show no sign that Polycarp was the author of them (Harnack, *Ueberlieferung*, p. 73).

Suidas (*Lexicon*, *s.v.* Πολύκαρπος, ed. G. Bernhardy, Halle and Brunswick, 1834–1893, ii. 345) mentions a letter of Polycarp to Dionysius the Areopagite, of which there is no other trace. Maximus the confessor, in the prologue of his commentary on the *Areopagitica*, also mentions a letter of Polycarp to the Athenians in which he speaks of Dionysius (*PG* iv. 17). Lastly, the seventh of the ten letters of pseudo-Dionysius is addressed to Polycarp. We need not dwell here on the value of the *Areopagitica* and all that may be connected with it (Harnack, *Ueberlieferung*, p. 73).

LITERATURE.—The chief references are given in the course of the article. For general bibliography see O. Bardenhewer, *Gesch. der altkirchl. Litteratur*, i.^{2} [Freiburg i. B., 1913]. Critical editions: T. Zahn, 'Ignatii et Polycarpi Epistulæ,' in *Patrum apostolicorum opera*, ii. [Leipzig, 1876]; F. X. Funk, *Opera patrum apostolicorum*, Tübingen, 1878 and 1901; J. B. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, pt. ii.^{2}, London, 1889. See also the elementary edition of A. Lelong, *Ignace d'Antioche et Polycarpe de Smyrne*, Paris, 1910 (Gr. text, Fr. tr., Introduction, and notes on *Ep. ad Phil.* and *Martyrium Polycarpi*).

P. BATIFFOL.

POLYGAMY.—See MARRIAGE.

PONTUS (Πόντος). — To early Greek writers, Pontus vaguely denoted any coastland of the 'Inhospitable Sea'—Πόντος ἄξενος, afterwards changed into Πόντος εὔξεινος—beyond the Bosporus. To Herodotus (vii. 95) it meant the southern littoral of the Euxine, and to Xenophon (*Anab.* v. vi. 15) the south-eastern. It had not a definite geographical meaning till the founding of the kingdom of Pontus by Mithridates in the troubled period which followed the death of Alexander the Great.

> 'The Macedonians obtained possession of Cappadocia after it had been divided by the Persians into two satrapies, and permitted, partly with and partly without the consent of the people, the satrapies to be altered to two kingdoms, one of which they called Cappadocia proper, . . . the other they called Pontus, but according to other writers Cappadocia on Pontus' (ἡ πρὸς τῷ Πόντῳ Καππαδοκία) (Strabo, XII. i. 4). Polybius names the kingdom 'Cappadocia towards the Euxine' (Καππαδοκία ἡ περὶ τὸν Εὔξεινον) (v. xliii. 1). In popular usage the single word Pontus displaced the more cumbrous nomenclature.

This kingdom attained its greatest prosperity and power in the reign of Mithridates IV. Eupator (111–63 B.C.), who extended it to Heracleia on the border of Bithynia in the west and to Colchis and Lesser Armenia in the east (Strabo, XII. iii. 1); but his wars with the Romans ended in his overthrow. The western part of his kingdom was joined to Bithynia to form the double province Pontus-Bithynia, which existed for three centuries. The eastern part was broken up into possessions for a number of native dynasts, and one of the larger fragments passed in 36 B.C. from the family of Mithridates to Polemon of Laodicea, the founder of a new dynasty of Pontic kings, which lasted till A.D. 63. Other portions were added one by one to the province of Galatia, forming together Pontus Galaticus, whose chief towns were Amasia and Comana. In A.D. 63 the Romans, thinking that Polemon's vassal kingdom had become civilized enough to be incorporated in the Empire, added part of it, including the cities of Trapezus and Neo-Cæsarea, to the province of Galatia as Pontus Polemonaicus, a name which it retained for centuries. Polemon II. was consoled for his loss by receiving the kingdom of Cilicia Tracheia, and he afterwards married Berenice (*q.v.*), the sister of Herod Agrippa. Still another fragment of the old kingdom of Pontus was added to the province of Cappadocia, and called Pontus Cappadocicus. From A.D. 78–106 the provinces of Galatia and Cappadocia were united for administrative purposes. When they were separated again by Trajan, Pontus Galaticus and Pontus Polemonaicus were permanently joined to Cappadocia.

Philo (*Leg. ad Gaium*, 36) testifies that in his time the Jews had penetrated ἄχρι Βιθυνίας καὶ τῶν τοῦ Πόντου μυχῶν. Pontus stands in the list of countries from which Jews and proselytes came to Jerusalem to attend the Feast of Pentecost (Ac 2^{9}). As the geographical names in this list have their popular rather than their Imperial meaning, Pontus may either denote the province of Pontus alone, or may include Galatic and Polemonian Pontus; but Polemon's kingdom was scarcely settled enough to be likely to attract Jewish colonists. 'The elect who are strangers of the Dispersion in Pontus' are named as the readers of the First Epistle of St. Peter (1^{1}), and here the language is strictly Roman, for the three provinces Galatia, Cappadocia, and Asia, together with the dual province Pontus-Bithynia, are meant to sum up the whole of Asia Minor north of the Taurus. The severance in this passage of Pontus from Bithynia, as well as the order in which the provinces are named, requires an explanation, and the best has been suggested by G. H. A. Ewald (*Sieben Sendschreiben des neuen Bundes*, 1870, p. 2 f.). The order indicated is that of an actual journey, which the bearer of the Epistle—probably Silvanus, the amanuensis (1 P 5^{12})—is about to undertake. Landing at one of the seaports of Pontus (Sinope or Amisus) he will make a circuit of Galatia, Cappadocia, and Asia, and work his way through Bithynia to another port of the Euxine (cf. F. J. A. Hort, *The First Epistle of St. Peter, I. 1–II. 17*, 1898, p. 17).

The first cities of Pontus to receive Christianity were doubtless those of the seaboard, from which it must have rapidly spread inland. Pliny the Younger was sent to administer Pontus and Bithynia in A.D. 111, and his correspondence with Trajan gives a clear idea of the changes already being wrought by the new religion—in his view a 'superstitio prava immodica'—not only in the great towns but in remote country places (*Ep.* x. 97). His reference to renegades who professed to have renounced their Christian faith as much as twenty-five years previously indicates that some parts of the province had been evangelized some time before A.D. 87 or 88. The First Epistle of Peter, even if it was not written till A.D. 80, carries the date of the introduction of Christianity into Pontus a good deal further back.

Aquila, the fellow-worker of St. Paul, was a native of Pontus (Ac 18^{2}). Another Aquila, the translator of the OT into Greek, who lived in the time of Hadrian, belonged to the same province. An inscription to an Aquila of Sinope (*Sinub*) has recently been found. Sinope was the birthplace of Marcion, whose father is said to have been a bishop.

LITERATURE.—W. M. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, 1893, *Hist. Geography of Asia Minor*, 1890; J. G. C. Anderson, 'Exploration in Pontus,' in *Studia Pontica*, 1903, and F. and E. Cumont, 'Voyage d'exploration archéol. dans le Pont et la petite Arménie,' *ib.*, 1906.

JAMES STRAHAN.

POOR, POVERTY.—The terms used in the NT to describe the poor are *πένης, πενιχρός, ἐνδεής* (once each), and *πτωχός*. In the great majority of instances it is obvious that these words describe the man who has little material wealth, but there are certain passages which suggest a larger meaning.

In the Epistle of James and in the Gospel of Luke the word 'poor' (*πτωχός*) is used occasionally in a manner which suggests that, while it has in part its literal sense, it may also denote one who possesses certain virtues which may have been conceived of as usually associated with poverty. 'Did not God choose them that are poor as to the world to be rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he promised to them that love him? But ye have dishonoured the poor man. Do not the rich oppress you, and themselves drag you before the judgement-seats?' (Ja $2^{5.6}$). Our Lord's words 'Blessed are ye poor: for yours is the kingdom of God,' and 'Woe unto you that are rich! for ye have received your consolation' (Lk $6^{20.24}$) may be thought to convey the same suggestion. In Mt 5^3 our Lord's words are repeated in a different form—'Blessed are the poor in spirit'; and while we may be inclined to think that Luke gives us the more original form of the words, the gloss, if it be such, of Matthew's Gospel is very possibly just in substance. When we examine the OT literature we find that it is possible that the word 'poor' is often used rather in a spiritual than in a literal sense, *e.g.* Ps 35^{10} 40^{17}.

It has been suggested that this points to some relation between the NT conception of the poor and some supposed body of Ebionites or pious men who are also called poor, but the material is too scanty to enable us to form any very positive judgment.

For the question of the position and treatment of the poor in the Apostolic Church see the artt. ALMS and COMMUNITY OF GOODS.

A. J. CARLYLE.

PORCH.—When 'porch' is a translation of *στοά*, it denotes a portico (so Ac 3^{11} RVm), covered colonnade, or cloister, where people could walk and talk, protected from sun or rain, and where liberty of public speaking and teaching was generally enjoyed. Round the entire area of Herod's Temple there ran a succession of magnificent porticoes built against the enclosing wall. Solomon's Porch, which adorned the eastern side—hence called also the *στοὰ ἀνατολική* (Jos. *Ant.* XX. ix. 7)—and faced the entrance to the Women's Court, was a double portico, about 50 ft. wide, formed by three rows of white marble monolithic columns, each about 40 ft. high. It was roofed by cedar beams, richly carved, and its aisles were paved in mosaic fashion with stone (Jos. *Ant.* XV. xi. 5, *BJ* v. v. 2). Josephus appears to have believed that it had survived from the time of Solomon (*Ant.* XX. ix. 7, *BJ* v. v. 1), but in all probability its name implied no more than that on the same foundations there had stood a previous structure which partly dated from Solomon's time. The porch in which Jesus walked on the Feast of Dedication (Jn 10^{23}), to which the people ran together after witnessing St. Peter's miracle at the Beautiful Gate (Ac 3^{11}), and which was a rendezvous of the early Church (5^{12}), was certainly modern. It was in the style of contemporary Hellenistic architecture, and was only less magnificent than the triple colonnade known as the 'Royal Porch'—*στοὰ βασιλική*—which ran along the south side of the Temple court.

LITERATURE.—A. Edersheim, *LT*^{4} i. 244 f., ii. 151; A. R. S. Kennedy, 'Some Problems of Herod's Temple,' in *ExpT* xx. [1908–09], art. 'Temple' in *EBr*^{11}; B. Kleinschmidt, art. 'Temple' in *JE*.

JAMES STRAHAN.

POSSESSION.—In the earlier period of his career man did not realize, as we do, the difference between himself and the animals, plants, and objects around him. He thought, and in the lower culture still thinks, of these as in many respects like himself. When, therefore, through dreams and other experiences, he realized that his body was inhabited and animated by a spirit, he also thought that the falling rock, the running river, the waving tree, the sun moving through the sky, were each inhabited by a spirit or spirits like that within himself; every thing and every affair were animated by their own particular spirit. This animistic belief was, and is still, held by the men of the lower culture, by the primitive Semites and Aryans and the races springing from them, by the modern Chinese, and even by educated Europeans to-day.*

Some spirits, like vampires, were corporeal, but the majority, if not all, were free to move about, and able, nay anxious, to enter into some relationship with man. As a person's ordinary speech and action sprang from the action of his own spirit (minor differences arising because each had his own individual spirit), so extraordinary conduct of any kind was due to the impact of a spirit other than his own. The man was not himself, he was out of his mind, and consequently another was in.†

The contact of a spirit and a person might be at the instance of the person, through his eating laurel leaves, inhaling fumes or incense, drinking blood or an intoxicant, drumming, dancing, steady gazing.‡ It might, again, be on the initiative of the spirit. The contact might be either obsession, in which the spirit acts from without, or embodiment, in which it actually enters into the person.§ Such expressions, in regard, *e.g.*, to the Holy Spirit, as 'come upon,' 'was upon,' 'fell upon,' 'poured out on,' 'baptized with,' pointing in the direction of obsession, others, as 'filled with,' 'God gave them,' 'they received the Holy Spirit,' pointing in the direction of embodiment, indicate that the spirit took the initiative.‖

The conception of spirits underwent development along two distinct, though not quite independent, lines. Certain spirits, coming to be recognized as stronger than others, gradually attained a higher dignity, a more elaborate ritual, and a wider sway. They got names and became deities. Further, some of these becoming more important than others, came to be the chief deities of tribes and nations, and then, like Zeus, the head of a pantheon. A strong belief in such a deity in some cases almost attained to, and in the case of Jahweh actually reached, monotheism, or at least what Hogarth calls 'super-Monotheism.'¶ In some religions, as Zarathustrianism and the cults of Mesopotamia, the inferior spirits were grouped into grades as angels, archangels, principalities, and powers, at whose head there sometimes stood a supreme spirit as the Satan. Again, as primitive man, believing that all things which occurred to, or within, him arose from the action of a spirit—generally a minor spirit—distinguished between things pleasant, beneficial, or according to his standard, good, and the reverse, he came to distinguish between spirits benevolent and beneficent, and others malevolent and maleficent.[*] When one is so fortunate as to be able to predict future events (Ac 21^{11}), or to indicate the will of God (13^{2} 15^{28} 16^{6}), then clearly one is filled with the Holy Spirit. This, rightly called 'inspiration,' is not found in the lower culture, except occasionally, when it is due to the spirits of the dead, though it has been maintained that the deliverances of the classic oracles were given by a divine being.[†] On the other hand, a person who becomes hot and burning, is twisted or tortured, slowly pines away as if being eaten up, is thrown helpless on the ground, into water or fire, writhing and jerking, exhibits the strength of a giant or the fury of a wild beast, strips off his clothes, raves in a voice not his own—such a one seems to be, and was by the men of the lower culture believed to be, possessed by a maleficent spirit.[‡] This belief acted in two ways. When the seizures were intermittent the sufferer believed that at the period of seizure he became possessed by a malevolent spirit, and even gave it a name. Again, a person who imagined that a harmful spirit had entered into him acted in the way possessed people were conceived inevitably to act, and this became in its turn a proof positive of such possession.[§] The entry of such a hurtful spirit is of course involuntary.[‖]

---

* See, *e.g.*, C. H. Toy, *Introduction to the History of Religions*, Boston, 1913, p. 293; G. T. Bettany, *Primitive Religions*, London, 1891, pp. 107, 122, 133; J. H. King, *The Supernatural*, 2 vols., do., 1892, i. 177, 199; *JE* iv. 516 ('R. Johanan knew of 300 kinds of shedim living near the town of Shiḥin'); J. L. Nevius, *Demon Possession and Allied Themes*, London, 1897, p. 6; R. Howton, *Divine Healing and Demon Possession*, do., 1905, p. 1; the writings of E. Swedenborg; J. Duncan, *Colloquia Peripatetica*^{3}, Edinburgh, 1871, pp. 39, 40; *DCG* i. 438^b.

† *EBr*^{11} xxii. 175.

‡ *Ib.* xxii. 174.

§ *HDB* iv. 22^b.

‖ Lk 1^{35} 2^{25}, Ac 10^{44} 11^{15} 10^{45} 11^{16}, Lk 1^{41}, Ac 2^4 4^{31} 15^8 19^2.

¶ C. H. Toy, *Introd. to the Hist. of Religions*, p. 293; *EBr*^{11} viii. 7; D. G. Hogarth, *The Ancient East*, London, 1914, p. 23.

The Greeks called a supernatural being intermediate between the gods and men *δαίμων*, 'demon.' This was used in the LXX and the Apocrypha, as in Tobit, to translate שֵׁדִים and שְׂעִירִים. The word thus came to get a bad meaning. The later Jews and Christians, in their hatred of the pagan cults, emphasized this view, and it has ever since been retained as in the English word 'demon.'[¶] The Greek term *δαιμονίζεσθαι* means 'to be possessed by a maleficent spirit.' Our word 'epilepsy' is the English form of *ἐπίληψις*, meaning 'seizure' by a superhuman agent, while epilepsy itself was called by the Greeks *ἱερὰ νόσος*, 'the divine illness.'[**]

While, therefore, 'demonism' and 'demonist' indicate belief in and a believer in demons, 'demonology' is the science which treats of demons, 'demonolatry' is the worship of demons; 'demonopathy,' or, better, to use the term of the Sydenham Society Lexicon of 1883, 'demonomania' is the pathological condition in which the patient, a 'demoniac,' believes, and his conduct would induce others to believe, that he is possessed by a maleficent spirit.

Anthropological research shows that demonomania prevails or has prevailed among the Amerind tribes from the furthest North to Patagonia, throughout Polynesia, in New Zealand, the Australian and Tasmanian regions, in all parts of India and Africa, among the Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, and all the Semitic nations.[††]

But the facts as to demonism and demonomania will become clearer by a consideration of these as we find them present in the life of one nation. The primitive Semites believed in demons, and this racial faith was inherited and developed by the Arabians, and the nations which swarmed from the desert cradle-land — Mesopotamians, Phœnicians, Canaanites, and Hebrews.[‡‡] The last, in their nomadic state and their sojourn in Egypt, by their settlement in Palestine and intercourse with neighbouring nations, and during the Exile, were subjected to influences which, while modifying, tended to intensify the ancestral belief.[*] They recognized not merely the existence of demons but their classification into the two great groups, beneficent and maleficent, the latter being our special concern.[†] The demons in the earliest culture had no names, but gradually, *e.g.* in Mesopotamia, they were divided into classes with distinct names. Among the Hebrews we have these classes.[‡]

(1) The שְׂעִירִים, field spirits, like satyrs, so called because of their resemblance to hairy he-goats. To these sacrifices were offered in the open field, and for their worship Jeroboam appointed priests.[§] A further reference to these may be found in 2 K 23^{8}, where for שְׁעָרִים there should be read[‖] שְׂעִירִים. One of these spirits became prominent enough to receive a personal name עֲזָאזֵל, and to have a distinctive ritual of his own in which a goat was offered.[¶]

(2) In Mesopotamian mythology one of the most prominent of the groups of demons was the *shēdîm*, storm-deities. They were represented in an ox-like shape, and from being used as the protective genii of palaces became, in Mesopotamia, propitious deities. From Chaldæa their worship passed to Palestine, and the name שֵׁדִים was applied by the Hebrews to the Canaanite demons whom they recognized and worshipped.[**] If אַבְנֵי הַשָּׂדֶה (Job 5^{23}) be a corruption for אֲדֹנֵי הַשָּׂדֶה, then 'the lords' were field-demons of this kind. A further reference to them is found in Gn 14$^{3.\ 8.\ 10}$, where הַשִּׂדִּים should be printed הַשֵּׁדִים;[††] and in Hos 12^{12} בַּגִּלְגָּל שְׁוָרִים זִבֵּחוּ should be בַּגִּ׳ לַשֵּׁדִים זִ׳, 'at Gilgal they sacrifice *to the false gods* (*la-shēdhîm*).'[‡‡] Three of these demons attained to such eminence as to receive names. These were לִילִית, Lilith (the night-hag, Is 34$^{13.\ 14}$), a female night-demon who sucked the blood of her sleeping victims;[§§] הַמַּשְׁחִית, a demon servant of Jahweh warded off by a blood-talisman (Ex 12^{23});[‖‖] Asmedai, the Asmodeus of To 3$^{8-17}$, who is called in the Aramaic and Hebrew versions of To 3^{8} 'king of the Shēdîm,' a demon borrowed from Zarathustrianism, who is identified with Ἀπολλύων (Rev 9^{11}).[¶¶] Indica-

---

[*] T. W. Davies, *Magic, Divination, and Demonology*, London, 1898, p. 7.

[†] *EBr*^{11} xxii. 174.

[‡] A. Edersheim, *LT*^{4}, London, 1887, ii. 762, 774; E. B. Tylor, *PC*^{4}, do., 1903, ii. 124, 130; R. R. Marett, *The Threshold of Religion*^{2}, do., 1914, p. 24 f.; Bettany, *Primitive Religion*, pp. 19, 57, 58, 69.

[§] Tylor, *PC*^{4} ii. 132.

[‖] *EBr*^{11} xxii. 175.

[¶] Davies, *Magic, Divination, and Demonology*, p. 7; *ERE* iv. 565.

[**] *JE* iv. 517; Edersheim, *LT*^{4} ii. 762; Tylor, *PC*^{4} ii. 137.

[††] See, *e.g.*, Tylor, *PC*^{4} ii. 123, 137; *DCG* i. 438; *ERE* iv. 590, 619, 620, 723, etc.; cf. art. Exorcism, 3.

[‡‡] K. Marti, *The Religion of the OT*, London, 1907, p. 50; *Exp*, 7th ser., iii. [1907] 325, 319; *JE* iv. 515; Edersheim, *LT*^{4} ii. 759, *ERE* iv. 568, 570, 741; and, generally, R. C. Thompson, *The Devils and Evil Spirits of Babylonia*, London, 1903–04.

[*] *ERE* iv. 755; Marti, *The Religion of the OT*, p. 90.

[†] Jg 9^{23}, 1 S 16^{14}; *Exp*, 7th ser., iii. 318; *DCG* i. 439.

[‡] C. H. Toy, *Introd. to the Hist. of Religions*, p. 293.

[§] Lv 17^{7}, 2 Ch 11^{15}; see also Is 13^{21} 34^{14}; J. H. Kurtz, *Hist. of the Old Covenant*^{2}, Edinburgh, 1872, ii. 158; W. R. Smith, *RS*^{2}, London, 1894, p. 113; H. Schultz, *OT Theology*, Eng. tr., do., 1892, ii. 270; A. H. Japp, *Some Heresies dealt with*, do., 1899, p. 240; J. H. Philpot, *The Sacred Tree*, do., 1897, p. 54; *JE* iv. 515; A. H. Sayce, *Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion*^{3} (*HL*, 1887), London, 1891, p. 199; Davies, *Magic, Divination, and Demonology*, p. 96; *Exp*, 7th ser., iii. 530, 532; *ExpT* iii. 485; *ERE* iv. 598; *HDB* i. 591, v. 617^{b}.

[‖] *Exp*, 7th ser., iii. 322, 531, n. 3; *HDB* i. 207.

[¶] Lv 16; *HDB* i. 207; *Exp*, 7th ser., iii. 532; *ExpT* xxiv. 9; *ERE* ii. 282, iv. 598; cf. Bar 4^{7}.

[**] *Exp*, 7th ser., iii. 331; *ERE* iv. 570, 595; Dt 32^{17}, Ps 106^{37}; Edersheim, *LT*^{4} ii. 760.

[††] *Exp*, 7th ser., iii. 322; *HDB* i. 58^{b}.

[‡‡] Hitzig, quoted by A. Kuenen, *The Religion of Israel*, Eng. tr., i. [London, 1874] 94; see also *JE* iv. 515; Davies, *Magic, Divination, and Demonology*, pp. 96, 103; J. J. S. Perowne, *The Book of Psalms*, 2 vols., London, 1883–86, ii. 266; Japp, *Some Heresies dealt with*, p. 25; H. G. Tomkins, *Studies on the Times of Abraham*, do., 1878, p. 149; Sayce, *HL*, pp. 441, 450, 463; *Exp*, 7th ser., iii. 322, iv. [1907] 135; *HDB* i. 96^{b}, 591, v. 617; *ERE* iv. 598.

[§§] *ERE* iv. 571, 598; *HDB* i. 590, iii. 122, v. 618, 553; A. Réville, *The Devil*^{2}, Eng. tr., London, 1887, p. 10; T. K. Cheyne, *The Prophecies of Isaiah*^{4}, do., 1886, i. 197; Sayce, *HL*, p. 145; G. Maspero, *The Dawn of Civilization*^{2}, London, 1896, p. 632; E. Schrader, *The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the OT*, Eng. tr., 2 vols., do., 1885–88, ii. 311; *Exp*, 7th ser., iv. 142, 3rd ser., vi. [1887] 460; Ps 91^{5}.

[‖‖] *Exp*, 7th ser., iii. 323.

[¶¶] To 6^{13} 3$^{8-17}$ 6–8; *HDB* i. 125^{b}, 172^{b}, iv. 408^{b}, 989^{a}; *Exp*, 7th ser., iv. 135; *DCG* i. 439; *ExpT* ii. [1890–91] 208, xi. [1899–1900] 258; J. H. Moulton, *Early Religious Poetry of Persia*, Cambridge, 1911, pp. 68, 77; Réville, *The Devil*^{2}, p. 13; H. Schultz, *OT Theology*, ii. 280; *ERE* iv. 600^{b}.

tions are not wanting that certain words which later came to signify calamities were originally the demons who caused the calamities. Such were קֶטֶב, ‘the smiter,’ the deadly hot wind of mid-day; רֶשֶׁף and בְּנֵי רֶשֶׁף, the demon of destroying flame;* עֲלוּקָה, a vampire, a blood-sucking demon.† Such demons resemble and appear as either wild beasts or imaginary hybrid monsters.‡ Satan was identified with a serpent. ‘The zoology of Islam,’ as has been well said, ‘is at once a demonology,’ and the remark need not be confined to that religion.§ While originally the belief in such demons may have been caused, partially or wholly, by the sudden or mysterious appearance or action of animals, the spirits gradually came to be looked on as assuming the appearance of certain animals.‖ Thus, when the Shunammite solemnly conjures the daughters of Jerusalem by the אַיְלוֹת and the צְבָאוֹת (Ca 2^7 3^5) she was doubtless referring to the faun-like spirits of the wild.¶ The continuous and persistent efforts of the prophets to extricate Jahweh from the other gods and to exalt His power and importance inevitably diminished those of the demons; and, as His holiness and goodness became clearer, their malevolence became more marked.** The continuous prevalence of and belief in demonomania becomes clearer still when we recall (*a*) the names given to the art of dealing with the demons, as קֶסֶם, ‘divination,’†† מִקְסָם, ‘divination,’‡‡ נַחַשׁ, ‘enchantment,’§§ שַׁחְרָהּ, ‘sorcery,’‖‖ כֶּשֶׁף, ‘incantations’;¶¶ (*b*) the terms indicating the practice of such arts, as עוֹנֵן, ‘to use hidden or magical arts,’*** such as those common among the Philistines; חָבַר, ‘to tie magical knots,’††† צִפְצֵף, ‘to twitter,’ with its corresponding name for the practitioner, הַמְצַפְצְפִים;‡‡‡ (*c*) the various kinds of practitioners whose business it was to deal with spirits, as דֹּרֵשׁ אֶל־הַמֵּתִים, ‘necromancers’; יִדְּעֹנִים, ‘knowing ones,’ or wizards;§§§ מְהַגִּים, ‘those who mutter’;‖‖‖ אִטִּים, ‘whisperers’;¶¶¶ אוֹב, those who maintain communion with the dead, cause them to return, and through intercourse with them deliver oracles, speaking low as if out of the ground. Condemned by the Deuteronomic legislation, they were banished by Saul, patronized by Manasseh, and much sought after by the Egyptians.* The entrance of these malevolent spirits into a person might be prevented by using proper precaution. Among the Orang Laut of the Malay Peninsula when the demon of small-pox is active in one locality the people of the adjacent districts prevent it coming to them by placing thorns in the paths between them and the infected locality. The Khonds of Orissa ward off the same intruder by presenting the demon with gifts.† Among the Hebrews the chief prophylactics were amulets,‡ charms,§ knotted cords,‖ the repetition of the *Sh^{e}ma‘* (Dt 6^4) and other formulæ, fixing of the *m^{e}zûzāh*, wearing the *t^{e}phillîn*, eating salt;¶ and, as we may infer from the practice of other races, the intervention of guardian angels.** When the malevolent spirit had actually entered a person the usual remedies employed were sacrifice,†† prayer,‡‡ and, as the thing aimed at was the expulsion of the spirit, exorcism.§§

These notes will make clear what needs to be kept in mind, the very large place demonism occupied in the minds of the ordinary Hebrews.

As men came to think of the river running and the tree falling through natural causes, while still attributing the earthquake and the thunder to the action of a god, so they came to think of certain maladies as also due to natural causes, whereas others, peculiar, or peculiarly severe, were still considered as the work of demons. It is impossible to trace out this process in every religion, but the OT affords us helpful suggestions. Among the Hebrews it pursues something like the following line. When a disease in its advent and development followed, in different people, very much the same course, exhibiting nothing abnormal, its nature came, so far, to be understood, and to be considered as due to natural causes. The sickness of the son of the woman of Zarephath (1 K 17^{17}), Hezekiah (2 K 20^1), Daniel (Dn 8^{27}), Jacob (Gn 48^1), Abijah (1 K 14^1), is not attributed to any extranatural cause.‖‖ This conception of natural diseases would result in, and go hand in hand with, some study of such diseases. By the time of Ḫammurabi, the doctor, the veterinary surgeon, and the brander were each distinct from one another.¶¶ The hygienic laws of Leviticus would encourage the study of the causes of disease. ‘In the Mishna it is mentioned with approval “Hezekiah put away” a Book of Healings.’*** In the time of Jeremiah physicians were a distinct set of men.††† They were more or less connected with the priests and prophets, and were probably more akin to the ‘leech’ of the Middle Ages than to the scientifically trained physician of to-day. Still the rise of curative applications * shows the dawning of some idea of rational treatment. Such men would be viewed with prejudice by people of a conservatively pietistic type, as the Chronicler (2 Ch 16^{12}) who censures Asa for resorting to physicians, and by disappointed patients with whose disease they had wrestled in vain (Wis 16^{12}, Job 13^{4}). But the success which in many cases they achieved merited and won its meed of praise.†

---

* Ps 91^6, ἀπὸ δαιμονίου μεσημβρινοῦ; Dt 32^{24}, Is 28^2, Hos 13^{14}; *Exp*, 7th ser., iii. 332; F. W. Farrar, *Life of Christ*, London, n.d., p. 180; *Exp*, 7th ser., iv. 145; W. St. Chad Boscawen, *British Museum Lectures*, London, n.d., iii. 9; *JE* iv. 515.

† Dt 32^{24}, Job 5^7, Ps 76^4 78^{48}, Ca 8^6, Hab 3^5; *Exp*, 5th ser., v. [1897] 403; *PEFSt* xxx. [1898] 259, xlvi. [1914] 141; *HDB* i. 451, ii. 418, v. 618; *ERE* iv. 598.

‡ Pr 30^{15}; *ERE* iv. 596; *HDB* ii. 418^a, iii. 210^b, v. 618^a; *JE* iv. 516; W. Robertson Smith, *OTJC*, Edinburgh, 1881, p. 122, but cf. 2nd ed. (do., 1892), p. 111. For דֶּבֶר, the demon of plague in Lv 26^{25}, see *JE* iv. 515; *PEFSt* xlvi. 141.

§ *Exp*, 7th ser., iii. 329 f. For other examples see p. 529.

‖ *Ib.* p. 535.

¶ *ERE* iv. 598.

** *Exp*, 7th ser., iii. 322.

†† Ezk 13^6, etc. Its cognates are קָסַם, ‘to divine’ (Dt $18^{10.14}$ etc.), a rite practised by strangers and by Balaam (Is 6^2, Jos 13^{22}), and קֹסְמִים (Dt 18^{14}), the practitioner of such an art; see *EBi* i. 1119.

‡‡ Ezk 12^{24} is a kindred term.

§§ Nu 23^{23}, etc., a word connected with divination by serpents, with its verb נִחֵשׁ, to practise such enchantments; Lv 19^{26}, etc.; *Exp*, 7th ser., iii. 540; and נַחְשׁוֹן, one who practises such divination, occurring only as a proper name in Ex 6^{23}.

‖‖ Is 47^{11}: ‘Evil will fall upon thee which thou canst not dispel with sorcery and which thou canst not remove with rituals of purgation’; *ExpT* xxii. [1910–11] 323; *Exp*, 7th ser., iii. 540.

¶¶ 2 K 9^{22}. The art itself, according to Robertson Smith, is an expression used of shredded herbs of which was concocted a magic brew (*Exp*, 7th ser., iii. 539); cf. Is 65^4. כִּשֵּׁף, 2 Ch 33^6, means to use incantations, while כַּשָּׁף (Jer 27^9), מְכַשֵּׁף, and מְכַשֵּׁפָה indicate those who used incantations, as the Egyptians and Babylonians (Ex 7^{11}, Dn 2^2).

*** Dt 18^{10} etc., Is 2^6. The LXX translates by κληδονίζομαι. The practitioner was termed מְעוֹנֵן (Dt 18^{10}, Jg 9^{37}).

††† LXX translates by καταδέω and the noun by κατάδεσμος, חֶבֶר being the magical knot so tied—Dt 18^{11}, Ps $58^{6\,(5)}$, Is $47^{9.12}$ (cf. Lk 13^{16}, a daughter of Abraham bound by Satan); *Exp*, 7th ser., iii. 536, 539. See also the sixteen figures, ‘captives,’ found by Bliss at Sendahannah (*PEFSt* xxxii. [1900] 332 and note by Clermont Ganneau, *ib.* xxxiii. [1901] 57).

‡‡‡ Is 8^{19} 10^{14} 38^{14}.

§§§ Dt 18^{11}, Lv 19^{31} $20^{6.27}$, 1 S $28^{3.9}$; *ExpT* ix. [1897–98] 157.

‖‖‖ Is 8^{19}; *Exp*, 7th ser., iii. 537.

¶¶¶ *Exp*, 7th ser., iii. 537; Is 19^3.

* 1 S 28^7, Is 8^{19} 29^4, Dt 18^4, 2 K 21^6, 2 Ch 33^6. They were n reality ἐγγαστρίμυθοι, ventriloquists in the original sense of that term; *Exp*, 7th ser., iii. 537; *ExpT* ix. 157.

† Tylor, *PC*^{4}, ii. 126, 127.

‡ *E.g.* the הַלְּחָשִׁים, Is 3^{20}; *Exp*, 7th ser., iii. 541; cf. 2 Mac 12^{40}; Davies, *Magic, Divination, and Demonology*, pp. 99, 105; Edersheim, *LT*^{4} i. 482; Dt 22^{12}, Is $3^{18\text{-}20}$; Japp, *Some Heresies dealt with*, p. 239.

§ Edersheim, *LT*^{4} ii. 776.

‖ *Exp*, 7th ser., iii. 543, where see other similar charms; Dt 22^{12}.

¶ Davies, *Magic, Divination, and Demonology*, p. 79; *DCG* i. 440.

** Ps 34^7 91^{11}, Mt 18^{10}, Mk 1^{13}, Ac 12^{15}; Tylor, *PC*^{4} ii. 199; *HJ* xi. [1912–13] 164; *DCG* i. 440.

†† Tylor, *PC*^{4}, pp. 129, 131.

‡‡ Mt 17^{21}, Mk 9^{29}, Ja 5^{15}.

§§ Mesopotamian literature has preserved many magic formulæ; see Sayce, *HL*, App. iii.; R. C. Thompson, *The Reports of the Magicians and Astrologers of Nineveh and Babylon in the British Museum*, London, 1900, *The Devils and Evil Spirits of Babylonia*; other authorities quoted in artt. DIVINATION and EXORCISM; Tylor, *PC*^{4}, pp. 127, 133, 135; *Exp*, 7th ser., iii. 327, 536, iv. 136, 139.

‖‖ See also Lv 15^{33}, 2 S 13^2, 2 K 1^2 $8^{7.29}$ 13^{14} 20^1, Sir 31^2, 2 Es 8^{31}.

¶¶ §§ 215–227.

*** Quoted by J. B. Lightfoot, *The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*, London, 1875, p. 140.

††† Gn 50^2 refers to professional embalmers.

But when a disease appeared as a sudden seizure, epidemical, or otherwise abnormal, men still believed that it was caused by a Divine being. Jahweh Himself smites with disease: diseases of the abnormal type are arrows shot from the hand of God.‡ Leprosy was clearly sent by Jahweh, and therefore His priests were the judges of the presence and of the cure of that disease, and the patient when cured had to offer sacrifice.§ At other times Jahweh employed a subsidiary spirit like the Satan (Job 2^{7}), or some other of his messengers.‖ Saul's case is instructive. First of all there came upon him a spirit called רוּחַ יְהוָֹה and רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים.¶ This spirit departed from him, and another spirit, called רוּחַ־רָעָה מֵאֵת יְהוָֹה ** and רוּחַ־אֱלֹהִים רָעָה,†† a malevolent spirit of the gods, came upon him; and a pathological condition at once ensued, exhibiting itself in intermittent attacks of a strange and therefore demoniacal disorder.‡‡ For such abnormal diseases exorcism, in some form or another, would continue to be employed.§§ Thus the evolution of the function and character of spirits and the advance of medical science led to the differentiation of two types of disease, one normal, always tending to increase in number, and the other abnormal, always tending to decrease in number, the latter type being due to the action of superhuman beings.

In the Apostolic Age a belief in the active participation of spiritual beings in human affairs was universal.‖‖ Of these some were beneficent, as the Spirit of God, the Spirit of Jesus, the seven spirits before the throne of God, angels, archangels, principalities, powers, 'living creatures,' and probably the πρεσβύτεροι before the throne.¶¶ Others, which specially concern us, were malevolent.*** These were organized into a kingdom, the prince of the demons being Beelzebul, otherwise named Satan, and the devil,††† who is the 'prince of the air,' and has therein his residence.‡‡‡ In fact, to some Christians the age appeared one of lawlessness and unbelief lying under the sway of the Satan.§§§ Satan is not merely a malevolent spirit; he delights in doing evil. As the Evil One, he is in a special sense the Tempter, sows evil in the world, and snatches away good. He has the power of death. He suggests to Judas to betray the Master, and the final surrender of the traitor to the Tempter is described in the words 'Satan entered into him.'* Subordinate to him are potentates of the dark present, the spirit-forces of evil in the heavenly sphere,† among all of whom there are degrees of malevolence.‡ The demons were numerous, they congregated in men,§ and in certain places where they might be found. These places, as can easily be understood, were uninhabited, and remote from human dwellings. Arabs and Jews thought of these malevolent beings as dwelling in deserts, waterless places, mountains, cemeteries, and places which had been deserted.‖ The demons were able to enter into men and animals; they could go out of their own accord and they could be cast out by exorcists.¶ The entrance of a maleficent spirit made a human being a demoniac. But we get a clearer view of demonomania if we look at it from:

(*a*) *The ethical standpoint.*—People whose strangeness of life or action seemed abnormal were said to have a demon; this was said ** of our Lord even by His own relatives, and of John the Baptist. In the Apostolic Age there were many people whom the writers of the NT looked upon as wicked. Amid that evil and disloyal generation †† were hypocrites, sinners, adulterers, harlots, thieves, brigands, and open enemies of our Lord and His servants. But none of these are thought of as demoniacs. The boy mentioned in Mk 9^{21} had been a demoniac from a child, hence the malady could not have arisen from moral causes. Further, the fact that demoniacs were not excluded from the synagogue ‡‡ indicates that demonomania was not looked upon as constituting them immoral characters. The demons were maleficent, some of them also malevolent, but their wickedness did not necessarily contaminate the patient morally. It is also to be observed that demoniacs were not constantly or permanently afflicted.

(*b*) *The physical standpoint.*—By the time of Jesus, the physician, separated off now from the prophet and the priest, had his distinctive name and practised his art on payment of fees.§§ Indications are not wanting that matters of diet and the use of restoratives were studied, and as healing appliances the balm of Gilead, the waters of Siloam and Bethesda, the hot springs of Tiberias and Callirhoe were well known and widely used.‖‖ Luke was a physician,¶¶ and most probably it was to him that the inhabitants of Melita brought those who were diseased to receive medical treatment.*** These developments of medical science more and more differentiated demonomania from more normal diseases. The latter were well known and are often alluded to. Peter's mother-in-law, Æneas, Dorcas, the father of Publius, Epaphroditus, Trophimus, besides many others whom our Lord cured, all laboured under ordinary diseases and no hint is given that they were demoniacs.†††

---

* See the case of Hezekiah (2 K 207).

† Sir 10^{10} $38^{1-3.\ 12}$; on 38^{15} see *HDB* iii. 321; *ExpT* x. [1898–99] 528; Jos. *Ant.* VI. viii. 2; cf. the reported hiding of a medical book of Hezekiah (*HDB* i. 113^{a}). A list of diseases will be found in *HDB* iii. 323.

‡ 2 Ch $21^{14.\ 18}$, Ex 9^{15}, Nu 11^{33}, Dt $28^{22.\ 27.\ 28.\ 35.\ 60}$, 1 S 25^{38} 26^{10}, 2 S 12^{15} 24^{15}, 2 K 6^{18}, Is 3^{17}, Zec 14^{12}, 2 Es 15^{4}, 2 Mac 9^{5}; *HDB* iii. 323.

§ Lv 13. 14, 2 K 15^{5}, Mk 1^{40-45}; Marti, *The Religion of the OT*, p. 113.

‖ 2 K 19^{35}, 2 S 24^{16}, 1 Ch 21^{12-27}, Dt 29^{22}, 2 S 12^{15}, Ex 12^{29}, Nu 11^{33}, 1 S 25^{38}, 2 K 15^{5} 19^{35}.

¶ 1 S $10^{6.\ 10}$ 11^{6} (28^{15}) (18^{12}) 16^{23}.

** 1 S 16^{14}.

†† 1 S $16^{15.\ 16}$ 18^{10}.

‡‡ Jos. *Ant.* VI. viii. 2, xi. 3.

§§ *Ib.* VIII. ii. 5; *Exp*, 7th ser., iii. 323; *JE* iv. 516.

‖‖ Mt 14^{26}, Mk 6^{49}, Lk 24^{37-39}, Ac 12^{15}.

¶¶ Mt 3^{16}, Ro 8^{9} etc., Ac 16^{7}, Rev 1^{4}, Ac 10^{7}; some angels had acquired names, Jude ^{9}, 1 Th 4^{16}, Ro 8^{38} etc., Rev 4^{4-6}.

*** Mt 11^{18} 12^{43}, Lk $7^{21.\ 33}$ 8^{2} 11^{24-26}, Jn 6^{70} 7^{20} $8^{48.\ 49}$ $10^{20.\ 21}$.

††† Rev 20^{2}, Mt $12^{24.\ 30}$=Mk $3^{22.\ 30}$=Lk $11^{15.\ 19}$; *DCG* i. 439, 441.

‡‡‡ Eph 2^{2}, Lk 10^{18}; *HDB* i. 58^{b}.

§§§ Appendix to Mark in Codex W, the Freer Uncial.

* Mt $13^{19.\ 38}$, 1 Jn 2^{13} 3^{12}, Mt 4^{1}, Mk 1^{13}, Lk 4^{1}, Jn 13^{27}, Lk 22^{3}, Mt $13^{25.\ 39}$, He 2^{14}, Jn 13^{2}, Lk 22^{3}, Jn 13^{27}.

† Eph 6^{12}.

‡ Mt 12^{45}.

§ Mk 5^{9}, Lk 8^{30}, Mt 12^{45}, Lk 8^{27}. Sometimes they were in parties of seven (Lk 8^{2} 11^{26}; cf. Rev 1^{4}); *ERE* iv. 570, 599; *DCG* ii. 249.

‖ Dt 32^{10}, Lk 8^{29}, Mt 12^{43}, Mk $5^{2.\ 3.\ 5}$, Lk 8^{27}, Rev 18^{2}; *Exp*, 7th ser., iii. 328, 528, 529; *ERE* iv. 613; *DCG* i. 439, 441; G. A. Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, Edinburgh, 1901, p. 281. In India the demons of disease live in damp places, latrines, ruined houses, the source of many diseases (Davies, *Magic, Divination, and Demonology*, p. 104).

¶ Mk 5^{1-13}, Lk 11^{24}.

** Mk 3^{22}, Mt 11^{18}, Lk 7^{33}, Jn 7^{20} $8^{48.\ 52}$ 10^{20}.

†† Lk 11^{29}.

‡‡ Mk 1^{23}, Lk 4^{33}.

§§ Mt 9^{12}=Mk 2^{17}=Lk 5^{31}, Mk 5^{26}, Lk 4^{23} 8^{43} omitted by BD, etc.

‖‖ Lk 8^{55} 10^{34}, 1 Ti 5^{23}, Mk 6^{13}, Ja 5^{14}, Jer 8^{22} 46^{11} 51^{8}, Ezk 27^{17}, Jn $9^{1ff.}$ $5^{2ff.}$; Jos. *Ant.* XVIII. ii. 3; *HDB* ii. 103; Jos. *Ant.* XVII. vi. 5; *PEFSt* xxxvii. [1905] 223.

¶¶ Col 4^{14}.

*** A. Harnack and W. Ramsay (*Exp*, 7th ser., . [1906] 492), J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan (*ib.* vii. [1909] 472), C. T. P. Grierson (*ib.* viii. [1909] 514).

††† Mt 8^{14}=Mk 1^{30}, Ac $9^{33.\ 37}$ 28^{8}, Ph 2^{26}, 2 Ti 4^{20}.

In the NT the distinction is carefully observed; sicknesses and diseases are referred to as prevalent;[*] particular diseases are mentioned by name, as lunacy, hæmorrhage, paralysis, dumbness, deafness, leprosy, fever, blindness, lameness, shrivelled limbs, dropsy, dysentery, maimedness;[†] disease is differentiated from demonomania.[‡] These latter types of disease, differing from the other by suddenness of attack or other abnormal feature, were still, owing to ignorance of their real nature, attributed to the action of superhuman beings such as Jahweh,[§] one of His messengers,[‖] the Satan,[¶] one of his messengers,[**] or a demon who was sometimes named from the disease with which he infected the sufferer, as a deaf and dumb spirit,[††] an unclean spirit,[‡‡] a spirit of infirmity,[§§] etc. While doubtless the old preventives against the entrance of demons continued to be employed, the older forms of expulsion (besides the direct act of God [Col 1^{3}] and determined effort on the part of the sufferer [Eph 6^{12}]), such as prayer[‖‖] and exorcism,[¶¶] were practised. We have no reason to suppose that our Lord and His followers thought of these diseases and remedies in any other way than the rest of their countrymen.[***] Our Lord's method of delivering His message, like His mode of living, was to a large extent conditioned by the times in which He lived. As He condescended to become a man, He humbled Himself to become one of the itinerant healers who abounded throughout the country. This enables us to realize how Jesus commanded the attention of His countrymen not merely by curing diseases but by exorcizing demons. Further, it explains how these wonders, while attracting the crowd, did not impress the majority of the people with the fact that He was a Divine Being, any more than the miracles of Moses led the Egyptians to think of him as a messenger from Jahweh. It is very significant that, after recording the turning of water into wine (Jn 2^{1} 4^{46}), the cure of the royal official's son (4^{47}), the healing of the invalid at the Pool of Bethesda (5^{1}), the feeding of the five thousand (6^{1}), and the walking on the sea (6^{19}), the writer of the Fourth Gospel says that not only many of His disciples refused to associate with Him any longer (v.^{66}), but even His own brothers did not believe in Him (7^{5}). Of the mass of the people it is said, 'But though he had done so many signs before them, yet they believed not on him' (12^{37}), but continued to demand a sign not on earth but from the heavens.

Jesus, then, cured not merely normal diseases, but cases of demonomania of which no particulars are given.[†††] But there are recorded four types of demonomania which appeared, and might well appear, to those of that age to be caused by the intrusion of a demon: (1) where certain organs existed but seemed prevented from fulfilling their proper functions, as cases of dumbness (Mt 9^{32}, Lk 11^{14}), dumbness allied with blindness (Mt 12^{22}), and dumbness aggravated by deafness, sudden convulsions, causing suicidal tendencies, foaming at the mouth and grinding the teeth (Mt 17^{15-18}, Mk 9^{17-26}, Lk 9^{37-43}); (2) the case of the demoniac of Capernaum, where the demon made its presence felt in outcries, shrieks, and convulsions (Mk 1^{23-26}, Lk 4^{33-35});[*] (3) the demoniac or demoniacs of Gadara present still stronger evidence of what would be deemed embodiment, such as abnormal physical strength, exhibiting itself in fierceness, violence, the breaking of chains and fetters, passion for seclusion among the tombs and mountains, frenzied shriekings, self-mutilation, nakedness, homicidal tendencies, loss of the sense of personality, and identification of the patient with the demon (Mt 8^{28-32}, Mk 5^{2-13}, Lk 8^{27-33});[†] and (4) the case of the daughter of the Syrophœnician woman, in which the cure was effected when the afflicted person was not present (Mt 15^{22-28}, Mk 7^{24-30}).

The question of how Jesus accomplished these cures brings us face to face with problems which have not as yet been satisfactorily solved, but which the study of insanity and kindred diseases will doubtless one day clearly explain. As to the outward methods employed, it is noticeable that our Lord used no incantations or similar outward means. He seems to have been in the habit of laying His hands on the sufferers, and this became a means by which spiritual blessing was also conveyed.[‡] His word alone seems to have been effective.[§] Jesus Himself uses two expressions to indicate the power which lay behind and wrought through touch and word—'the Spirit of God' (Mt 12^{28}) and 'the finger of God' (Lk 11^{20}). These expressions do not help us much to understand the authority which the crowds recognized as accompanying His acts (Mk 1^{27}); nor, indeed, do the words of the Third Evangelist (Lk 5^{17}): 'the power of the Lord was present for the work of healing.' The difficulty is not lessened when we remember that this power is said to have been conveyed by Jesus to the Twelve and to the Seventy (see EXORCISM). Indeed it is increased when we learn that, even during our Lord's ministry, unauthorized exorcists effected cures in His name (Mk 9^{38}, Lk 9^{49}, Mt 7^{22}), that such power was promised 'to all those that believe' (Mk 16^{17}), and that Jewish exorcists used His name in a magical formula to cast out demons (Ac 19^{13}).

The real solution would seem to lie in the direction of suggestion. Suggestion is defined as 'the communication of any proposition from one person (or persons) to another in such a way as to secure its acceptance with conviction, in the absence of adequate logical grounds for its acceptance.' The idea thus suggested 'is held to operate powerfully upon his bodily and mental processes,' with the result that owing to the conditions of mental dissociation 'the dominance of the suggested idea is complete and absolute.'[‖] Suggestion is most effective when the agent is a person with an intense personality wielding magnetic power, when he has gained a reputation for power to do what he is expected to do, and distinguished by some outstanding quality like kingship or holiness, and if there has grown up a widespread popular belief in his power; also when the patient is inferior in knowledge or station to the agent. Suggestion becomes still more powerful if the attention of both is intensely concentrated on the purpose to be accomplished, if the impression has already been produced that the agent will accomplish his task, and if consciousness is practically, for the time being, concentrated on the one thing. Of course the more direct and powerful the suggestion and the more receptive the patient, the greater the success.[*] A careful reading of the cures of demonomania effected by our Lord will show how the factors making for success were not only present, but powerfully present. We are in this way led to the conclusion that there is 'no reason to suppose that the cases . . . recorded [in the NT] were due to anything but disease. . . . No facts are recorded which are not explicable either as the ordinary symptoms of mental disease or as the result of suggestion.'[†]

---

[*] Mt 4^{23} 8^{17} 9^{35} $14^{14.35}$ $25^{36.39.43.44}$, Mk $6^{5.55.56}$, Lk 4^{40} 6^{17} $7^{2.10}$ 9^{2} 10^{9}, Jn 5^{4} $4^{46.52}$ 6^{2} 11^{1-6}, Ac 5^{15} 9^{37} 28^{9}, Ph $2^{26.27}$, 2 Ti 4^{20}, Ja $5^{14.15}$.

[†] Mt 4^{24} 10^{8}, Lk 7^{22}; Mt 9^{20}, Mk 5^{25}, Lk 8^{43}; Mt 4^{24} 9^{2}, Mk 2^{3}, Lk 5^{18}, Ac 8^{7} 9^{33}; Mt 15^{29-31}, Mk 7^{37}, Lk 1^{20}; Mt 11^{5}, Mk $7^{32.37}$, Lk 7^{22}; Mt 11^{5} 8^{2} 26^{6}, Mk 1^{40} 14^{3}, Lk 4^{27} 5^{12} 17^{12}; Mt 8^{14}, Mk 1^{30}, Lk 4^{38}, Jn 4^{52}, Ac 28^{8}; Mt 11^{5} 9^{27} $15^{14.29-31}$ 20^{30} 23^{16}, Mk 8^{22} 10^{46}, Lk 4^{18} 6^{39} 7^{22} 14^{13}, Jn 5^{3} 9^{1} 10^{21}; Mt 11^{5} $15^{29.31}$, Lk 7^{22} 14^{13}, Jn 5^{3}, Ac 3^{2} 8^{7}; Mt 12^{10}, Mk 3^{1}, Lk 6^{6}, Jn 5^{3}; Lk 14^{2}; Ac 28^{8}; Mt 15^{30}, Lk 14^{13}; minor troubles, as stomachic complaints, stammering, are also alluded to, 1 Ti 5^{23}, Mk 7^{32}.

[‡] Mt 4^{24} 8^{16} $10^{1.8}$, Mk $1^{32.34}$ 3^{15} 6^{13} 16^{17-18}, Lk $4^{40.41}$ $6^{17.18}$ 13^{32} $9^{1.2}$, Ac 8^{7} 19^{12}.

[§] Ac 12^{23} 13^{11} 23^{3}.

[‖] Ac 12^{23}.

[¶] Lk 13^{13}

[**] 2 Co 12^{7}.

[††] Mk $9^{17.25}$.

[‡‡] Mt 12^{43} etc.

[§§] Lk 13^{11}. Cf. the Mesopotamian differentiation of functions of the spirits of disease (Maspero, *The Dawn of Civilization*, p. 631). The conception of disease produced by supernatural agents or causes is found in Rev 6^{8}, 1 Co 11^{30}; cf. Ps 103^{3}, Jahweh 'who healeth all thy diseases.'

[‖‖] Mt 17^{21}, Mk 9^{29}.

[¶¶] Jos. *BJ* VII. vi. 3; Lk 10^{17}; Davies, *Magic, Divination, and Demonology*, p. 29.

[***] *DCG* ii. 92, 93; P. Dearmer, *Body and Soul*, London, 1909, p. 146; T. J. Hudson, *The Law of Psychic Phenomena*, do., 1913, chs. xxiii., xxiv.; G. J. Romanes, *Thoughts on Religion*^{6}, do., 1896, p. 180, and C. Gore's note; *ExpT* xxv. [1913–14] 483.

[†††] Mt 4^{24} 8^{16}, Mk 1^{32} $3^{14.15}$ 6^{7} 16^{17}, Lk 8^{2} 4^{41} 7^{21} 13^{32}.

[*] W. M. Alexander, *Demonic Possession in the NT*, Edinburgh, 1902, p. 81.

[†] *Ib.* p. 39.

[‡] Mt 9^{18}, Mk 5^{23} $6^{2.5}$ $8^{23.25}$ 9^{27}, Lk 4^{40} 13^{13}, Ac 5^{12} 9^{17} 8^{28}; cf. Ac 3^{7}; Dearmer, *Body and Soul*, p. 168; Mt 19^{13}, Mk 10^{16}, Ac 6^{6} $8^{12.18.19}$ 13^{3} 19^{6}, 1 Ti 4^{14} 5^{22}.

[§] Mt $8^{6.32}$ 17^{18}, Mk 5^{8}, Lk $4^{35.36}$.

[‖] *EBr*^{11} xxvi. 49.

The Jewish doctrine as to demonomania will be found fully developed in the Talmud.[‡]

The article EXORCISM shows how belief in demonomania and its cure by exorcism prevailed in the Apostolic Church, and among the Fathers.[§] In the post-Apostolic Church these beliefs were, if possible, even more strongly held. Justin Martyr says[‖] that some Christians had 'the spirit of healing,' and claims[¶] that their exorcism in the name of Christ always succeeded, while success was probable only if the exorcism was in the name of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. 'The church sharply distinguished between exorcists who employed the name of Christ, and pagan sorcerers and magicians, etc.; but . . . several of her exorcists were just as dubious characters as her "prophets."'[**] From the time of Justin Martyr for about two centuries there is not a single Christian writer who does not solemnly and explicitly assert the reality and frequent employment of exorcism. The Christians fully recognized the supernatural power possessed by the Jewish and Gentile exorcists, but they claimed to be in many respects their superiors. By the simple sign of the Cross or by repeating the name of the Master they professed to be able to cast out devils which had resisted all the enchantments of the pagan exorcists. Tertullian, Origen, Lactantius, Athanasius, Augustine, and Minucius Felix all profess their faith in demonomania and exorcism.[††] In the mediæval Church the *ἐνεργούμενοι*, persons who are apt to become possessed, and to whom a special part of the church was exclusively assigned, were under the care of an *ἐπορκιστής*.[‡‡]

The belief in demonomania lingered, and still lingers, in certain Christian circles. We have it in the Church. The rite of casting out demons from the bodies of the possessed is still retained in the rituals of the Roman and Greek Churches,[§§] the exorcist in the former Communion occupying the third place among the four minor orders. It still holds a place in the belief and ritual of the Maronite Church.[*] In England, by the 72nd Canon of A.D. 1603, 'no minister or ministers shall, without licence and direction of the bishop . . . attempt . . . to cast out any devil or devils.'[†] Among individuals we find Burton[‡] a firm believer in demonomania. Times of excitement, especially of religious excitement, rouse the belief in demons and demonomania. Certain disturbances which occurred in the Rectory at Epworth were ascribed by the Wesleys to the devil.[§] Wesley (1703–28) himself believed that disease and other discomforts were caused by demons, and that epilepsy was often the result of possession.[‖] He gives several cases of such disease, where the afflicted person believed that he or she was possessed by an evil spirit, and who were partially or completely cured by exorcism.[¶] Cotton Mather (1663–1728) was a fervent believer in demonomania. Lavater (1741–1801) was so convinced of the facts of possession that he was seriously concerned with the cessation of the gifts of healing and miracle-working power possessed by the early Church.[**] The obsolete word 'demonagogue' was used as late as 1736 to indicate a medium 'useful in expelling preternatural substances from the body.'[††] George Lukins, who was possessed of seven devils who threw him into fits, and talked, sang, and barked out of him, was cured by a solemn exorcism by seven clergymen at the Temple Church in Bristol in 1788.[‡‡] In 1843 Pastor Blumhardt exorcized the devil out of the sisters Dittus.[§§] As late as 1848 'demonifuge' was used to mean some substance, like salt, used to drive away demons. In countries still under the sway of animism the belief exists in all its pristine strength. In Ceylon the exorcist will demand the name of the demon possessing a person, and the person will give the demon's name.[‖‖] To the question 'Does Devil-possession, in the sense in which it is referred to in the New Testament, exist at this present time amongst the least civilized of the nations of the globe?' R. C. Caldwell gives an answer in the affirmative, and gives instances of such possession from Southern India.[¶¶] Among all peoples of the lower culture demonomania and exorcism are mixed up with a good deal of trickery and ventriloquism.[***] But even among the more highly educated races the belief ever and anon becomes more or less prominent. The diseases which were ascribed to demons still occur, and where a person of powerful will and outstanding religiosity, with a profound belief in himself and in demon-possession, attains to some eminence, then persons more or less demoniac are treated by exorcism. But modern exorcism—or Divine healing, as it is sometimes called—rests very much on the personality of Satan and on subordinate demons only as doing his work;[†††] and so the patient should be treated only by those who are 'anointed by the Holy Spirit.'[‡‡‡] Nevius, an American missionary, found that in China demonomania was not an uncommon disease, and that the Chinese ascribed it, as all people of the lower culture do and did, to the action of demons—a belief confirmed among the Chinese Christians by the narratives of the NT. Nevius did not attempt to cast out the demons by exorcism or the use of the name of Jesus. The most that he and the other missionaries did was to pray for the relief of the patient . . . 'and the demon, speaking apparently in a different personality and with a different voice, confessed the power of Jesus, and departed.'[*] Howton, who declares he has seen demons possessing human bodies, and producing exactly similar effects to those described in the Word of God,[†] gives many instances of cures effected by himself, of which the following is typical. A local preacher afflicted evidently by multiple personality had baffled Howton, but he says, 'early one morning the Spirit of God came upon me and I commanded the Demon in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ to come out of him. The Evil Spirit threw him on the floor, made him writhe like a serpent, and foam at the mouth, and then left him. He was cured.'[‡]

---

[*] W. MacDougall, *Psychology*, London, 1912, p. 196; *EBr*¹¹ xxvi. 49; Boris Sidis, *The Psychology of Suggestion*, do., 1898, pp. 56, 79; *DCG* i. 402; Boris Sidis and S. P. Goodhart, *Multiple Personality*, New York, 1905, which contains an account of the famous Hanna Case; Hudson, *The Law of Psychic Phenomena*, p. 351.

[†] *EBr*¹¹ xxii. 175.

[‡] Jos. *Ant.* VIII. ii. 5; *DCG* i. 439; *Exp*, 7th ser., iii. 320, 325.

[§] *HJ* xi. 153.

[‖] *Dial. c. Tryph.* 30, 39, 76; *Apol.* ii. 5, 6.

[¶] *Apol.* ii. 6; *Dial.* 30, 85.

[**] Harnack, *Mission and Expansion of Christianity*², tr. J. Moffatt, London, 1908, i. 132.

[††] W. E. H. Lecky, *History of European Morals*, London, 1911, i. 161; *HDB* iii. 39; art. EXORCISM; *Exp*, 7th ser., viii. 515; *de Civitate Dei*, Eng. tr., Edinburgh, 1871, ii. 490; Tylor, *PC*⁴ ii. 139.

[‡‡] See art. EXORCISM and authorities quoted there; *ERE*, 'Demons and Spirits (Christian).'

[§§] Tylor, *PC*⁴ ii. 142.

[*] *PEFSt* xxiv. [1892] 144.

[†] Dearmer, *Body and Soul*, p. 289.

[‡] Robert Burton, *Anatomy of Melancholy*, ed. London, 1866, pt. I. sect. i. mem. 1, subsect. 1; Tylor, *PC*⁴, p. 191.

[§] R. Southey, *Life of Wesley*, new ed., London, 1864, pp. 16, 306.

[‖] *Ib.* p. 365.

[¶] *The Journal of the Rev. J. Wesley* (Everyman ed.), i. 190, 235, 237, 295, 363, 412, 557, ii. 100, 225, 259, 309, iii. 149.

[**] *HJ* xiii. [1914] 191.

[††] *OED* iii. 185.

[‡‡] Tylor, *PC*⁴ ii. 140.

[§§] Dearmer, *Body and Soul*, p. 378.

[‖‖] Tylor, *PC*⁴ ii. 404.

[¶¶] R. C. Caldwell, *CR* xxvii. [1876] 369 f.

[***] Tylor, *PC*⁴ ii. 182.

[†††] Howton, *Divine Healing*, p. 82.

[‡‡‡] *Ib.* p. 90.

It is somewhat difficult to draw the line between the milder forms of demonomania and certain forms of temptation, convictions of sin, and even theological scepticism. John Bunyan's prolonged periods of melancholia, Brainerd's deep convictions of evil, Carlyle's 'Stygian darkness' are all instances in point. In many cases these feelings are symptoms of an already existing pathological state. This feeling in its strongest form 'manifests itself in the idea of demoniacal possession. The foreign evil power by which the patient imagines he is governed, assumes different demoniacal shapes, according to the prevailing superstitions and beliefs of the epoch and country. The chief differentiating mark of demon possession is the automatic presentation and the persistent and consistent acting out of a new personality. With this are associated convulsions of the voluntary muscles, contraction of the larynx which alters the voice in a striking manner, anæsthesia of different important organs, hallucinations of sight and hearing. This delirium is at times accompanied by intermittent paroxysms of violent convulsions, evidently analogous to epileptic or, still more frequently, hysterical attacks, which are separated by intervals of perfect lucidity.'[§] At Gheel in Belgium there was a shrine of St. Dymphna to which in former days lunatics were carried in large numbers to have the demons expelled. Many are still taken there, but to be treated by physicians.[‖] That men have believed in certain things 'is ground for holding that such ideas were indeed produced in men's minds by efficient causes, but it is not ground for holding that the rites in question are profitable, the beliefs sound, and the history authentic.'[¶] To seek, to-day, for the action of a demon in a case of demonomania would be just as sensible as to take a walk into a desert to have an interview with Lilith or Azazel. As Comte well said, 'no conception can be understood except through its history.'[**]

P. A. GORDON CLARK.

POSSESSIONS.—See WEALTH and COMMUNITY OF GOODS.

POTENTATE.—The word occurs only in the designation of God in 1 Ti 6^{15}, 'the blessed and only Potentate (*δυνάστης*), the King of kings, and Lord of lords.' This is the only instance in the NT in which the word *δυνάστης* is applied to God. It occurs with tolerable frequency in this sense in the apocryphal books, *e.g.* Sir $46^{5.6}$, 2 Mac 3^{24} 12^{15}, 3 Mac 2^{3}. It is characteristic of the Pastoral Epistles to set God in the foreground as the author of salvation, and the heaping up of attributes in this passage to denote the Divine sovereignty may be merely an instance of this tendency. Some, however, find underlying it a protest against Gnostic misrepresentations, or against the growing practice of Emperor-worship.

G. WAUCHOPE STEWART.

POTTER (*κεραμεύς*).—The ceramic art is of great antiquity. Wherever the primitive races of mankind found clay, they became potters. Rude baked vessels are found with the remains of our remotest ancestors. In the story of the creation, God is represented as a Potter moulding the human body out of the dust of the ground (Gn 2^{7}; cf. Job 10^{9} 33^{6}), and thoughtful men in all ages have figured themselves, in their whole relation to God, as clay in the Potter's hands (Is 45^{9} 64^{8}, Jer 18^{6}, Ro 9^{21}). In one aspect the metaphor is still readily accepted, for all devout men believe in the Divinity that shapes their ends. The classical modern expression of the doctrine is found in Browning's *Rabbi Ben Ezra*:

> 'Ay, note that Potter's wheel,
> That metaphor! and feel
> Why time spins fast, why passive lies our clay,—
> . . . . . .
> But I need, now as then,
> Thee, God, who mouldest men;
> . . . . . .
> My times be in Thy hand!
> Perfect the cup as planned!'

But God's 'vessels of wrath' (Ro 9^{22}) create a difficulty for the reason as well as the heart, a difficulty which becomes a *σκάνδαλον* when the phrase is interpreted as meaning that 'the Lord has created those who, as He certainly foreknew, were to go to destruction, and He did so because He so willed' (J. Calvin, *Institutes*, Eng. tr., 1879, ii. 229). Such a doctrine has been a rock of offence to very many. The legitimate protest of the clay is heard in the quatrains of Omar Khayyam; and the last word of the Christian spirit is not uttered in the militant Messianic Psalm quoted in the Apocalypse: 'Thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel' (Ps 2^{9} ‖ Rev 2^{27}). See PREDESTINATION.

JAMES STRAHAN.

POVERTY.—See POOR, POVERTY.

POWER, POWERS.—Six Greek expressions are thus translated in the EV.

1. ἐξουσία is rendered thus frequently in the AV. It means, more exactly, 'authority,' which the RV often substitutes, but sometimes, especially in Rev., it follows the AV. The Revisers prefer 'right' in Ro 9^{21}, 1 Co $9^{4f.}$, 2 Th 3^{9}. In Ac 26^{18} the expression 'the power (*ἐξουσία*) of Satan' is to be noted, with which compare Lk 22^{53}, Col 1^{13}.

2. δύναμις.—We find 'the power of God' in 1 Co $1^{18.24}$ 2^{5}, 2 Co 6^{7}; 'the power of our Lord Jesus' in 1 Co 5^{4}; 'the power of the Holy Ghost' in Ro $15^{13.19}$; in Ac 8^{10} 'that power of God which is called Great' is a title given to Simon Magus. There is a strange variation in the RV of 2 Co 12^{9}, where *δύναμις* is twice used as an attribute of Christ; on the first occasion it renders 'my *power* is made perfect in weakness' (AV 'my strength'), but on the second (where the AV has 'power') it gives 'that the *strength* of Christ may rest upon me.' Elsewhere 'power' is uniformly used by the RV, replacing 'might' and 'strength' of the AV (cf. Eph 1^{21}, Col 1^{11}, Rev 12^{10}).

3. κράτος is rendered 'power' by the AV in Eph

---

[*] Nevius, *Demon Possession*, p. vii, etc.; A. Lang, *The Making of Religion*, London, 1898, p. 141.

[†] Howton, *Divine Healing*, p. 89.

[‡] *Ib.* pp. 93, 103–106, 108; R. Brown, *Demonology and Witchcraft*, p. 90; Nevius, *Demon Possession*, pp. 13, 35.

[§] W. Griesinger, *Mental Pathology*, New York, 1882, pp. 168, 186, 206; *Exp*, 7th ser., viii. 510.

[‖] K. Baedeker, *Belgium and Holland*^{11}, London, 1894, p. 184.

[¶] Tylor, *PC*^{4} i. 13.

[**] Quoted by Tylor, *ib.* p. 19.

1^{19} 6^{10}, Col 1^{11}, Rev 5^{13}, 1 Ti 6^{16}, He 2^{14}; in the last two references the RV also translates in the same way.

4. ἰσχύς (2 Th 1^{9}) is rendered AV 'power,' RV 'might.'

5. τὸ δυνατόν.—In Ro 9^{22} AV and RV have 'willing to make his power known,' *i.e.* 'what is possible to Him.'

6. τῷ δυναμένῳ is translated in Ro 16^{25} 'to him that is of power'; RV 'to him that is able.'

Lastly, in Rev. the AV sometimes inserts the word 'power' from the sense, where there is no Greek to correspond, *e.g.* Rev 6^{4}, 'power was given to him' (*ἐδόθη αὐτῷ*); cf. 11^{3} 13^{15} 16^{8}, in all of which the word disappears from the RV.

The plural 'powers' represents *δυνάμεις* in He 6^{5}, Ro 8^{38}, 1 P 3^{22}; in the last two references angelic beings seem to be meant, as also in Eph 1^{21} and 1 Co 15^{24} (singular). 'Powers' is used by the AV and the RV for *ἐξουσίαι* (another class of angels) in Eph 3^{10} 6^{12}, Col 1^{16} 2^{15}, and in Ro 13^{1-3} in the sense of 'earthly rulers.' In Tit 3^{1} the AV gives 'powers,' the RV 'authorities' (*q.v.*). See, further, art. PRINCIPALITY.

W. H. DUNDAS.

PRÆTOR.—In origin this word means 'the man who goes before (the army),' *præ-itor*, 'the general,' and was applied to the chief magistrates of Rome, when the kingdom gave place to the republic. On the appointment (367 B.C.) of two extra officials to look after the legal business of the Roman State, the name *prætor* was given to them, and a new name *consul* was given to the chief magistrates. The same Greek equivalent, *στρατηγός* ('general'), was used for *prætor* always, though the duties had changed. The prætors of Ac $16^{20ff.}$ are the chief magistrates of Philippi, a Roman *colonia*. It is not impossible that *prætores* was their official title, but it is generally believed that in their case it was merely honorary (see under MAGISTRATE). See W. M. Ramsay in *JThSt* i. [1899–1900] 114 ff.

A. SOUTER.

PRÆTORIAN GUARD.—See GUARD.

PRÆTORIUM (*πραιτώριον*).—Originally denoting the general's (*i.e.* the prætor's) tent in the camp (Livy, x. 33), this word came to signify the official residence of the governor of a province (Cic. *in Verr.* II. iv. 28, v. 35), and in post-Augustan times a palace (Juv. x. 161) or any splendid country-seat (Suet. *Aug.* 72, Juv. *Sat.* i. 75). See, further, art. PALACE.

JAMES STRAHAN.

PRAISE.—1. Ideal of praise.—'He knows little of himself who is not much in prayer, and he knows little of God who is not much in praise.' These words express the habitual thought and practice of the Apostolic Church. We must distinguish between praise and thanksgiving. We praise God for what He is, we thank Him for what He has done. It is possible that a strain of selfishness may creep into our thanksgivings—the Pharisee spirit is not easy to eradicate. But a sincere heart is lifted by praise to the highest level of adoration. With angels and archangels we laud and magnify, saying 'Holy, Holy, Holy.' If we cannot trace the *Sanctus* of the Eucharist back to the 1st cent., we can affirm that it was based on the teaching of the Apocalypse, and may be said to perpetuate in the highest degree the doxologies so often heard on the lips of apostolic writers.

There are two points to be remembered: (1) the rich inheritance of the traditions of praise derived from the Temple services, and (2) the teaching of the Synagogue that, when one is cut off from participation in sacrifices, praise should take their place. The few scattered hints in the Acts support the paradox that least is said in the NT about that which is most familiar in thought and practice. The preparation of the apostles for Pentecost was to be continually in the Temple praising God (Lk 24^{53}). Afterwards we read that the apostles 'did take their food with gladness, . . . praising God' (Ac $2^{46f.}$). Peter and John going to the Temple at the hour of prayer were certainly in accord with the Psalmist: 'Seven times a day will I praise thee' (Ps 119^{164}); and the lame man, whom Peter healed, instinctively praised God (Ac 3^{8}). When Peter reported to the apostles and brethren the gift of the Holy Ghost to the Gentile Cornelius and his friends they glorified God (11^{18}).

St. Paul goes very deeply into the thought of praise as an essential part of devotion when he speaks of the degradation of the heathen world as in a great measure due to their neglect of praise. 'Knowing God, they glorified him not as God' (Ro 1^{21}).* His own practice may be illustrated by the fact that when he and Silas had been beaten with rods at Philippi they sang hymns to God (Ac 16^{25}). And in Ro 1^{25} he turns from the loathsome subject of heathen immorality to give glory to God, as if to guard himself from contamination, just as he prepares himself for his impassioned argument on backsliding Israel by an ascription of praise to 'God blessed for ever' (9^{5}), and passes into another doxology at the end of his argument ($11^{35, 36}$). As he pictures Abraham when he received God's promise of a son giving glory to God (4^{21}), so he desires that Gentiles might glorify God for His mercy (15^{9}, quoting Ps 18^{49} 117^{1} LXX).

The Epistle to the Ephesians opens (1^{1-14}) with a great ascription of praise to God for the blessing of the Church. We are chosen in Christ that we should be 'holy to the praise of the glory of his grace.' Again and again he repeats the cadence 'to the praise of his glory.'

This level is worthily sustained in He 2^{12}: 'in the midst of the congregation will I sing praise unto thee,' when the writer quotes Ps 22^{22}. As the typical king David comes to his own despite Saul's persecution, so does Christ the true King in the hour of His victory over pain acknowledge His people as brethren, and the citizens of His Kingdom take the song of praise from the lips of their King.

Again in He 13^{15} it is suggested that our praises are only worthily offered through our great High Priest: 'Through him let us offer up a sacrifice of praise.' The phrase is quoted from Lv 7^{12}, where it is used for the highest form of peace offering. B. F. Westcott (*ad loc.*) adds that the word 'sacrifice' in Mal 1^{11} 'appears to have been understood in the early Church of the prayers and thanksgivings connected with the Eucharist.' From praise for 'the revelation of God in Christ (*His Name*)' the writer goes on naturally to speak (v.^{16}) of kindly service and almsgiving, for 'praise to God is service to men.'

St. Peter also has a characteristic passage on praise (1 P 2^{9}): 'That ye may tell forth the excellencies of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light.' He is quoting 2 Is 43^{21}, and his word 'excellencies,' standing for Hebrew 'my praise,' means an eminent quality in any person or thing, and the idea is blended with that of the impression which it makes on others; 'the one sense involves the other, for all praises of God must be praises either of His excellencies or of His acts as manifestations of His excellencies' (F. J. A. Hort, *ad loc.*). St. Peter does not say how the Asiatic Christians are to tell them forth, but he implies that their lives must correspond to their worship.

There is a fine saying of Rabindranath Tagore to the effect that the future Saviour of India will be known not so much by the light which streams from Him as by the light which is reflected to Him from His people. 'This calling into God's light . . . is thus fitly chosen as the characteristic act of Him whose excellencies the Christians were to tell forth, because it was on their use of the realm of vision thus opened to them that their power of exhibiting Him to men in grateful praise would depend' (Hort, *ad loc.*).

---

* Cf. Ac 12^{23}, 'Herod was punished because he gave not God the glory.'

The reference to 'marvellous light' suggests a reminiscence of the Transfiguration, and the idea is paraphrased in Clement of Rome (36): 'Through Him [Jesus Christ] let us gaze into the heights of the heavens; through Him we behold as in a mirror His spotless and supernal countenance; through Him the eyes of our heart were opened; through Him our dull and darkened mind burgeons anew into the light' (quoted by Hort, *ib.*; cf. 2 P 1^{16}).

It may be of interest to classify (after Westcott) the various doxologies found in the Epistles and the Apocalypse.

(1) Gal 1^5. To whom [our God and Father] be the glory for ever and ever. Amen.
(2) Ro 11^{36}. To him [the Lord] be the glory for ever. Amen.
(3) Ro 16^{27}. To the only wise God through Jesus Christ [to whom] be the glory for ever. Amen.
(4) Ph 4^{20}. Unto our God and Father be the glory for ever and ever. Amen.
(5) Eph 3^{21}. Unto him [that is able to do exceeding abundantly] be the glory, in the church and in Christ Jesus unto all generations for ever and ever. Amen.
(6) 1 Ti 1^{17}. Unto the King eternal . . . the only God be honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen.
(7) 1 Ti 6^{16}. To whom [the blessed and only Potentate . . .] be honour and power eternal. Amen.
(8) 2 Ti 4^{18}. To whom [the Lord] be the glory for ever and ever. Amen.
(9) He 13^{21}. To whom [the God of peace or possibly Jesus Christ] be the glory for ever and ever. Amen.
(10) 1 P 4^{11}. To whom [God or, possibly, Jesus Christ] is the glory and the dominion for ever and ever. Amen.
(11) 1 P 5^{11}. To him [God] be the dominion for ever and ever. Amen.
(12) 2 P 3^{18}. To him [our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ] be the glory both now and for ever. Amen.
(13) Jude ^{25}. To the only God our Saviour through Jesus Christ our Lord be glory, majesty, dominion and power before all time, and now, and for evermore. Amen.
(14) Rev 1^6. Unto him [that loveth us and loosed us from our sins] be the glory and the dominion for ever and ever. Amen.
(15) Rev 5^{13}. Unto him that sitteth on the throne and unto the Lamb be the blessing and the honour and the glory and the dominion for ever and ever. And the four living creatures said, Amen.
(16) Rev 7^{12}. Amen: Blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, and honour, and power, and might, be unto our God for ever and ever. Amen.

Westcott notes that all except (12) and perhaps (16) are closed by Amen. They vary greatly in detail. We may consider first the address, which in most cases is made to the Father, in two—(3) and (13)—through Christ, and in three to Christ—(8) (12), and (14), possibly also (9) and (10). The richness and variety of the titles in St. Paul's doxologies contrast with the simplicity of his ascription of 'glory.' In one instance he adds 'honour,' in another substitutes 'honour and dominion.' Enlargement of the ascription is found in Jude, and above all in the central vision of the Apocalypse when the sevenfold theme marks the highest range of praise.

It seemed best to incorporate in the foregoing the formal doxologies of this type in the Apocalypse, but others claim mention. In 4^8 the living creatures say: 'Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God, the Almighty, which was and which is and which is to come.' In Swete's words (*ad loc.*): 'This ceaseless activity of Nature under the Hand of God is a ceaseless tribute of praise.' The elders also lay down their crowns of victory before the Throne with their tribute of praise (v.^{11}): 'Worthy art thou, our Lord and our God, to receive the glory and the honour and the power: for thou didst create all things, and because of thy will they were, and were created.'

It is interesting to note how much fuller is the doxology which the angels in 5^{12} offer to the Lamb, adding 'riches, wisdom, strength, and blessing,' and showing how 'they recognize both the grandeur of the Lord's sacrificial act, and its infinite merit' (Swete, *ad loc.*).

A four-fold doxology follows from all creation (no. (15) above), 'dominion' taking the place of the angels' word 'strength,' 'active power being here in view rather than a reserve of secret strength' (Swete, *ad loc.*).

The seven-fold doxology of the angels in 7^{12} (no. (16) above) again follows a short doxology of the Church (v.^{10}): 'Salvation unto our God which sitteth on the throne and unto the Lamb.' But they do not include the Lamb as in 5^{11}.

2. Music.—Our study of the ideal of praise in the Apostolic Church would be incomplete without some reference to the music both vocal and instrumental in which pious hearts desired to express it. The earliest Christian hymns were sung, no doubt, like the psalms, but we know very little if anything about the vocal method of the Hebrews. A. Edersheim, however, thinks that some of the music still used in the Synagogue must date back to the time when the Temple was still standing, and traces 'in the so-called Gregorian *tones* . . . a close approximation to the ancient hymnody of the Temple' (*The Temple*, p. 81). References to musical instruments are few in number. St. Paul refers to pipes, harps, trumpets, and cymbals. The pipe was a cane pierced with holes for notes, or a bit of wood bored out and played like a flageolet.

The harp (κιθάρα) was an instrument of seven strings akin to a lyre. St. Paul argues (1 Co 14^7) that, unless pipe or harp gives a distinction in the sounds, no clear thought will be conveyed to the hearer, just as a trumpet must give no uncertain sound in a call to arms. He refers also to cymbals, half-globes generally of bronze, giving out a clanging sound which cannot be tuned to accord with other instruments. They are symbolic of a character which makes professions in words but is lacking in love, or, as Edersheim puts it, 'he compares the gift of "tongues" to the sign or signal by which the real music of the Temple was introduced' (*op. cit.* p. 78). Edersheim (*ib.* p. 75) also draws an 'analogy between the time when these "harpers" are introduced' in the heavenly services (Rev 5^8 $14^{2.3}$) 'and the period in the Temple-service when the music began—just as the joyous drink-offering was poured out.' And again in Rev 15^2 'the "harps of God"' are sounded 'with pointed allusion . . . to the Sabbath services in the Temple,' when special canticles (Dt 32, Ex 15) were sung, to which the Song of Moses and of the Lamb corresponds when sung by the Church at rest. There was a certain prejudice against the music of flutes, but they seem to have been used at Alexandria to accompany the hymns at the Agape until Clement of Alexandria substituted harps about A.D. 190.

The references to praise in the Apostolic Fathers bring out the same underlying ideas. We find in Clem. Rom. *Ep. ad Cor.* i. 61: 'O Thou, who alone art able to do these things, and things far more exceeding good than these for us, we praise Thee through the High Priest and Guardian of our souls, Jesus Christ, through whom be the glory and the majesty unto Thee both now and for all generations and for ever and ever. Amen.'

The ancient homily known as 2 Clement exhorts to give God 'eternal praise not from our lips only but from our heart' (ii. 9).

The *Epistle of Barnabas* (7) bids 'the children of gladness understand that the good Lord manifested all things to us beforehand, that we might know to whom we ought in all things to render thanksgiving and praise.' The author of the *Odes of Solomon* (Ode 6) compares a soul at praise to a harp, as both Philo (i. 374) and Plato (*Phædo*, 86A) had done: 'As the hand moves over the harp and the strings speak, so speaks in my members the Spirit of the Lord, and I speak of His love.'

Ignatius also writes to the Philadelphians (*ad Phil.* 1) of their bishop as 'attuned in harmony with the commandments, as a lyre with its strings.'

Delight in self-surrender quickens adoration. In the beautiful words of J. F. D. Maurice: 'What we desire for ourselves and for our race, the greatest redemption we can dream of, is gathered up in the words, "Thine is the glory"' (*The Lord's Prayer*, London, 1848, p. 130).

LITERATURE.—In addition to the Commentaries referred to in the text, see **A. J. Worlledge**, *Prayer*, London, 1902; **W. Milligan**, *The Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood of our Lord*^{2}, do., 1894, p. 299 f.; **A. Edersheim**, *The Temple: its Ministry and Services as they were at the Time of Jesus Christ*, do., n.d.; **E. Leyrer**, art. 'Musik bei den Hebräern' in *PRE*^{2}; **J. Stainer**, *The Music of the Bible*, new ed., London, 1914.

A. E. BURN.

PRAYER.—1. General.—Prayer was to the Apostolic Church the very secret of a 'life hid with Christ in God' (Col 3^{3}). It was to them the most natural thing in the world to pray for guidance in perplexity, for strength and blessing when the will of God was manifest. In a word, their intercourse with God passed through the whole scale of feeling from the low note of penitence to the highest notes of thanksgiving and praise. Petition for themselves invariably grew into intercession for others and was never the last word of prayer. Alike when the apostles were about to choose a successor to Judas (Ac 1^{24}) and when the Church of Antioch sent forth Barnabas and Paul on their first missionary journey (13^{3}), prayer was offered. When Paul was kept in prison, he desired and expected such earnest prayer of the Church unto God for him as was offered by the Church of Jerusalem for Peter (12^{5}).

At first the Temple was the centre for the Christians' devotions. They clung to it as 'the house of prayer,' and used 'the prayers' (3^{1}) of Jewish devotion at the customary hours. The third hour was marked by the gift of the Spirit (2^{15}), the ninth by the miracle of the healing of a lame man by Peter and John on their way to prayer (3^{1}), the sixth by the vision which taught Peter to receive Gentile converts. The ill-will of priests and Sadducees only drove them to more earnest prayer for grace to speak God's word 'with all boldness' (Ac 4^{24-30}). There is a deep thought in 1 Jn 3^{22} where prayer is spoken of as the boldness with which a son appears before the Father to make requests. Every such prayer is answered 'not as a reward for meritorious action, but because the prayer itself rightly understood coincides with God's will' (Westcott, *ad loc.*).

The chief characteristic of Christian prayer is the new power which the fellowship of the Spirit brought to Christians, and the grace of perseverance (Eph 6^{18}). It is the Spirit whose voice within each child of God cries 'Abba, Father' (Gal 4^{6}).[*] And, when we are weak and know not what to pray for, 'the Spirit itself entreats for us with groans which are not to be expressed in words,' 'bears His part in our present difficulties' and makes 'our inarticulate longings for a better life . . . audible to God . . . and acceptable to Him since they are the voice of His Spirit' (H. B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the NT*, London, 1909, pp. 220, 221). In this deepest teaching of Paul we are led to associate with the work of the Spirit within the intercession of the Son at the Right Hand (Ro 8^{34}). And we find the clue to the great prayers of Paul.

Beginning with 1 Th 1^{2-3}, we find that the Apostle includes thanksgiving, intercession, and consciousness of the presence of God as of the needs of others. He lays stress on the need of intelligence if prayer is to edify (1 Co $14^{14ff.}$). And along with intelligence he demands from the Christian soldier the resolute perseverance which characterizes his own prayers.

Eph 6^{18}.—The universality of the duty as to mode, times, and persons is enforced by the words 'all prayer,' 'at all seasons,' 'in all perseverance,' 'for all the saints.'

Ro 1^{8-12}.—As elsewhere, Paul begins with thankfulness, offering all prayer through the one Mediator, to whom he commends all the service of the Roman Christians, remembering them, no doubt by name, and desiring to see them both to impart and to receive grace.

Eph 1^{15-19} 3^{14-19}.—Again, beginning with thanksgiving, he asks that his friends may have the spirit of efficiency, growth in knowledge, enlightenment, issuing in power. Knowledge and power are the keynotes in the second prayer, in which there is remarkable social teaching. As each individual is strengthened, the life of the whole community will be uplifted by the Spirit of the Father from whom every fatherhood is named, and who has sent the Christ to teach love as 'the characteristic virtue both of the historic Person and of the ideal State' (Chadwick, *Pastoral Teaching of St. Paul*, p. 292).

In Col $1^{9ff.}$ the same keynotes—knowledge, strength, thankfulness—recur. Knowledge of God's will affects conduct; under the guidance of the Spirit we are led to new forms of service, are enabled to bear with cheerfulness our difficulties and disappointments, assured that the lot of the saints is a privilege 'in the [Divine] light.'

In Ph 1^{9-11} Paul prays that love may abound in knowledge and in all perception. All the faculties of reason and emotion will be cultivated in the well-balanced life, in which enthusiasm does not overpower intelligence and tact, but in the long series of moral choices, by which character is built up, the presence and power of Christ will determine the goal which is 'the fruit of righteousness' in a life lived in union with Him. 'Gloria Dei vivens homo.'

These prayers of Paul throw a bright light on the meaning of the different words for prayer which are often discussed from a philological rather than from a religious point of view. The most important are united in the explicit charge given to Timothy (1 Ti $2^{1f.}$): 'I exhort therefore, first of all, that supplications (*δεήσεις*), prayers (*προσευχαί*), intercessions (*ἐντεύξεις*), thanksgivings (*εὐχαριστίαι*), be made for all men; for kings and all that are in high place; that we may lead a tranquil and quiet life in all godliness and gravity.' Here *προσευχή* means prayer in general, always as addressed to God, whereas *εὐχή* means more often a vow than prayer; *δέησις* is prayer for particular benefits; *ἔντευξις* (lit. 'a pleading for *or* against others') includes the idea of approach (*ἐντυγχάνω*) which in Ro 8^{26} emphasizes its meaning of the intercession of the Spirit, and in Ro 8^{34}, He 7^{25} of the Son. Other words are *αἴτημα*, a petition of man to God (Ph 4^{6}, 1 Jn 5^{15}); and *ἱκετηρία*, an adjective used at first with such a word as *ῥάβδος* or *ἐλαία*, picturing the symbol of supplication, an olive branch bound round with wool carried by the suppliant.

While all Christians are exhorted to pray without ceasing (1 Th 5^{17}) it was regarded as a special privilege of those who had leisure, such as 'widows indeed' (1 Ti 5^{5}), to continue in supplications and prayers night and day. Thus the apostles enlisted the help of the Seven in order to give themselves to prayer and to the ministry of the Word (Ac 6^4).

---

[*] A reminiscence of the Lord's prayer in Gethsemane or a reflexion of the liturgical use of the Church of Jerusalem.

There is a deep meditation on the hearing of prayer in He 5^7, with reference to our Lord's prayers. 'True prayer—the prayer which must be answered—is the personal recognition and acceptance of the divine will (John xiv. 7: comp. Mark xi. 24 ἐλάβετε). It follows that the hearing of prayer, which teaches obedience, is not so much the granting of a specific petition, which is assumed by the petitioner to be the way to the end desired, but the assurance that what is granted does most effectively lead to the end. Thus we are taught that Christ learned that every detail of His Life and Passion contributed to the accomplishment of the work which He came to fulfil, and so He was most perfectly "heard." In this sense He was "heard for His godly fear"' (Westcott). These pregnant sentences go to the very root of the problem of prayer. We learn its meaning as the Apostolic Church learnt it only by following our Lord to Gethsemane and the Cross. The ordinary posture of prayer was standing with arms outstretched, like the Pharisee of our Lord's parable (Lk 18^{11}), and the earliest paintings of *Orantes* in the Roman Catacombs. The well-known words of Tertullian may be quoted (*Apol.* 30): 'Gazing up heavenward we Christians pray with hands extended because they are innocent, with the head uncovered because we are not ashamed; finally, without a guide because we pray from the heart.'

Following the example of our Lord, both kneeling and prostration were also adopted; Stephen (Ac 7^{60}), Peter (9^{40}), Paul (20^{36} 21^5), all knelt. Clement of Rome associated prostration with penitence (*Ep. ad Cor.* i. 48): 'Let us therefore root this out quickly, and let us fall down before the Master, and entreat Him with tears.' The value attached by Ignatius to the influence of prayer is expressed in the words (*Eph.* 5): 'For if the prayer of one and another hath so great force, how much more that of the bishop and of the whole Church.'

2. Prayers for the departed.—The possible references to prayers for the departed in the NT taken by themselves are ambiguous, nor is it easy to deal with this subject without reference to authors who wrote outside the limits of this Dictionary. But there is one reference, which may be fairly said to prove the existence of this practice during the first half of the 2nd century.

The epitaph of Abercius (Avircius Marcellus), who was bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia Salutaris *c.* A.D. 160, includes: 'Let every friend who observeth this pray for me.' This is confirmed by the evidence of Tertullian, *de Corona*, 3 (written *c.* A.D. 211): 'We offer oblations for the dead on the anniversary of their birth.' And again (*c.* A.D. 217), in *de Monogamia*, 10, Tertullian describes a Christian widow as one 'who prays for his [*i.e.* her husband's] soul, and requests refreshment for him in the meanwhile, and fellowship in the first resurrection, and she offers [sacrifice] on the anniversaries of his falling asleep.'

There are also many such references in the inscriptions of the Catacombs, some of which may be assigned to the 2nd century. And there is a continuous tradition of such prayers in the ancient Liturgies, in which prayers are offered for those who rest in Christ that they may have peace and light, rest and refreshment: that they may live in God (*or* in Christ): that they may be partakers of the joyful resurrection, and of the inheritance of the Kingdom of God.

It is clear that such intercessions date from the beginning of the 2nd cent., and that they represent quite faithfully the general tenor of the teaching of the Apostolic Church on the Future State. Without labouring the point we may say that they support the inference that Onesiphorus was dead when Paul prayed for him (2 Ti 1^{16-18}): 'The Lord grant unto him to find mercy of the Lord in that day.' The Apostle mentions his household in 1^{16} and 4^{19}, but says nothing of Onesiphorus himself.

The reference in 2 Mac 12^{43-45} to sacrifices offered for the dead by Judas Maccabæus may be taken to prove that prayers for the dead were not unknown in our Lord's time. But the author speaks in an apologetic way, as if the act of Judas were not a common practice. And the Sadducees who controlled the Temple services did not believe in any resurrection, so we cannot suppose that they would have approved of such prayers.

The central thought of the Apostolic Church with regard to their relationship to the faithful departed is summed up in the Epistle to the Hebrews (12^{22-23}) in the words: 'Ye are come . . . to the spirits of just men made perfect,' also described (12^1) as 'a great cloud of witnesses.' They are living and they are interested in both our faith and conduct, and the least response of our loyalty to them will naturally find expression in our prayers for their peace and progress.

LITERATURE.—**W. E. Chadwick**, *The Pastoral Teaching of St. Paul*, Edinburgh, 1907; **F. E. Warren**, *The Liturgy and Ritual of the Ante-Nicene Church*, London, 1897; **A. J. Worlledge**, *Prayer*, do., 1902; **G. Bull**, *Serm.* iii. (=*Works*, 7 vols., Oxford, 1846, i. 77); **H. M. Luckock**, *After Death: Testimony of Primitive Times*^{4}, London, 1882; **S. C. Gayford**, *Future State*, do., 1903; **J. Ussher**, *An Answer to a Challenge made by a Jesuite in Ireland*, do., 1631; **G. H. S. Walpole**, *The Gospel of Hope*, do., 1914. A. E. BURN.

PRAYER FOR THE DEAD.—See PRAYER.

PREACHING.—The essential nature of apostolic preaching is expressed in the two main words used throughout the NT: κηρύσσειν, 'to proclaim as a herald' (κῆρυξ), and εὐαγγελίζειν, 'to tell good tidings' (εὐαγγέλιον, 'the gospel'), both of which are translated 'to preach.' Sometimes the full expression κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, 'to proclaim the gospel' (Gal 2^2, 1 Th 2^9), occurs, while εὐαγγελίζειν frequently characterizes the content of the good tidings, specifically as 'the gospel' (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, 1 Co 15^1, 2 Co 11^7, Gal 1^{11}), or more variously as 'Jesus Christ' (Ac 5^{42}), 'peace' (Eph 2^{17}), or 'the word' (Ac 15^{35}). Other expressions, such as 'proclaim Christ' (καταγγέλλειν Χριστόν, Ph $1^{17f.}$) and 'testify the gospel (διαμαρτύρεσθαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον) of the grace of God' (Ac 20^{24}), help to make clear that preaching was primarily the proclamation of good tidings from God, the heralding of Jesus Christ as the Saviour of men.

To get back to the NT standpoint it is necessary to rid one's mind of the preconception that preaching was giving a sermon or delivering a discourse elaborated in accordance with certain recognized homiletical canons. Still less was it the detailed exegesis and exposition of a so-called text or isolated passage of Scripture, such as prevailed in the synagogue preaching. That the message was often supported by quotations from the OT is not doubted; but the apostolic preaching did not confine itself to appeals to Scripture. It was rather the spontaneous, authoritative announcement of a truth felt to be new to the experience of man, and explicable only in the light of the incarnation, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ as Saviour of men.

1. Preaching and teaching.—The function of preaching, as above outlined, is to be distinguished from teaching (διδαχή), in which the truths and duties of Christianity were more deliberately unfolded and applied. The content of the preaching and of the more elaborated instruction was necessarily often the same (Ac 5^{42} 15^{35}, Col 1^{28}). The preacher (κῆρυξ) was sometimes also a teacher (διδάσκαλος), especially in the more settled state of the early Church (1 Ti 2[7], 2 Ti 1[11]). But, even so, a clearly marked distinction is made in the case of Paul '*preaching* (κηρύσσων) the kingdom of God, and *teaching* (διδάσκων) the things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ' (Ac 28[31]). The ability to preach or to teach was regarded as a gift of the Holy Spirit, but due regard was given to the 'diversities of gifts' and 'diversities of ministrations' even in these closely related activities. 'To one is given through the Spirit the word of wisdom, and to another the word of knowledge, . . . to another prophecy' (1 Co 12[4-11]; cf. Ro 12[6ff.]). That a clearly marked differentiation of function was believed to be Divinely appointed appears from the two formal lists of spiritually gifted members, in which 'teachers' are mentioned after apostles and prophets (1 Co 12[28], Eph. 4[11]). Preaching was the function of the apostles (in the wider meaning of the word) and of the prophets. Both travelled about, the former continuously in their missionary activities, the latter frequently settling down in one locality where their preaching would tend to edification and exhortation.

2. Qualification.—The work of preaching in the 1st cent. was regarded not as an office but as a 'calling' due to the gift of the Spirit. Apostolic preaching began with the command of Christ to the Twelve (Mt 10[7], Mk 16[15. 20]); but it was after the bestowal of the Spirit at Pentecost as a 'tongue of fire' that this gift (χάρισμα) of inspired utterance became general in the early Church. Those who preached the gospel did so because they were under Divine compulsion (Ac 4[8. 20] 6[10] 8[26]). The Holy Spirit qualified them for this special work, and authenticated their message. They felt that they were commissioned by no mere human authority. Subjectively their call to preach consisted in a feeling of 'necessity' (1 Co 9[16]), but an objective test was applied to them and their message by the spiritual communities to which they ministered (1 Th 5[21], 1 Co 12[3. 10], 1 Jn 4[1f.]). The *Didache* shows that at a later stage the tests were practical, if not drastic. The prophet must 'have the ways of the Lord' (xi. 8); he must practise what he preaches, and not ask for money (xi. 9–12). But the preacher, when duly approved, had the right to expect support (1 Co 9[4ff.], 2 Co 11[8f.], *Did.* xiii. 1–3), and was to be treated with great honour (*Did.* iv. 1). 'The picture of these wandering preachers, men burdened by no cares of office, with no pastoral duties, coming suddenly into a Christian community, doing their work there and as suddenly departing, is a very vivid one in sub-apostolic literature' (T. M. Lindsay, *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries*, 1902, p. 73).

3. Preaching and faith.—That preaching was the Divinely ordained means for the diffusion of Christianity appears from the successful appeal it made to the capacity for faith which is latent in all men. 'Belief cometh of hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ' (Ro 10[17]). The ancient world was familiar with much propaganda work done by travelling teachers of various philosophical schools. But the basis of appeal in these cases was to the speculative curiosity of their hearers. The preachers of the gospel, on the contrary, did not depend upon the assent of reason (1 Co 2[1. 4]). Not that the gospel had no place in a rational view of man and his relation to the universe and God; there was a 'wisdom' to be spoken among mature believers (v.[6]). But the message of the early Christian preachers was more in the nature of a Divine summons to the human heart to trust in the fatherly love of God and to believe in Jesus Christ as the pledge of His redeeming grace. It was a call to the human will, estranged by sin, to yield in trustful submission to the Divine will. The faith which the preacher sought to arouse was no mere intellectual belief in a system of doctrine, but an act of the whole personality, in which trust, belief, and volition united in a self-commitment to a Divine Person—God or Christ. And a careful study of the NT shows that such a close connexion between preaching and faith was established: 'So we preach, and so ye believed' (1 Co 15[11]). The philosophic teacher might capture the intellect, the mystery-monger might stir superstitious hopes and fears, but 'the first Christian preachers *testified* that they had found salvation through faith in the Gospel of the Cross as they presented it. With the consciousness of the same need awakened, their hearers believed the testimony that was thus given them; they embraced the Saviour who was thus presented to them; and so believing, they entered into the same experience of salvation as belonged to their teachers' (W. L. Walker, *The Cross and the Kingdom*², 1911, p. 25 f.). The gifts of the Spirit received by the 'hearing of faith' authenticated both the believer (Gal 3[2]) and the preacher (1 Co 2[4]).

4. Kinds of preaching.—The preaching of the Apostolic Age was marked by great variety. The sources available for a characterization are the historical portions of Acts, together with the actual discourses contained therein, and also what may legitimately be inferred from the Epistles. The Epistles should not be regarded as specimens of apostolic preaching, being rather, in form and content, examples of primitive teaching. But they contain many allusions to preaching, and thus help us to reconstruct historically the conditions under which it took place, the forms it assumed, and its main doctrinal contents.

The variety of apostolic preaching was determined by the individuality of the speakers, the nature of their audiences, and the stage in the doctrinal development of the message. But beneath all differences a unity was preserved round the central theme of the Person and work of Jesus Christ in human redemption. It was 'preaching Christ,' whatever might be the local or personal conditions under which the message was proclaimed. Three main characteristics are to be noted. (*a*) First in historical order came the preaching to the Jews, which may be called *Messianic*. St. Peter's addresses in Jerusalem and St. Paul's sermons in the synagogues on his missionary journeys appeal to the resurrection of Jesus in proof of His Messiahship, and support it by quotations from the OT. Exhortations to repentance naturally followed this kind of preaching, especially as the exaltation and second coming of the Christ were emphasized. (*b*) Next there was the preaching to the Gentiles, which may be described as *missionary*. The evangelization of heathen without any knowledge of the Scriptures or of the facts concerning Jesus naturally employed different methods of appeal. On the negative side it exposed idolatry, superstition, and degrading notions of God, and condemned human sin. The positive element was the proclamation of Jesus Christ as the Saviour of all men. This included the facts of His earthly life, and His death and resurrection (Gal 4[4], 1 Co 15[3f.]). (*c*) The third kind of preaching was what may broadly be called *edifying*. It was addressed to congregations composed of Jewish Christians and converts won from heathenism. In these spiritual communities meetings for edification were held, in which every one who had a 'gift'—whether of prophecy or interpretation, or 'tongues,' or praise (1 Co 14[26f.])—used it for the upbuilding of the Church. It was in such gatherings that preaching, in the more generally accepted sense of the term, was exercised.

In St. Paul, who is the preacher *par excellence* of the Apostolic Age, we see all the foregoing kinds of preaching illustrated, together with a marvellous variety of modes of address to win his hearers. In the case of Jews he appealed, like St. Peter, to the OT (Ac $13^{40.\ 47}$ $15^{15f.}$ $17^{2f.}$). In Athens he did not hesitate to quote a pagan poet (17^{28}), and expounded the philosophy of the Christian religion. To the people of Lystra ($14^{15f.}$) he used the arguments of natural theology. But it was in Corinth that he opposed his central theme of 'Christ crucified' to the impurity, commercialism, and superstitions of the city (1 Co 1^{22} 2^{2}). Attention has also been drawn (A. C. McGiffert, *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, 1897, p. 255) to the fact, which is often overlooked, that St. Paul in his preaching did much personal work among individuals (Ac 18^{2}, 1 Th 2^{9}), in addition to addressing audiences. The effective preaching of Philip to the Ethiopian eunuch (Ac 8^{35}) may be quoted as an earlier example of this 'hand-to-hand work' in Christian evangelization.

5. Content of apostolic preaching.—The elaborated doctrinal aspects of the gospel proclaimed by the apostles are dealt with in the artt. GOSPEL and TEACHING and those concerned with the points of biblical theology involved. All that can be attempted here is to indicate the main outlines of the subject-matter of the preaching of the apostles.

(*a*) *God and Christ.*—Our Lord proclaimed as good tidings the coming of the Kingdom of God. But after His death and resurrection a new content appears in the preaching of His followers, viz. the Person and work of Christ Himself. Not that the subject of the Kingdom was dropped (Ac 8^{12} 20^{25} 28^{31}); but it became subordinated to the gospel concerning Christ, through whom the Divine sovereignty was to be established on earth, and to the ultimate question about the nature of God and His grace, through which alone such a Kingdom could come among sinful men. As a basis for missionary Christological preaching the doctrine of the existence and unity of God would form a large element in the glad tidings to heathen living under the distractions of polytheism and demonism (Ac $17^{22ff.}$, 1 Th 1^{9}). But undoubtedly in the forefront was the proclamation to all nations of the 'unsearchable riches of Christ' (Eph 3^{8}). In one word, Christ was the main content of apostolic preaching. Among those who under stress of persecution went about 'preaching the word' was Philip, who in Samaria 'proclaimed unto them the Christ' (*ἐκήρυσσεν τὸν Χριστόν*, Ac $8^{4f.}$), while to the Ethiopian eunuch he 'preached Jesus' (*εὐηγγελίσατο τὸν Ἰησοῦν*, v.^{35}). Others came to Antioch 'preaching the Lord Jesus' (*εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν*, 11^{20}). St. Paul warns the Corinthians against anyone who 'preacheth another Jesus, whom we did not preach' (*ἐκηρύξαμεν*, 2 Co 11^{4}); and he rejoices when, even under conditions of faction, 'Christ is proclaimed' (*Χριστὸς καταγγέλλεται*, Ph 1^{18}). The very Person of Jesus Christ constituted a gospel worth preaching. He embodied and expressed in human nature the final revelation of God (cf. Jn 14^{9}).

(*b*) *Resurrection and Messiahship of Jesus.*—It was no mere abstract conception of the personality of Jesus that was preached. As pointed out by B. Weiss, 'like Jesus Himself, His apostles commence, not with a religious doctrine or an ethical demand, but with the proclamation of a fact' (*Biblical Theol. of NT*, Eng. tr., 1882–83, i. 173). That fact was the Messiahship of Jesus. But another fact formed the basis of this proclamation—and that was the fact that Jesus had been raised from the dead. 'The resurrection of Jesus,' says G. V. Lechler, 'appears in primitive Christian preaching as the fundamental fact, the Alpha and Omega of apostolic announcement' (*Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times*, Eng. tr., 1886, i. 267). Hence it was after the Resurrection and the supernatural gift at Pentecost that the apostles 'ceased not to teach and preach (*εὐαγγελιζόμενοι*) Jesus as the Christ' (Ac 5^{42}; cf. 2^{36} $3^{14f.}$ 4^{10} 5^{31}). This close connexion between the Resurrection and Messiahship of Jesus appears also in the preaching of the Apostle of the Gentiles. St. Paul declared in the synagogue at Thessalonica: 'it behoved the Christ to suffer, and to rise again from the dead; and this Jesus whom I proclaim unto you is the Christ' (Ac 17^{3}; cf. 1 Th 1^{10}). Later in Corinth he testified that 'Jesus was the Christ' (18^{5}), reminding them afterwards that the 'gospel preached' unto them was that 'Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures . . . and that he hath been raised on the third day according to the scriptures' (1 Co $15^{1\text{-}4}$). It must be remembered that the good tidings of the resurrection of Jesus carried with it the glad message also of the believers' share in the Messianic blessings (Ac $3^{19\text{-}26}$), and a participation in the future resurrection (1 Co $15^{20ff.}$; cf. Ac 17^{18}: St. Paul 'preached Jesus and the resurrection').

(*c*) *Death and Atonement of Christ.*—The earliest hearers of the gospel, however, could not lose sight of the prior sinister fact of the crucifixion and death of Jesus. That was a 'stumbling-block' to the Jews and 'foolishness' to the Greeks. But St. Paul found in the death of Christ the central theme of his preaching, for in it he discerned Christ's redeeming work as Saviour of all men. 'We preach' (*κηρύσσομεν*), he says, 'a Messiah crucified' (1 Co 1^{23}). 'I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified' (2^{2}). It was because 'the word of the cross' (1^{18}) was also the 'word of reconciliation' (2 Co 5^{19}) that St. Paul preached it so fervently, and because he had proved in his own experience that this, 'his gospel,' was the 'power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth' (Ro 1^{16}). 'Only a man,' says W. Beyschlag, 'in whom the Lord who is the Spirit has come to dwell, who exhibits the love of Christ in its transforming power, can kindle that flame of divine life in others; and the fire is spread, not by instruction in a doctrinal system, but by testimony to a personal experience of the gospel of God coming from the heart with individual truth and freedom' (*NT Theology*, 1895, ii. 169). That this conception of the redeeming efficacy of the death of Christ formed a large part of apostolic preaching may be inferred from many different passages (He $9^{13f.}$, 1 P $1^{18f.}$, 1 Jn 1^{7} 2^{2}).

To 'preach Christ,' then, was to proclaim, as good news to sinful and dying men, the many-sided fact of Christ, the whole scheme of salvation—pardon, regeneration, spiritual enrichment, personal immortality—involved in Christ's death, resurrection, and exaltation. This may be seen from several expressions in which the term 'preaching' does not apply to the gospel message, *e.g.* 'Moses hath in every city them that preach (*κηρύσσοντας*) him' (Ac 15^{21}), where the whole Mosaic dispensation is the content of the preaching. Again, 'the baptism which John preached' (*ἐκήρυξεν*, Ac 10^{37}), and to 'preach circumcision' (Gal 5^{11}), indicate clearly other and wider contents than 'baptism' and 'circumcision.' If to 'preach Moses' meant to proclaim the validity of the whole Mosaic legislation, then to 'preach Christ' involves not only the proclamation of the religious significance of Jesus Christ but the whole evangelical scheme of redemption and reconciliation that centres in Him. Hence one can 'preach peace' (Eph 2^{17}) in view of the results of the gospel, or 'preach the faith' (Gal 1^{23}), or 'preach the word of God' (Ac 13^{5}) as a Divinely given message to be proclaimed and as a gospel of salvation.

LITERATURE.—In addition to the works quoted above, see J. Ker, *Lectures on the History of Preaching*, 1888; M. Dods, 'The Foolishness of Preaching,' in *Expositor's Bible*, '1 Corinthians,' 1889; artt. on 'Preaching,' by W. F. Adeney, in *HDB* and *DCG*, and art. on 'Preaching Christ,' by J. Denney, in *DCG*; A. W. Momerie, *Preaching and Hearing*, 1886; J. B. Lightfoot, *Ordination Addresses*, 1890, pp. 3–119; J. H. Jowett, *Apostolic Optimism*, 1910, p. 262; W. T. Davison, *Strength for the Way*, 1902, p. 137; R. W. Dale, *Christian Doctrine*, 1894, p. 302; J. M. E. Ross, *The Christian Standpoint*, 1911, p. 15; A. M. Fairbairn, *Christ in the Centuries*, 1893, p. 23.

M. SCOTT FLETCHER.

PRECIOUS.—The word is of frequent occurrence in the NT, and represents various Greek terms: *ἔντιμος, τιμή, τίμιος, ἰσότιμος*. The root idea is something of great worth, which also becomes precious or an honour to those who possess it. It is applied to jewels (Rev 17^{4} $18^{12.16}$ $21^{11.19}$), to wood (18^{12}), to the fruit of the earth (Ja 5^{7}), to costly stones used in building, *i.e.* stones of large size or of great price, like marble, etc. (1 P $2^{4.6}$, 1 Co 3^{12}; cf. 2 Ch 3^{6}). It is also applied to the great promises (2 P 1^{4}), to the blood of Christ (1 P 1^{19}), and to faith, 'equally precious faith' (2 P 1^{1}, RVm). The AV rendering of 1 P 2^{7}, 'Unto you therefore which believe he is precious,' is changed in RV to 'For you therefore which believe is the preciousness.' In this passage the RVm 'honour' is to be preferred (see HONOUR).

JOHN REID.

PRECIOUS STONES (*λίθοι τίμιοι; λίθος τίμιος* used collectively in Rev $18^{12.16}$).—The writers of Scripture share to some extent the instinctive delight of mankind in precious stones, 'a subject in which the majestic might of Nature presents itself to us within a very limited space, though, in the opinion of many, nowhere displayed in a more admirable manner' (Pliny, *HN* xxxvii. 1). St. Paul uses precious stones figuratively (1 Co 3^{12}), in allusion either, generally, to the marbles and other costly materials employed in the building of palaces and temples, or, in particular, to the 'pleasant stones' (LXX, *λίθοι ἐκλεκτοί*, Vulg. 'lapides desiderabiles') of Is 54^{12}. He thinks of Christians, of characters, or of creeds (apparently the last are more immediately in view) as the precious stones which may be built upon the one foundation, Jesus Christ. The writer of the Rev. alludes to the proper colours of precious stones in a very technical manner, displaying 'that exact knowledge of particulars only possessed by persons either dealing with precious stones, or from special circumstances compelled to have a practical acquaintance with their nature' (C. W. King, *The Nat. Hist. of Precious Stones and of the Precious Metals*^{2}, 1867, p. 325). He figures Him that sits on the throne of heaven as like a jasper and a sardius (4^{3}). The light (*φωστήρ*) within the New Jerusalem is like a very precious stone, a jasper, crystal-clear (21^{11}); and the foundations of the city are adorned with all manner of precious stones (21^{19}). The merchandise of Imperial Rome of course includes precious stones (18^{12}), with which, indeed, the city decks herself (18^{16}). While Pliny, a contemporary of the writer of Rev., expresses a sober regret that the admiration of precious stones 'has now increased to such a universal passion' (*loc. cit.*), the Hebrew-Christian prophet writes with a holy indignation, since to his mind the things that are most precious have become an adornment for her who is most vile—for 'Babylon,' the mother of harlots (Rev $17^{4.5}$).

The idea of a New Jerusalem built of precious stones (21^{19-21}) was not original, for it occurs in the prayer of Tobit (To $13^{16.17}$). St. John's list of 12 precious stones is closely related to that of the 12 engraved stones in the breastplate of the high priest (Ex 28^{17-20} 39^{10-13}), and thus to that of the king of Tyre (Ezk 28^{13}, where the LXX, diverging widely from the Massoretic text, simply reproduces the stones of the breastplate). It was probably the writer's intention to name all the 12 stones which had been consecrated by use in the ephod, but he quotes loosely from memory, omitting some and adding others. Sardius, topaz, emerald, sapphire, jacinth, amethyst, beryl, and jasper reappear in his list, though in a different order. Carbuncle (marg. 'emerald'), diamond (marg. 'carbuncle'), agate, and onyx (marg. 'beryl') are omitted, and their place is taken by chalcedony, sardonyx, chrysolite, and chrysoprase.

Various causes make the identification of the precious stones of the ancients a difficult matter. The classical treatises of Theophrastus (*c.* 300 B.C.) and Pliny (*c.* A.D. 100) are full of interest, but the descriptions of particular stones are often too vague for diagnosis. The old principle of classification was colour rather than chemical affinity. Various red stones—ruby, red spinel, and garnet—were grouped together under the general name of carbuncle (*ἄνθραξ*), while many green stones—emerald, peridote, green fluorspar, malachite, and certain kinds of quartz and jade—were each called *σμάραγδος*. Stones once deemed valuable have fallen out of esteem, and their names have been transferred to others which have risen into favour. Stones which were, and still are, precious have had their names interchanged. Of the twelve foundation stones in Rev $21^{19.20}$, the jasper, the emerald (a corruption of *σμάραγδος*), the sardonyx, the sard, the beryl, and the amethyst have (on the whole) retained their ancient meanings; but the ancient sapphire is our modern lapis lazuli, the chalcedony our agate, the chrysolite our topaz, the topaz our chrysolite, and the jacinth our sapphire. Moreover, it is very improbable that the stones in the Hebrew ephod were in all instances so precious as the Greek names assigned to them in the Ptolemaic period would seem to indicate. As taste developed, it normally moved away from the common to the rich and rare. The conquests of Alexander brought into the Western markets all the gems of the gorgeous East, and established a new standard of values in precious minerals. The diamond and the ruby, which became well known in the Greek and Roman periods, are anachronisms in the OT (where even the RV retains them); and Flinders Petrie (*HDB* iv. 619 ff.) has stated strong reasons for holding that the 'sardius' of the Hebrew breastplate (Ex 28^{17}; cf. Rev 21^{20}) was an opaque red jasper, the 'emerald' a quartz crystal, the 'topaz' a yellow green serpentine, and the 'beryl' a green felspar. The question whether the writer of Rev. gave the terms he found (mostly) in the LXX an ancient or a modern connotation is one which perhaps scarcely occurred to himself.

It is probable that precious stones were originally valued less for their beauty and rarity than for the magical and medicinal powers which they were supposed to possess. By a kind of sympathetic magic the amethyst (*ἀ*, 'not,' and *μεθύσκω*, 'make drunk') with its wine-red colour was reputed to be a preventive of intoxication, the red jasper (or blood-stone) was a cure for hæmorrhage, the green jasper brought fertility to the soil, and so forth. According to the doctrine of 'signatures,' each mineral was supposed to be marked by some natural sign which indicated the particular medicinal use to which it could be put. The belief in 'lucky stones' was widespread. Pliny gravely sets down the peculiar virtues of many of the precious stones which he describes: the diamond 'neutralizes poison and dispels delirium'; amber, 'worn on the neck, is a cure for fevers and other diseases,' and so on. From this superstition the writer of Rev. is far removed. It does not appear that his precious stones have any occult or mystical meaning. He merely uses their colours æsthetically, as the pigments of a splendid picture. His sole desire is to fire the imagination with an idea of the radiant beauty of the city whose builder and maker is God.

LITERATURE.—W. M. Flinders Petrie, art. 'Stones, Precious,' in *HDB*; A. S. Murray and A. H. Smith, art. 'Gem' in *EBr*^{11}; C. Babington, art. 'Gems' in Smith's *DCA*.

JAMES STRAHAN.

PREDESTINATION.—1. Context.—Predestination in its widest reference, as attributed to God, is 'His eternal purpose, according to the counsel of His will, whereby, for His own glory, He hath foreordained whatsoever comes to pass' (*The Shorter Catechism*, A. 7). The word 'predestinate' appears nowhere in the AV of the OT, and in the NT it has now disappeared, having given place to 'foreordain' in the RV in the four places where the AV had it (Ro $8^{29.30}$, Eph $1^{5.11}$). 'Foreordained' of the AV has also given place to 'foreknown' in the RV of 1 P 1^{20} (where the Gr. is *προεγνωσμένου*. See FOREKNOWLEDGE). 'Foreordain' in the passages referred to above, and also in Ac 4^{28} (AV 'determined before'), 1 Co 2^{7} (AV 'ordained'), renders *προορίζειν*, the tense employed in these six instances being the aorist, as befitted a purpose of the Divine mind from eternity. The simple *ὁρίζειν* occurs similarly with a kindred meaning (Lk 22^{22}: *κατὰ τὸ ὡρισμένον*; Ac 2^{23}: *τῇ ὡρισμένῃ βουλῇ*; cf. Ac 10^{42} $17^{26.31}$, Ro 1^{4}).

2. Connotation. — *Election* and *predestination* belong to the purpose of grace cherished in the Divine mind from all eternity; and as far as salvation is concerned they are the expression of the entire dependence of sinful man upon the grace of God from the beginning to the end. They are included together by St. Paul among the spiritual blessings bestowed upon believers; and the two transactions are regarded as taking place before the foundation of the world (Eph $1^{4.5}$). *Election* has in view the persons who are to be the objects of Divine blessing; *predestination* the privileges and blessings which are to be their portion (Ro $8^{29.30}$, Eph $1^{4.5}$). *Foreknowledge* (*πρόγνωσις*, 1 P 1^{2}; cf. Ro 8^{29}, 1 P 1^{20}) belongs to the same purpose of grace, and is spoken of by St. Paul as the first step in the Divine plan of salvation, for it is those whom God 'foreknew' whom He also 'foreordained' to be conformed to the image of His Son. The word 'chose' (*εἵλατο*) in 2 Th 2^{13} includes 'foreknew' and 'foreordained' of Ro 8^{29}, and has itself apparently the force of 'elected' (*ἐξελέξατο*).

3. Predestination in the moral world.—It belongs to the very nature of God that He should have a counsel or purpose which embraces all things from the beginning to the end, and that this counsel shall be assuredly accomplished. This is again and again declared in Scripture: 'The Lord hath made all things for himself; yea, even the wicked for the day of evil' (Pr 16^{4}); 'My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure' (Is 46^{10}). St. Paul affirms this truth when he speaks of 'the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his will' (Eph 1^{11}). Not only the good but the evil of the world comes under the Divine predestinating purpose, for the evil as well as the good is known beforehand to the Omniscient (Ac 15^{18}). 'In him we live, and move, and have our being' (17^{28}), and every act of man, whatever its motive, is performed with bodily life and strength, with faculties and powers which He has supplied, and continues to supply, to the best and to the worst, to the noblest and the most depraved. Whilst not Himself the author of sin, He not only suffers the evil designs and wicked purposes of men, but uses them (and by using them shows that He purposed to use them from all eternity) for ends of His own, even the loftiest and holiest of which men can form any conception. The death of Christ was an essential element in the Divine plan of redemption. To bring to pass the death of Christ He made use of the hatred of the Jews, the baseness of the betrayer, and the culpable weakness of the Roman governor. The first Christians discerned and acknowledged this as they lifted up their united voice in prayer to God and said: 'Of a truth in this city against thy holy Servant Jesus, whom thou didst anoint, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the peoples of Israel, were gathered together, to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel foreordained to come to pass' (*ὅσα ἡ χείρ σου καὶ ἡ βουλὴ προώρισεν γενέσθαι*, Ac $4^{27f.}$). And St. Peter declared the same truth to the Jewish multitudes on the Day of Pentecost: 'Him being delivered up by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye by the hand of lawless men did crucify and slay' (*τῇ ὡρισμένῃ βουλῇ καὶ προγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ*, Ac 2^{23}). It was in language no less strong that the Lord Himself predicted His betrayal and death: 'The Son of man indeed goeth, as it hath been determined (*κατὰ τὸ ὡρισμένον*, Lk 22^{22}): but woe unto that man through whom he is betrayed.' We also read that He showed 'unto his disciples, how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and the third day be raised up' (Mt 16^{21}). These passages 'combine to show that not only in the physical world, which is generally admitted to be subject in all its provinces to the absolute control and regulation of the Almighty, but also in the moral world, all circumstances and events, dependent though they may be on the voluntary actions of His intelligent creatures, are nevertheless pre-arranged and predetermined by Him; or, in other words, that whatsoever God does by His own personal agency in any department of the universe, and whatsoever He permits to be done by the agency of His rational creatures, is done or permitted by Him purposely and designedly, in accordance with His own determinate counsels, and for the accomplishment of His own contemplated ends' (Crawford, *Mysteries of Christianity*, p. 303).

4. St. Paul's view of predestination and salvation.—Predestination, however, in its bearing upon salvation finds its great exponent in the apostle Paul. That God has foreordained particular persons from all eternity to salvation and eternal life, that He has provided for them the means to that salvation in the work of Christ and the gracious ministry of the Holy Spirit, and that He bestows upon them grace to persevere to the end, is especially the teaching of St. Paul. Here, again, as in his teaching upon election, St. Paul follows up the teaching of the Lord. 'No man can come to me,' says Jesus, 'except the Father which sent me draw him: and I will raise him up in the last day' (Jn 6^{44}). 'My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me. . . . My Father, which hath given them unto me, is greater than all; and no one is able to snatch them out of the Father's hand' ($10^{27.29}$). 'All that which the Father giveth me shall come unto me' is, as the older divines would have put it, an article in the Covenant of Redemption between the Father and the Son in the counsels of eternity; 'and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out' is an article in the Covenant of Grace wherein the offer of a free and a full salvation is made to all (6^{37}). It is this teaching which St. Paul casts into his own more philosophical moulds and expounds in language which has not only passed into the vocabulary of theology, but even become familiar in the religious speech of many types of evangelical Christians. 'We know,' he says in a characteristic utterance, 'that to them that love God all things work together for good, even to them that are called according to his purpose. For whom he foreknew, he also foreordained to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren' (Ro $8^{28.\ 29}$). The sovereignty in which St. Paul here reposes such confidence is the sovereignty of a God of grace and faithfulness; and he is confident that He who began a good work in him and his fellow-believers 'will perfect it until the day of Jesus Christ' (Ph 1^{6}). The end to which God 'foreordained' those whom He 'foreknew' is conformity to the image of His Son, that they should be sons of God after His likeness of love and holiness here and dignity and glory above. This end is that which apostolic teaching always has in view, and no other: the apostles have nothing to say of predestination to wrath or destruction (cf. 1 Th $1^{2\text{-}5}$, 2 Th 2^{13}, 2 Ti 1^{9}, 1 P $1^{1.\ 2}$).

In the opening passage of the Epistle to the Ephesians St. Paul sets forth in still greater detail this great doctrine (Eph $1^{3\text{-}8.\ 11.\ 12}$). It is 'the saints which are at Ephesus and the faithful in Christ Jesus' who are the objects of this Divine choice and blessing, persons who are believing men and women (*τοῖς πιστοῖς*) and Christians indeed (*τοῖς ἁγίοις*). The benefits bestowed upon them in common with the Apostle are enumerated as 'redemption,' 'forgiveness of sins,' 'holiness,' 'adoption' as sons of God, 'a heavenly inheritance,' and they comprise 'every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places in Christ'—benefits not merely offered but actually enjoyed, and that in accordance with the purpose of God before the foundation of the world. The Divine choice rested upon them and took effect in them not because of their merits or attainments, not because God foresaw in them a holiness and a faith marking them out as recipients of eternal favour and blessing, but 'according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace.' They were chosen not because of foreseen holiness and blamelessness, but 'in order that they should be holy and without blemish.' If we adopt the punctuation which connects 'in love' (at the close of v.^{4}) with 'having foreordained' (at the commencement of v.^{5}), and which has some textual authority, we should hold that it was in love that He foreordained them, moved by 'an "unseen universe" of reasons and causes wholly beyond our discovery' (H. C. G. Moule, *Cambridge Bible*, 'Ephesians,' 1886, p. 48). Whatever the grounds of God's predestinating purpose, they did not lie in any merits or qualifications of theirs, for they were called 'not according to their works, but according to his own purpose and grace before the world began' (2 Ti 1^{9}). Election is a spontaneous act of God's favour and grace, uncalled for by anything in the objects of it moving Him thereto. Before the ages of time God foreordained the glory of the saints, and with a view to that consummation He purposed both creation and redemption (1 Co 2^{7} with T. S. Evans' note in *Speaker's Com.* iii. [1881]).

Whilst St. Paul in speaking of God's predestinating purpose towards the saints calls them 'vessels of mercy which he afore prepared unto glory' (Ro 9^{23}), he is careful not to attribute to the immediate agency of God 'the destruction' which overtakes the 'vessels of wrath' (Ro 9^{22}). These the Apostle describes as 'fitted unto destruction,' whom God 'endured with much longsuffering'; and he regards them as bringing upon themselves by their obstinacy and continued sinfulness the natural penalty of their guilt, the just judgment of God. The issue of glory for the saints proceeds from God's predestinating purpose 'according to the good pleasure of his will' and without any foresight of merit on their part; the issue of destruction for the wicked proceeds from the rejection of offered grace and their persistence in transgression and sin. The distinction is that set forth by St. Paul when he says: 'The wages of sin is death; but the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord' (Ro 6^{23}).

That God's sovereignty in predestination is exercised consistently with man's perfect liberty to choose is an antinomy which it is impossible for us to reconcile, but which, nevertheless, stands out clear in the teaching of St. Paul. In Ro $9^{20.\ 21}$ St. Paul appeals to one side of the antinomy and affirms the Divine sovereignty by reference to the figure of the potter; and in Ro $10^{11\text{-}15}$ he exhibits the other side when he affirms the universality and freeness of the gospel offer, saying, 'Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?' Whilst St. Paul, as we have seen, affirms the doctrine of absolute predestination to life, he asserts no less clearly the truth of human responsibility. Underlying all his exhortations to holiness, and all his presentations of gospel privilege and blessing, there is the assumption of the freedom of the human will to avail itself of offered grace or to refuse it, to put forth effort or to remain inactive. Whilst the kindling of the Divine life in the soul through the exercise of faith in Christ is of sovereign grace (Eph 2^{8}), the increase and fruitfulness of the Divine life through prayer and service depends upon the same grace, as St. Paul exhorts: 'Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to work, for his good pleasure' (Ph $2^{12.\ 13}$).

5. Predestination in Christian experience.—The doctrine of predestination has the analogy of Christian experience to support it. Every Christian man is ready to acknowledge that there was some power at work for his salvation before his own freewill. 'We love,' says St. John, 'because he first loved us' (1 Jn 4^{19}). It is He who, through the Holy Spirit, by the use of the means of grace, quickens into spiritual life men who are dead in trespasses and sins. And there are multitudes who acknowledge their experience to have been that of Lydia, 'whose heart the Lord opened, to give heed unto the things which were spoken by Paul' (Ac 16^{14}). In Christian experience there is the conviction of this gracious influence which has been beforehand with us in showing us the guilt of sin and leading us to Christ for salvation, but there is also the consciousness of moral responsibility, requiring from us the constant exercise of faith and the diligent use of all the means of grace. 'I could no more,' says Erskine of Linlathen, writing to Thomas Chalmers from Herrnhut (*Letters, 1800–1840*, ed. Hanna, 1877), 'separate the belief of predestination from my idea of God, than I could separate the conviction of moral responsibility from my own consciousness. I do not, to be sure, see how these two things coincide, but I am prepared for my own ignorance on these points. We know things, not absolutely as they are in themselves, but relatively as they are to us and to our practical necessities.' There we must be content to leave the antinomy, believing that though it is beyond our limited powers to reconcile, it is reconciled in the mind of the All-knowing and Eternal God.

6. Practical applications.—The doctrine of predestination has practical applications full of comfort and encouragement. A reasonable assurance of salvation finds in the eternal decree, whose sole cause is the good pleasure and eternal will of God, its most certain and abiding ground. To have a well-grounded persuasion, through the fruit of the Spirit and the evidences of the new life, that one is of the number of those whom God foreknew and foreordained to be conformed to the image of His Son, cannot fail on the one hand to fill one with gratitude and humility, and on the other to stimulate one to the pursuit of holiness and all the graces of the Christian life. The belief that God in His predestinating purpose has His elect—known to Him when unknown to man—in every community and every congregation where Christ is preached, is an encouragement to faithful ministry, as it was to St. Paul when in a vision of the night the Lord said to him: 'I have much people in this city' (Ac 18^{10}). 'The doctrine of this high mystery of predestination,' says the Westminster Confession (ch. iii. 8), 'is to be handled with special prudence and care, that men attending to the will of God revealed in His word, and yielding obedience thereunto, may, from the certainty of their effectual vocation, be assured of their eternal election. So shall this doctrine afford matter of praise, reverence, and admiration of God, and of humility, diligence, and abundant consolation to all that sincerely obey the Gospel.'

LITERATURE.—C. Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, 1872, i. 535 ff.; T. J. Crawford, *Mysteries of Christianity*, 1874, p. 291 ff.; John Forbes, *Predestination and Freewill*, 1878; J. B. Mozley, *Predestination*², 1878; B. Jowett, *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians, and Romans*, 1894, ii. 370; J. Drummond, *Studies in Christian Doctrine*, 1907, p. 463; T. Haering, *The Christian Faith*, 1913, p. 788 ff.

T. NICOL.

PRE-EXISTENCE OF CHRIST.—With regard to pre-existence, the apostolic Scriptures furnish material for the two-fold conclusion, that it does not belong to the primary data of Christian faith in the Historic and Exalted Jesus, but that it is a necessary implicate of that faith. It forms no element in the primitive doctrine recorded in the opening chapters of Acts. Under the impulse of the Spirit, the conviction of their Master's resurrection wrought in the first disciples a victorious re-assertion of faith in Him as the Messianic Redeemer. He is proclaimed as 'both Lord and Christ'; and under the category of Messiahship this primitive gospel involves all that is characteristic in historical Christianity (see Denney, *Jesus and the Gospel*, p. 15 ff.). Jesus is sovereign in the government of the world as in the realm of spiritual ideals, author of salvation in every sense of the word, moral and eschatological; but there is no emergence of the thought that His origin must be transcendent as His destiny—no hint of pre-existence. Christ's place in eternity is in the foreknowledge and counsel of the Father.

Coming to the Pauline Epistles, we enter a Christological atmosphere which is startlingly different. In the earlier Epistles the Pre-existence is not so much asserted as taken for granted. In marked contrast with such themes as the Atonement or Justification, it is never made the subject of the Apostle's dialectic; but deductions, both practical and speculative, are drawn from it as an axiomatic truth, familiar equally to writer and to readers, and disputed by no one. And although it is only in the later Epistles that the necessity of the Pre-existence as the basis for a full world-embracing redemption is deliberately set forth, there is no evidence of a real development either in the conviction of the fact or in the conception of its significance.

The chief Pauline passages are the following. With regard to the closely parallel texts, Gal 4^4 and Ro 8^3, it is not too much to say that the obviously intended contrast between the dignity of God's 'own Son' and the conditions of His earthly life ('born of a woman, made under the law,' 'in the likeness of sinful flesh') is fully illuminated only by the assumption of His pre-existence. In speaking of the sacraments of the wilderness (1 Co 10^{1-4}) St. Paul clearly presupposes the activity of the pre-incarnate Christ in the history of Israel. The statement that the Rock in Kadesh was Christ does not imply that he regarded it as an actual Christophany (Bousset, *Die Schriften des NT*, ii. [1908] 115); but it does imply that, in St. Paul's view, the water miraculously furnished by it was 'spiritual drink' because in it Christ was sacramentally active for receptive souls. In 1 Co 8^6, as one God, the Father, is the ultimate source and end of all creation, so one Lord, Jesus Christ, is its Mediator—the first hint of that more fully formulated conception of the 'cosmic' Christ which is a feature of later Epistles. A similarly anticipatory passage is 2 Co 8^9—'Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, he for your sakes became poor,' which cannot be naturally understood in any other sense than that Christ's earthly life was to His prior condition as beggary to wealth. This thought of the Incarnation as an act of self-abnegation, by which an original state of heavenly glory was voluntarily exchanged for one of human limitation and suffering, is expanded in Ph 2^{5-11}, the most deliberate and majestic of St. Paul's utterances upon the subject. Whether we understand by *μορφὴ θεοῦ* a form which is separable or that which is inseparable from the Divine essence, one which was surrendered or that which could not be surrendered, does not affect the assertion of pre-existence. Christ became man only by laying aside a state of being to which an equal participation with God in all Divine prerogatives (*τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ*) naturally belonged. Finally, in Colossians and Ephesians St. Paul develops the thought of Christ's relation to created being as a whole. In His pre-incarnate state, He is the *ἀρχή*, the Head or Origin, the *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*, begotten before all creatures and the agent of their creation, therefore possessing supremacy, absolute and universal (Col $1^{15.16}$). The same conception is implied in Eph 1^{10}—as all things are originally centred in Him, so they are destined to be gathered together and re-centred in Him; while in Eph 1^4 His pre-existence is brought more directly into relation with human redemption—we are chosen '*in him* before the foundation of the world.'

In the later Epistles, it thus appears, there is a larger use of the concept of pre-existence, a more deliberate unfolding of its relations to God, humanity, and the created universe; but, while this enables us to apprehend more clearly how the concept was already latent in the primary faith-experience of the Exalted Christ, it cannot be said that the later Epistles, as compared with the earlier, show any distinct advance in the Apostle's or in the Church's belief in the fact. And here we are confronted with a problem. The thought of the Apostolic Church has advanced from the position reflected in the first chapters of Acts, in which there is no hint of a doctrine of pre-existence, to that presupposed even in the earlier Pauline Epistles, where its presence and activity are fully assumed; and apparently nothing save a process of development so gradual, silent, and unconscious as to have left no trace, bridges the distance between the Pentecostal discourses and Colossians. By what processes of thought may it be supposed that this remarkable transition was effected? Various attempts have been made to find a solution of the problem *ab extra*.

(*a*) *Jewish apocalyptic*.—'Even as a Jew, Saul believed the Messiah to be already in existence'

(H. Weinel, *St. Paul*, Eng. tr., 1906, p. 45). 'Jewish Messianic speculation had already imagined a picture for the completion of which really nothing was wanting but the Nicene dogmas' (*ib.* p. 313). It is true that such passages as *2 Es.* xii. 32, xiii. 26, xiv. 9, *En.* xlviii. 6, lxii. 7 bear out the statement that pre-existence of the Messiah was a feature of traditional apocalyptic doctrine; nor is there any antecedent improbability that the development of Christian belief may have been influenced from this quarter. At the same time it is to be noted that the apocalyptic tenet has its place in a connexion of ideas quite different from the Christian. Since according to the cherished apocalyptic hope the Redemption was imminent and might arrive at any moment, it followed that the Messiah must be already in existence, waiting only to be revealed (Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, Eng. tr., 1902, p. 302). No such stimulus was applicable to the development of the Christian belief.

(*b*) *Rabbinism.*—According to its peculiar mode of thought, Rabbinism expressed the transcendent value of any person or thing by assigning to it a pre-existent celestial archetype. Thus, according to the Midrash on Ps 8^{9}, the Throne of Glory, Messiah the King, the Torah, ideal Israel, Repentance, Gehenna, were created before the world. But the inclusion of Repentance in this list sheds a significant light upon the sense in which these entities are regarded as having preternatural existence. In Rabbinism, according to the best authorities, the pre-existence of the Messiah was only ideal—'not literal, but present only in God's eternal counsel of salvation' (Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, p. 355). The *name* of the Messiah was ideally pre-existent (*ib.* p. 198). 'As a matter of fact, the earlier rabbinism was content with holding, on the basis of Ps 72^{17}, the pre-existence of the name only' (Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 301).

(*c*) *Alexandrian Judaism.*—According to Philo (*Sac. leg. alleg.* on Gn 2^{7} [ed. Mangey, i. 49], *de Mundi opificio*, ed. Mangey, i. 30), God created two kinds of men—a 'heavenly' man, made after the image of God, incorruptible and super-terrestrial; the other formed of the dust, composed of body and soul, male and female, by nature mortal. And, with 1 Co 15^{44-49} as almost a sole support, it has been maintained by various scholars since Baur, that St. Paul has simply taken over the Alexandrian theory. That some such theory has, directly or indirectly, suggested the *wording* of the Pauline passage seems certain. But if there is any intentional reference, it can only be by way of refuting the Philonic view (see Bousset, *Religion des Judenthums*, p. 406). The 'heavenly' man, who with Philo is the 'first,' is with St. Paul the 'second' (as if to emphasize the point, it is expressly said, 'that was not first which was spiritual, but that which was natural; and afterward that which is spiritual'). When, moreover, St. Paul distinguishes the two as 'from earth' and 'from heaven,' he points to their respective sources and qualities of being, implying nothing as to a previous *state* of being.

While the history of primitive Christianity proves its eclectic genius, its hospitality towards all ideas and forms of thought by which it could express its sense of the inexpressible religious value of Christ, and while there is no *a priori* reason to deny that it may have incidentally woven into its own web sundry hints of a pre-existent Messiah or Ideal Man, it seems impossible that the rapid Christological advance which had taken place by the time the Pauline Epistles were written can have been in any vital way influenced by the recondite speculations of apocalyptic, Rabbinical, or Hellenistic Judaism.

That this advance was connected chiefly with Pauline lines of thought is perhaps suggested by the fact that little or no use is made of the conception of pre-existence in 1 Peter. The language of 1^{11}—*τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ*—suggests but does not necessarily imply it (see Hort's note *in loc.*). To say that the Spirit who inspired the prophets was the Spirit of Christ does not imply that Christ was personally coeval with the prophets (cf. He 11^{26}). In 1 P 1^{20} it is claimed that *φανερωθέντος* implies pre-existence, since only that which already exists can be manifested; but, on the contrary, the parallelism between *φανερωθέντος* and *προεγνωσμένου* excludes a reference to personal pre-existence. He who was manifested is He who was foreknown, and the object of Divine foreknowledge must be the incarnate, not the pre-existent Christ. Nor is the present writer able to appreciate the force of the reason for which Chase (*HDB* iii. 793^{b}) regards $3^{18.19}$ as decisive—viz. that the 'spirit' in which Christ was 'quickened' and ministered to the 'spirits in prison' is represented as something *assumed* by Him no less than the 'flesh' in which He was 'put to death,' and that, therefore, Christ is conceived as having existed before the beginning of His human life. To deduce from the words *ἐν ᾧ* that Christ had a personal existence prior to His possession of the 'spirit' in which He acted after His death in the flesh, seems to lay on them a greater stress than they are fitted to bear.

The advance in Christological ideas which had taken place by the time of the Pauline Epistles must be ascribed to an innate necessity of thought. The concept of pre-existence lay implicit in the Church's most primitive consciousness of the Crucified and Exalted Christ *as Saviour*. The form in which this first found expression was Messianic. Jesus was the Lord Christ, the Person by whom the people of God were to be turned from their iniquities, and the Divine Kingdom brought to men. Without intellectual perception that this implied His proper Divinity, the Exalted Lord was *felt* as God; the instinctive attitude towards Him was that of faith and worship. But in a community which entirely retained the fundamental theocentric postulate of OT religion, such an attitude could not long remain merely instinctive. Granted the premise that Jesus is Saviour and that only the Eternal God can save, we pass, logically, at a single step from the Acts of the Apostles into Colossians. The inevitable conclusion, slowly as it may come to formulation, is that in Him the fullness of the Godhead dwells; otherwise it is a man, not God, who takes the central place in faith's universe. And to connect the Historical Christ with the being of Eternal God, the category of pre-existence was indispensable; for to Jewish monotheism the idea of *θεοποίησις*—that any one should *become* God—was unthinkable. He who was Divine unto everlasting must have been Divine from everlasting; in whatever sense God is preternatural, in the same sense must Christ also be.

Further, there are two lines along which this necessity of thought is seen to be especially urgent.

(*a*) *Ethical.*—It cannot be said that the great ethical appeal of the gospel to self-sacrificing love is explicit in its first proclamation. It is implicit there in its central truth of the suffering Messiah; but the presentation is shaped by the polemical necessities of the hour, and the chief aim is to establish that the Crucified Jesus is Lord rather than to emphasize that His sovereignty is won by sacrifice. In St. Paul's Epistles the ethical appeal is dominant throughout. His experience of salvation was an experience of forgiveness and eternal life bestowed with an unspeakable fervour of Divine love—love that by infinite sacrifice reconciled the sinner unto God. And in his conception of this love, the pre-existence of Christ had a two-fold function. (i.) It raised the earthly manifestation to infinitude. The redeeming sacrifice of Christ was not a love that was commensurable with any human self-sacrifice. It is voluntary poverty seen against a background of Divine wealth. The most amazing in the series of His self-emptyings is the first—the choosing to renounce the Divine form of existence for another in which He was destined to reach the absolute point of humiliation and suffering. This was the love beyond compare, passing knowledge. (ii.) In the same way, we may suppose, the conception of pre-existence helped St. Paul to relate the love of Christ to the love of God. It is not inconceivable, indeed, that St. Paul should have found in the historical life and death of Jesus ample reason for such expressions as, 'Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift,' 'He that withheld not his own Son'; but how much more amazing and subduing is the thought, if the Son thus 'delivered up for us all' was God's 'own image,' His 'first-begotten before every creature.' It scarcely permits of doubt that this was the thought in the Apostle's mind.

(*b*) *Soteriological.*—Salvation in the full sense includes not merely a subjective change in man, but a corresponding change in man's environment. No more than humanity itself does nature embody the perfect final will of God. In its present constitution it is the correlative of human sin; it lies under the dominion of 'principalities and powers' that are unfriendly to man; and for man to be spiritually renewed and reconciled to God, and yet left in the midst of a hostile universe, would be no complete redemption. Thus, even in St. Paul's earlier Epistles it is seen that Christ's redeeming work must extend its influence over all created things (1 Co 15^{24-28}, Ro $8^{19-22. 37-39}$); and in Colossians the cosmic Redemption, the vision of a 'Christianized universe,' becomes one of the Apostle's central themes. The Church's Lord and Redeemer must be Lord and Reconciler of all things (Col 1^{15-20} $2^{14. 15}$; cf. Ph $2^{10. 11}$). But this is possible only to One in whom the undivided fullness of the Godhead dwells (Col $1^{19. 20}$ $2^{9. 10}$; cf. Ph $2^{6. 9}$), who is the one Mediator between God and the created universe. And this, again, involves His pre-existence (*πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*, Col 1^{15}). Only He who is the original and eternal principle of unity in all things (1^{17}), who stands in such a relation to God (*εἰκὼν τοῦ ἀοράτου θεοῦ*, 1^{15}) that this must be His relation to the universe, can bring the universe into final unity with the Divine character and purpose. Only He who is the mediatorial beginning can be the mediatorial end; only the First can be the Last.

The question immediately arises for theology: How is one to relate this conception of the Pre-existent Christ to the Eternal Unity of the Godhead? Beyschlag's theory of an ideal pre-existence in the Divine thought and will is wholly inadequate as a historical interpretation of Pauline thought; and the same may be said of the theory (Baur, Pfleiderer) according to which the conception of the 'Man from Heaven,' the 'Second Adam,' is the fountainhead of the Pauline Christology. The point in which the effort of NT thought to answer this question culminates is the Johannine doctrine of the Logos; and to treat of this lies beyond the scope of the present article. Suffice it to say here, that for the whole Johannine group of writings—Apocalypse, Gospel, Epistles—the truth of Christ's pre-existence is absolutely fundamental. On the one hand, there is the deliberate endeavour to relate this, through the concept of the Logos, to the Godhead; on the other hand, and especially in the First Epistle, the strongest emphasis is laid upon the complete, personal, permanent identity of the Pre-incarnate with Him who became flesh and tabernacled among us. That 'Jesus is the Christ come in the flesh' is the test and watchword of the Christian faith. Though the foundation for the cosmic significance of the Incarnation is laid in the prologue to the Gospel (1^{3}) this is nowhere elaborated as by St. Paul. The ethical interest absorbs all others; and here St. John has spoken the last word (Jn 3^{16}, 1 Jn $4^{9. 10}$). The love of Christ is the manifested love of God. He who died on Calvary, the propitiation for our sins, is He who came forth from the bosom of the Father.

LITERATURE.—This is enormous: all the text-books on NT Theology, including those by **Baur** (1893), **Beyschlag** (Eng. tr., 1895), **Feine** (1910), **Holtzmann** (^{2}1911), **Schlatter** (^{3}1905), **Stevens** (1899), **Weinel** (^{2}1913), **B. Weiss** (Eng. tr., 1882–83). Among special treatises the following may be mentioned: **H. R. Mackintosh**, *The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ*, 1912; **A. B. Bruce**, *The Humiliation of Christ*^{2}, 1881; **W. Bousset**, *Die Religion des Judenthums*^{2}, 1906; **J. Denney**, *Jesus and the Gospel*, 1908; **A. Harnack**, *History of Dogma*, Eng. tr.^{2}, 1897, vol. i. app. i.; **P. Lobstein**, *Notion de la préexistence du Fils de Dieu*, 1883; **W. Olchewski**, *Die Wurzeln der paulinischen Christologie*, 1909; **R. L. Ottley**, *The Doctrine of the Incarnation*, 1896; **O. Pfleiderer**, *Paulinism*, Eng. tr., 1891, i. 123–159; **D. Somerville**, *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, 1897; **F. Weber**, *Jüdische Theologie*, 1897.

R. LAW.

PREPARATION.—In the NT Epistles the word appears only in Eph 6^{15}: 'having shod your feet with the preparation (*ἑτοιμασία*) of the gospel of peace.' The exhortation was suggested by the sandals (*caligæ*) of the Roman soldier. They were very heavy, thickly studded with hobnails, and strongly laced. The purpose which they served in the equipment of the Roman soldier is to be served by the *ἑτοιμασία* provided by the gospel of peace. The sandals gave the soldier firm footing, and fitted him for fighting or marching through any kind of country. The word has two meanings: in general, that of 'preparation,' 'preparedness,' or 'readiness,' and in particular, 'firm foundation' or 'firm footing.' Illustrations of the latter meaning are found in Ps $89^{14\ (15)}$, 'Righteousness and judgement are the foundation of thy throne' (RV), also in Zec 5^{11}, Ezr (LXX 2 Es) 2^{68}. The verb 'to prepare' (*ἑτοιμάζειν*) in the sense of 'firmly fix' or 'establish' is found in Ps 24^{2}, 'and established it upon the floods,' also 99^{4}, Pr 3^{19}, 2 S 5^{12}. In the NT it has the sense of 'destined' in Mt 20^{23} ('for whom it hath been prepared of my Father') $25^{34. 41}$, 1 Co 2^{9}, He 11^{16}. The common translation of *ἑτοιμασία* in Eph 6^{15} is 'preparation' (EV, Erasmus, Hodge, Eadie, etc.), but 'foundation' or 'firm footing' is strongly supported (Chrysostom, Bengel, Hatch). The weakness of the translation 'preparation' is that it does not indicate the kind of equipment which is referred to. It translates the word but not the idea. The more restricted meaning of 'firm footing,' with its suggestions of confidence or assurance, brings out more clearly what the gospel of peace provides. This 'firm confidence' is not only necessary for 'standing' in 'the evil day,' but for the general warfare of the Christian at all times.

LITERATURE.—The principal Commentaries *in loco*; E. Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*, 1889, pp. 51–55; A. F. Buscarlet, *ExpT* ix. [1897–98] 38–40, where there is also a fine illustration of the foot-gear of a Roman soldier.

JOHN REID.

PRESBYTER, PRESBYTERY.—See ELDER, BISHOP.

PRESENCE.—In the apostolic writings the following Greek words lie behind our English term 'presence,' *ἀπέναντι*, *ἔμπροσθεν*, *ἐνώπιον*, *κατενώπιον* (prepositions = 'in the presence of,' and frequently rendered 'before'); *παρουσία* and *πρόσωπον* (nouns). There is no need to dwell on such common expressions as the 'presence' of Pilate (Ac 3^{13}) or of the Council (5^{41}), or even on St. Paul's mention of his presence (or absence) in the letters to Philippi (Ph 2^{12}), Corinth, and Thessalonica. The question of the Apostle's 'bodily presence' being 'insignificant' (2 Co $10^{1. 10}$) is discussed elsewhere (see PAUL). There remain those passages which speak of the presence of the angels and of the Lamb (Rev 14^{10}), and the presence of God. From this source come 'times of refreshing' (Ac 3^{19}) for the repentant, but also of 'destruction' for the disobedient (2 Th 1^{9}, in reference to the Second Advent or Parousia; cf. 1 Th 2^{19}). No man, however wise or strong, may boast in the presence of God (1 Co 1^{29}); in that presence Christ appears on our behalf (He 9^{24}); and there 'before the presence of his glory' we ourselves may hope to stand (Jude ^{24}). There is matter for reflexion in all these statements, but it is better to leave this somewhat artificial and mechanical schedule of references in order to discuss the general idea of the presence of God as it is found in the writings of the Apostolic Age.

1. In some of the passages cited above there is unquestionably a reminiscence of the sense of sanctity with which the royal presence was invested in ancient times. The OT is full of references to this fact. We have it literally in such passages as Gn 41^{46} ('the presence of Pharaoh'), Ex 10^{11}, 1 S 19^{7}, 2 S 24^{4}, 1 K 1^{28} 12^{2}, 2 Ch 9^{23}, Neh 2^{1}, Est 1^{10} 8^{15}. Generally speaking, these references to the kingly presence carry the suggestion of favour, graciousness, assent, or benediction. When a ruler turned his countenance towards a suppliant or courtier, it meant that his desire was granted, or that he was a *persona grata* in the court (cf. Est 8^{15}); when it was turned away, it foreboded refusal, the loss of favour, or serious disgrace (cf. 1 K 12^{2}). The same association of ideas governs the usage of such phrases as 'the presence of the Lord' (Gn 3^{8}, Job 1^{12} 2^{7} 23^{15}, Ps 16^{11} 97^{5} 140^{13}, etc.). Those hidden in the Divine presence are safe from harm (Ps 31^{20} 91^{1}); to be driven from God's presence is to be outcast indeed (Ps 51^{11}); it is even to perish utterly (68^{2}). The minds of the NT writers were saturated with Hebrew notions, and their usage of language corresponds with this fact. Thus the 'presence of Pilate' (Ac 3^{13}) means his seat of authority (cf. 5^{41}); the 'presence of the Lord' is the source of all spiritual blessing (3^{19}), of Divine authority (Lk 1^{19}), and of eternal felicity (Jude ^{24}); while the opposite is suggested in Rev 14^{10}. God's presence, in a word, saves or damns those who are exposed to its searching radiance, according to their spiritual relation to Him.

2. It is, however, the positive suggestions of the phrase that require exposition. The presence of God (or of Christ who brought 'life and incorruption to light through the gospel,' 2 Ti 1^{10}) means in apostolic literature all that is implied in the revelation of His nature, and the instrumentalities of His grace. In the OT that presence was largely mediated through nature and Providence (cf. Job and the Psalms *passim*); in the NT this aspect has largely faded into the background, probably as a result of the Deistic attitude of later Judaism, which substituted *cultus* or worship (especially in the form of a mass of liturgical and ceremonial acts and processes) as the chief medium of the approach of man to God, or of God to man. God Himself became remote, His very name was avoided. Belief in a present Deity, glad faith in a God who manifests Himself in actual experience is found only in such exalted experiences as the Maccabæan struggle. Men tried to bridge the chasm by angels, especially natural guardian angels, and by such quasi-personalities, quasi-abstractions as the Wisdom, the Word, Shekinah of Glory, the Spirit of God. But all such efforts were far from successful. What differentiated the heightened spiritual consciousness of the primitive Church was its assurance that in Jesus Christ God had come near to man in a new and living way. This fact is expressed with matchless felicity in St. John's words '(we beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father), full of grace and truth' (1^{14}), and in St. Paul's 'God' hath 'shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ' (2 Co 4^{6}). The same idea is given in He 1$^{1-3}$, 'God . . . hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in his Son, . . . being the effulgence of his glory, and the very image of his substance.' To His immediate disciples the physical person of Christ was evidently full of attractiveness and power, because of the spiritual radiance that shone from His presence; they afterwards dwelt lovingly in thought on the expression of His face, on His looks and gestures, which must have been eloquent of His inner disposition, thoughts, and purposes; and they afterwards found a deep mystical significance in these things as they brooded on His words and dealings with them. It was the Resurrection-life of Jesus that provided the interpretative light in which all His earthly life was transfigured in the memory of His immediate circle of friends, and which brought home the real meaning of His dealings with them in the days of His flesh.

3. This personal objective nearness of God in the 'presence' of Christ as mirrored in the Gospels, becomes in the Epistles a subjective nearness in the souls of believers. Christ dwells in their hearts by faith (Eph 3^{17}); they 'have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ; through whom also we have had our access by faith into this grace wherein we stand'; they 'rejoice in hope of the glory of God' (a synonym for His radiant favouring presence, Ro 5$^{1.2}$), and Christ who is the 'image and glory of God' (1 Co 11^{7}) becomes at last in them 'the hope of glory,' *i.e.* of a blessed immortality (Col 1^{27}). This indwelling presence of God in human hearts is not the mere 'inner light' of which the mystics speak, but that light made opulent with all the spiritual content for which Christ stands. It is a Life within the life, a Self within the self, a Divine presence enriching and irradiating the recesses of the soul with its high benefit and power. St. Paul is perpetually conscious of this new element in his life which, when he first had it, made him 'a new creature,' and which made 'all things new' to him (2 Co 5^{17} [καινός = 'fresh,' 'bright,' 'glittering']). Whether he speaks of the believer being *in* Christ (Col 1^{2}), or of Christ being *in* him (v.^{27}), or of being *together with* Christ (Eph 2^{5}; cf. 2^{12}), he is referring to the same supreme experience in its various aspects. This personal fellowship of the Risen Lord around and within him becomes at last a permeative and enfolding presence in virtue of which he becomes identified with Him 'in inmost nearness,' as when he says, 'I have been crucified with Christ; yet I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me' (Gal 2^{20}). The mystical sense of oneness with Christ is the highest and most distinctive experience of the Christian life. It is seen in its purity only in the very finest saints, such as Origen, Athanasius, Augustine, Abelard, Tauler, Luther, Wesley; but all true believers know it more or less in proportion to their spiritual sensitiveness, and to their faithfulness in cultivating the 'practice of the presence of God' in their hearts. This experience has naturally found abundant expression in our hymns, *e.g.* in Eliza Scudder's

> 'Thou Life within my life, than self more near,
> Thou veiled Presence infinitely clear,
> From all illusive shows of sense I flee,
> To find my centre and my rest in Thee'
> (*Worship Song*, line 156 ff.).

4. Rich and glowing as such experiences are, they are by no means exclusively mediated through isolation. The NT, indeed, enforces and illustrates the truth that the presence of God is often most vividly apprehended when a community of disciples, whether they be few or many, meet in His name for fellowship, praise, and edification. There are collective experiences to which the recluse is a stranger, and the monk, whether he live in a cell or walk the fields instead of joining with those who assemble themselves together, shuts himself off from some of the highest possibilities. The early Christian churches, though comprising many who were but 'babes in Christ' and were far from maturity in ethical and spiritual matters, were happy in the united exercise of their gifts and in the reality of the Divine presence which characterized their meetings for worship. In marked contrast to the OT nothing is said in the NT of church buildings, hardly anything about the conduct of worship, and there is a striking absence of regulations regarding rites and ceremonies. But the real thing is there—the presence of God, without which the most magnificent architecture, the most elaborate ritual are a vain show. We remember how St. Paul would have the Corinthian Christians worship in such a fashion that if the man in the street chanced to drop in to one of their services he should be 'reproved by all . . . judged by all,' so that the secrets of his heart should be made manifest, 'and so he will fall down on his face and worship God, declaring that God is among [*or* in] you indeed' (1 Co $14^{24f.}$). Such an event is indeed connected by the Apostle with 'prophecy,' or, as we should call it, preaching, but it is not only, perhaps not mainly, the sermon that thus overwhelmingly convinces the outsider of the presence of God in a people. Nor is it the observance of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, although therein, whatever be their varying conceptions of its mode and form, disciples of Christ frequently discern the Real Presence more fully than in any other act of worship or experience of everyday life. There is the sense of prayer and of fraternal union, the atmosphere of devotion and of brotherly love. These, added to a preaching of the Word of God which is alive and powerful, piercing and exposing, cleansing and comforting, are the signs and tokens of the presence of God in a community, and are visible not only to those within but to those without the circle.

5. Finally, there is in the NT consciousness a strong and eager forelooking to a higher experience still. The experience of believers on earth, while strengthened and uplifted by a sense of the presence of the Saviour through His spirit in the heart, and by the operation of His saving grace, yet lacks the precision and definiteness of a real personal presence. It is better than the objective fellowship of Jesus with His disciples which was limited by the disabilities of the flesh, for as He was then *with* them, He is now *in* them (Jn 14^{16}); but it is not the perfect communion for which the soul craves in its highest moods. The Parousia or Second Coming of the Lord shaped itself to the imagination of primitive believers as a quasi-physical appearance of the Lord in glory and great power 'in the clouds' and with a retinue of 'holy angels' (1 Th 4^{17}; cf. Rev 1^{7} 'He cometh with the clouds; and every eye shall see him'; also Mt $16^{27f.}$). In the later writings of St. Paul this cruder anticipation is spiritualized. He speaks of death as a door into the nearer presence of Christ (Ph 1^{23} 'to be with Christ; for it is very far better'); he is 'willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be at home with the Lord' (2 Co 5^{8}); and he warns his readers that all must 'be made manifest before the judgement-seat of Christ' to give an account of their earthly life (v.^{10}). In St. John this process of spiritualization is carried still further. There is no mention of any spectacular or objective Parousia. The 'Comforter' is promised as Christ's representative presence with His disciples after His departure to the Father (Jn 14^{16}), while He remains with the Father, and makes preparation for the time when His followers will rejoin Him, that where He is there they may be also (Jn 14^{1-3}). It may be said that while the hope of the Second Coming of Christ in the earlier sense has never died out of the Christian Church, the normal Christian attitude throughout the ages has been rather that mirrored in St. John than that suggested in 1 Th 4^{16-17} or 1 Co $15^{51f.}$. Believers hold firmly that while they have fellowship with Christ in the flesh, this is but a dim foretaste of the perfect fellowship that awaits the redeemed with their Saviour in the eternal world. We know nothing of the details of the life beyond the grave; it is enough to know that there Christ reigns even more surely and triumphantly than here, and that where He is there will be blessedness and fullness of life (Jn 10^{10}), and a 'joy unspeakable and full of glory' (1 P 1^{8}).

> 'To heaven's high city I direct my journey,
>   Whose spangled suburbs entertain mine eye;
> Mine eye, by contemplation's great attorney,
>   Transcends the crystal pavement of the sky.
>   But what is heaven, great God, compared to Thee?
>   Without Thy presence, heaven's no heaven to me.
>
> Without Thy presence, earth gives no reflection;
>   Without Thy presence, sea affords no treasure;
> Without Thy presence, air's a rank infection;
>   Without Thy presence, heaven itself no pleasure.
>   If not possessed, if not enjoyed in Thee,
>   What's earth, or sea, or air, or heaven to me?'
>   (Francis Quarles, *Divine Emblems*, 1635).

A. J. GRIEVE.

PRICKS.—See GOAD.

PRIDE.—This word occurs thrice in the AV: in Mk 7^{22} as the rendering of *ὑπερηφανία*, in 1 Jn 2^{16} of *ἀλαζόνεια*, in 1 Ti 3^{6} as the rendering ('lifted up with pride') of *τυφόω* (the same verb is found in 1 Ti 6^{4}, 'he is proud' [RV 'puffed up'], and in 2 Ti 3^{4}, 'highminded' ['puffed up' RV]; it is formed from the substantive *τύφος*, 'smoke' or 'cloud,' which does not occur in the NT, but is found in the metaphorical use in 1 Clem. xiii. 1 along with *ἀλαζόνεια* and suggests the pride which beclouds the moral sense and destroys self-control). In 1 Co 13^{4}, where we read that love 'vaunteth not itself' (*οὐ περπερεύεται*), 'is not puffed up' (*οὐ φυσιοῦται*), the first verb appears to denote the arrogant or forward manner of one who sounds his own praises, the latter (cf. 1 Co 4^{6} 8^{1}) the disposition of self-conceit which loves pre-eminence.

The two words *ὑπερηφανία* and *ἀλαζόνεια*, with their corresponding adjectives, are common in the literature of the early Church: *e.g.*, in Hermas, *Mand.* VI. ii. 5, both stand together as signs of the presence within the heart of 'the messenger of wickedness.' In Ro 1^{30} with these is associated the epithet *ὑβριστής* (AV 'despiteful,' RV 'insolent'); but *ὕβρις* indicates the unrestrained insolence of wrong-doing (common in Greek tragedy) rather than pride in the strict sense: it is essentially the contempt of others breaking forth into acts of wantonness and outrage, and therefore the strongest word of the three in the scale of guilt. In distinguishing the pride of the *ἀλάζων* from that of the *ὑπερήφανος*, R. C. Trench (*NT Synonyms*^{9}, 1880, pp. 98–105) rightly refers the former to 'speech,' the latter to 'thought,' but not thought, it must be noted, as merely quiescent and passive. The pride of overmastering language is definitely brought out in the use of *ἀλαζόνεια* in such passages as Ja 4^{16} (AV 'boastings,' RV 'vauntings') and 1 Clem. xxi. 5; in 1 Jn 2^{16} Trench suggests that the Germ. *Prahlerei* is the most adequate rendering; the English 'pride' is too vague and colourless; and Beza's 'gloriosus' is a better rendering of *ἀλάζων* than Vulg. 'elatus.' On the other hand, *ὑπερηφανία* (Germ. *Hochmuth*) is a vice developed not so much in society as in the secrecy of the heart; none the less, it manifests itself in outward acts of arrogance, cruelty, and revengefulness. The 'proud' of Ja 4^{6}, 1 P 5^{5}, Pr 3^{34} are those whose overweening treatment of others calls forth and merits the Divine antagonism.

B. F. Westcott (*Epistles of St. John*^{2}, 1886, p. 65) suggests that while *ἀλαζόνεια* may be referred to a false view of what things are in themselves, empty and unstable—a sin against *truth*—*ὑπερηφάνια* is a sin against *love* as implying a false view of what our relations to other persons are. Thus, 'the vainglory of life' is a false view of the value of our possessions, and therefore *ἀλαζόνεια* in 1 Jn 2^{16} is rightly associated with life (*βίος*) in its external and transient significance, not in its essential principle (*ζωή*).

It may be noted that the verb *καυχάομαι*, with its corresponding nouns *καύχημα* and *καύχησις* (see art. BOASTING) is often used by St. Paul in a good sense to indicate the legitimate pride with which an apostle contemplates the effects of his ministry in the life and conduct of his converts (*e.g.* 2 Co 9^{2}, Ph 2^{16}); it also expresses the sacred glorying of the inner life in God or Christ (*e.g.* 1 Co 1^{31}, Ph 3^{3}, and elsewhere)—a characteristic and very common Pauline expression.

The pride of racial exclusiveness, *e.g.* of Greek towards barbarian and especially of Jew towards Gentile, as done away in Christ, is a common theme with the same apostle; cf. Ro 10^{12} (and argument of the whole chapter), Gal 3^{28}.

R. MARTIN POPE.

PRIEST.—Much of the ambiguity of the term arises from its use even in the RV to represent two different Greek words. The one is *ἱερεύς*, a sacrificing priest, whose services were necessary in the ritual of any such religion as that of the ancient Jews. In other cases the term represents *πρεσβύτερος*, 'presbyter,' from which indeed it has been derived by a process of compressing the several syllables into one. Before our period it was in use both in Egypt and in Asia Minor to designate the members of a secular corporation, and in the former case also the members of a college of priests (Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, Eng. tr., 1901, pp. 154 ff., 233 ff.), and its connotation had already come to refer to office and not to age. The implications of the word with either origin may be conveniently examined in its application in turn to Jewish officials, to Jesus Christ, to Christians generally, and to the ministry of the Church.

1. Use in regard to Jews.—The actual **high priest** of the day figures in Acts alone (4^{6} 7^{1} 22^{5} 23^{4}, etc.), whilst in Heb. the original and typical high priest, Aaron, is introduced for the purpose of comparison with the priest of the New Covenant. The term is used with some laxity even in Acts, as in 4^{6}, where it is applied to Annas, whose son-in-law Caiaphas was the actual holder of the office. Apparently it covered the group of ex-high-priests, whose number varied with the frequent changes of appointment made by the Roman authorities, and was the style of address of the occupant of the chair at any important meeting of the Sanhedrin. The phrase **'chief priests,'** again confined to Acts,* is of the same elastic kind. It included such officials probably as were 'of the kindred of the high priest' (Ac 4^{6}), with such representatives of the priesthood as were prominent through ability or influence. Technically it was confined at first to the heads of the twenty-four courses; but the term was convenient and fluid, and when used loosely, embraced any priests whose character or status gave them a certain recognized authority. After the fall of Jerusalem they rapidly declined in influence through their loss of income and inability to discharge their sacrificial duties. But their priestly pedigree still remained a distinction, preserved by the incidence upon them of special prohibitions, though not investing them with any authority comparable in fact with that of the Rabbis, the masters and expounders of the Law. A sacrificial priest becomes an anachronism when his duties are in abeyance, and the opportunity for their discharge is but a hope always deferred.

2. The priesthood of Jesus Christ.—According to apostolic teaching, Jesus Christ (*a*) gathered to Himself all the ideas essential to the conception of a sacerdotal person or ministry; (*b*) particularly was the antitype, in regard alike to qualification and to function, of all the distinctive features of the Jewish institution, but stood eternally above all His predecessors, closing the line of development in Himself in such a final and complete way that no other priest is needed, and no real want of the human soul is left unmet.

(*a*) In the earliest times the priestly was a part of the parental function, but was so far separable from it that any adult man was held to be able to approach God for himself with offerings or prayers, and after due preparation to communicate Divine responses to others. Gradually the offices were differentiated. Access to God in aspiration and vow remained the recognized privilege of every man, while in the case of sacrificial duties, of everything that belonged to the deep religious life and to the promptings begotten of the consciousness of an actual or imminent breach in right relation with God, resort was had to an official class or family. In the course of time the members of this class were invested with a quasi-sacred dignity, and were regarded as intermediaries between God and man. On the one hand, they were the representatives of man to God, and through them only could offerings be made that would expiate sin or propitiate an offended Deity. They were the custodians of the prescribed ritual, the acknowledged mediators. On the other hand, they were the representatives of God to man; and, however this character may have been claimed or possessed by the prophets, the prophets were rather preachers of righteousness, and not directly concerned with the administration of institutional religion. The priest presented the sacrifice to God, and blessed the people 'in the name of the Lord' (Dt 21^{5}), settling difficult perplexities and sending men away from the altar with the assurance of Divine grace and help. For Jesus Christ as Priest and High Priest the NT claims this doubly representative character. The phrase 'appointed for men in things pertaining to God' (He 2^{17} 5^{1}) suggests, if it does not actually cover, 'appointed for God in things pertaining to man.' He offers Himself, as representing man, as a sacrifice for man. Between God and man there is only 'one mediator, himself man' (1 Ti 2^{5}), who gave Himself a ransom for all, and in whom men are blessed with every spiritual blessing (Eph 1^{3}). As representative of God, He reveals the Father, and gives men in Himself the sum of all benediction. As representative of men, He approaches God with an adequate offering, and continues permanently to act as our Paraclete or Advocate (1 Jn 2^{1})—an office which includes, though it is not confined to, His priestly work.

The NT is far from silent in regard to the conditions of His appointment as Priest and Representative. He was not self-appointed, nor on the other hand was He selected and chosen by those whom He represents. The latter course was impossible in the case of a priesthood affecting all generations, future and past as well as present;

---

* In the *Didache* the title is given to the prophets, who are represented as pronouncing the blessing at the Eucharist in such words as they pleased. But the question of the date and trustworthiness of this part of the document has lately been reopened, and a date within our century is impossible (see C. Bigg, *The Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles*, 1898, and especially J. Armitage Robinson, *JThSt* xiii. [1911–12] 339 ff.).

and the former would have been open to all the objections, and liable to all the defects, that attach to every assumption of the right to speak or act for others. The appointment was made by the Father (He 5^{4}), and the action of the Son was not that of initiation but of loving and resolute consent ($10^{7ff.}$, 1 Jn 5^{20}). He needed no constraint, and was more than ready to undertake a priesthood that involved the pains of a life upon earth and death for men. Love, resolute from the beginning and persisted in through all difficulty and human unresponsiveness, is the explanation of the Incarnation on His part, and a fundamental qualification for priesthood.

If it be asked, What is it exactly that constitutes the representative character of Christ? or Why did the Father appoint Him and no other? apostolic thought suggests several replies, that give prominence in turn to the typical, the federal, and the immanental relation of Christ to man. He is the antitype of Adam, between whose relation to the race and that of Christ a striking parallel, with a more striking contrast, may be drawn (Ro 5^{12-21}, 1 Co $15^{21f.\ 45ff.}$). The one was the medium of sin and death, the other of redemption and life; and as the one stands for a race sinful before God, so, in virtue of what He does for the race, lifting men up to higher spiritual privileges than the unfallen Adam ever knew, the other is even a fitter representative. These typical representations of Christ's Headship of the race have at times to be modified into His Headship of the Church on account of the different attitudes towards Him that men assume (Col 1^{18}, Eph $1^{22f.}$, 1 Jn 2^{2}), and are strengthened by various federal considerations. He brings the race into unity, especially by His priestly exercise of sympathy and brotherliness (He 2^{10-17} $4^{14f.}$), and creates human solidarity by the common tie of brotherhood, binding each individual to Himself (Jn 17^{23}). Thereby again He is qualified to act for all; and an effective motive is secured for unlimited forbearance among men and for mutual kindness and helpfulness of every degree.

But deep down at its foundations the representative character of Christ rests not so much upon His ethical qualities and their exhibition and effects, or upon typical connexions with OT beliefs, as upon what He actually is, upon His intrinsic and essential nature. He is God as well as man, and as God He is immanent in every man, and thereby naturally qualified to act as his representative. This is implied in the frequent references to the indwelling of Christ as a racial fact, which becomes when recognized a source of assurance and strength, to the universal Fatherhood and Sonship, and to the action of the Holy Spirit in leaving no man without internal witness and prevenient grace. Not only are we insphered in God (Ac 17^{28}), but we are the shrine in which His Spirit dwells (1 Co 3^{16} 6^{19}; cf. Ro $8^{9ff.}$), dishonoured and powerless, or allowed to rule, and leading on to perfection. All the differentiations of the universe, personal or impersonal, were produced by Christ from an original unity, of which He was the centre (Col $1^{15ff.}$), just as again they will eventually be gathered up into a unity in Him (Eph 1^{10}). Meanwhile 'in him all things consist,' or hold together; and Christ is thus the secret of the world's order and the natural representative of the race in the presence of God. In the apostolic period it was too soon to discuss at length the relations between the Divinity and the humanity of Christ, or to recover the doctrine of immanence from the pantheistic schools and apply it to the solution of the problems of Christ's work. Yet the germs are distinctly present, and one part of St. Paul's writings guards and completes the teaching of another. Christ as Priest is the substitute and representative of man, not by any arbitrary appointment on the part of God, still less by a legal fiction with which there is no correspondence in actual fact, but because as God He is immanent in every man, and therefore in His nature the fit and only Person to act in the behalf and stead of all. As God-Man He stands in virtue of what He is between the two parties to be brought together, and represents perfectly each to the other.

(*b*) Since the apostolic teaching sprang immediately out of Jewish conceptions, it was to be expected that it would represent the Priesthood of Christ specifically as a continuation of the sacerdotal ministry of the OT, and knit the two together as a preparation with the fulfilment, or as provisional with the ideal (He 8^{5} $9^{23ff.}$) and permanent. This it does in respect alike to the priestly qualifications and to the priestly functions of Christ. To the qualifications already referred to—(1) Divine appointment and (2) sympathy—several are added. The list begins with (3) His perfect humanity, involving oneness with the men for whom He acts, with the experience in His case as in theirs of the discipline of suffering and temptation (He $2^{9f.}$ 4^{15}). (4) In personal character He was holy and guileless (He 7^{26}, 1 P 3^{18}, Ac 3^{14}), not only free from moral disqualification, but an example of virtue and godliness, with a personal right of access to God. (5) This freedom from limitations extends beyond the range of morality to all the infirmities to which man is subject (He 7^{28} 5^{2}), and lifts Christ altogether above the Aaronic order. A better comparison is suggested by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews: see MELCHIZEDEK. The Priesthood of Christ is royal from the beginning, and still He sits 'on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens' (8^{1}). (6) Its timelessness and indissolubility arise from Christ's triumph over death (Ro $6^{9f.}$, He $7^{23f.}$), and render any delegation of His priestly duties unnecessary, and any succession to His office impossible. Because 'he ever liveth to make intercession,' salvation 'to the uttermost' (7^{25}) is a gift He can bestow at any moment upon the sincere and strenuous. Other priestly aids become superfluous and an encumbrance. (7) Finally, the offering He presents is perfect both in itself (Gal 1^{4}, Eph 5^{2}, He $9^{12.\ 24}$) and in its value and effect (Ro 5^{21} $6^{9f.}$, He $9^{25f.}$ $10^{12.\ 14-18}$, Tit 2^{14}).

Of the actual *priestly work of Christ* two views are combined, according as it is regarded as reaching its supreme point on the Cross or as still continuing; and in either relation it may be considered under various aspects.

(1) Prominence is given in the NT to the fact that the offering of Christ was expiatory. It stands in a line with the sacrificial institutions of the OT, and even takes up into itself the meaning of each. It is a burnt-offering (Eph 5^{2}, Ph 4^{18}), a sin-offering (2 Co 5^{21}), a peace-offering (Eph 2^{14}, Col 1^{20}), and it moves easily amid the implications of the Passover and Day of Atonement (1 Co $5^{7f.}$, He $9^{7.\ 12-14.\ 24ff.}$). The very variety of the typical sacrifices, handled and offered by our Priest, tells of the exceeding sinfulness of sin, and of the primary need of expiation through the shedding of blood (He 9^{22}, Eph 1^{7}) as the ground of remission.

(2) From this idea of such a treatment of sin as destroys its offensiveness, wiping it out or neutralizing its relation to natural justice, it is but a step to that of propitiation. By linking His offering with our sin our Priest removes the necessity for a Divine reaction in our condemnation, and even propitiates God, *i.e.* takes away the hindrances to the manifestation of His goodwill, and enables His grace to exhibit itself in forgiveness (Ro $3^{25f.}$, He 2^{17}, 1 Jn 2^{2} 4^{10}; cf. Lk 18^{13}). As the passages show, propitiation is not regarded as a priestly act by which love is excited in God, for God devised it and

arranged its method, but as an act so altering the condition of the sinner that the unchanged love is able to exhibit itself and stream out upon him. His sin, and not merely his creatureliness, is rendered inoperative and null; and the active goodwill of God is the natural response to Him who substituted Himself in sacrifice, and to those for whom He acts.

(3) Hence complete reconciliation between God and man is rightly viewed as the culmination of Christ's priestly work upon earth. In effecting it He removes altogether the alienation in heart and will of man from God, and the alienation, under the necessities of His perfect nature, of God from sinful man. Of these two aspects of His priestly work, the one is explicit in Scripture (Ro $5^{10f.}$ 11^{15}, 2 Co 5^{18-20}, Col 1^{21}), the other is present in frequent logical implication. Not only is reconciliation itself a mutual process, involving a changed sentiment on either side (cf. Mt 5^{23}, where the advice is to do everything to turn a brother's coolness or resentment into forgiveness), but God's attitude changes from apparent displeasure to evident pleasure (Ro $8^{8.\ 16f.}$), from accumulating wrath to wonder-awakening grace (2 Th $1^{9.\ 10}$). He provides the means whereby forgiveness may be granted without moral harm, and, the means being used, His unchangeable nature reacts accordingly, and the love that is outraged but not quenched by sin becomes the most assured feature of His relationship with the penitent. Thus the Priestly Mediator covers the sin of man with His sacrifice, enables a God who is compacted of all moral perfections to act without denying the legitimate rights of any of them, and, breaking down all non-moral distinctions, makes men everywhere one by making each severally in the enrichment of his faith one with God (Eph $2^{14ff.}$, Col $1^{19f.}$).

(4) To this whole process from its beginning in the experience of the regenerate to the ultimate perfecting, as anticipated by St. Paul, the term 'redemption' is freely applied. Redemption is thus the result either of the offering by the priest of a propitiatory gift in satisfaction for a forfeited life, or of the payment of the required price for the release of a person from servitude (1 P $1^{18f.}$, Ac 20^{28}). The servitude is variously represented as captivity to sin (He 9^{26}), with its accompanying curse (Gal 3^{13}) or with its penal liabilities (He $2^{14f.}$). The price paid by the Priest is Himself (Gal 1^{4}, Tit 2^{14}); and that is what the references to His life (Mt 20^{28}) and to His blood (Eph 1^{7}, Rev 5^{9}) really mean. Thereby He binds men to Himself as His property (1 Co 6^{20} 7^{23}); and to His rights of ownership, as to their obligation of devoted service, there is no limit.

(5) At His death the sacrificial part of Christ's priestly work was completed (He 7^{27} 9^{28}); and after His ascension He entered (6^{20} $9^{12.\ 24}$, Eph 4^{10}) and 'passed through the heavens' (He 4^{14}) to the very presence of God (9^{24}), where from His throne on the right hand (He 1^{3} 8^{1}) He continues to act as the Priestly Representative of men, interceding for them (7^{25}, Ro 8^{34}), Himself the permanently valid propitiation for their sins (1 Jn 2^{2}), and therefore the triumphant Advocate of the case of every one in fellowship with Him.

3. The priesthood of believers.—It has been seen already that, according to early belief, all sacrificial institutions and ministries were gathered up into Jesus Christ, whose Priesthood is complete, admitting no rivalry, with no residue of opportunity or work for a successor. Yet metaphorically the sacrificial term is applied to the whole Christian community, irrespective of office or any other distinction (1 P $2^{5.\ 9}$), and also with implications of future enlargement (Rev 1^{6} 5^{10} 20^{6}). Thus the conception of Israel in Ex 19^{6} is transferred to the community of believers, whose priestly rights are common and equal, whatever administrative grades are introduced with a view to efficiency and order. To all alike the priestly privilege of access to God belongs (Ro 5^{2}, Eph 2^{18}, He 4^{16} 10^{19}, 1 P 3^{18}). All alike are called upon to offer spiritual sacrifices of praise and prayer (Rev 10^{3}), of body and soul (Ro 12^{1}, He 13^{15}), with such actual gifts in charity and helpfulness as are prompted by love to God (He 13^{16}, 2 Co 9^{7}, Ph 4^{18}). Nothing of this kind is an offering for sin, the virtue of that made by Christ being inexhaustible. No longer does any distinct priestly class or caste mediate between God and man; but the priestly functions and status, in a strict sense reserved entirely to the Saviour, pass over, as far as they can pass over, to the whole body of believers, each of whom has the indefeasible right of access to God through Christ alone. Of himself the individual has to give account, and no artificial system of mediation prevents him from standing in personal and incommunicable responsibility before God.

4. The priestly theory of the Christian ministry.—It follows that this theory is without direct Scriptural warrant. The word used for the office is *πρεσβύτερος*, from which sacrificial associations are absent, and never *ἱερεύς*, from which such associations are inseparable.

(*a*) No argument can be based upon the passages in which compounds of that term or cognate expressions occur. The nearest is probably Ro 15^{16} RVm: 'a minister of Jesus Christ unto the Gentiles, *ministering in sacrifice* the gospel of God.' Here the sacrificial allusions are unquestionable but entirely figurative. St. Paul is a *λειτουργός*, *i.e.* one who performs functions that are sacred inasmuch as they serve the needs of the community, whether viewed as an ecclesiastical (1 Ch 16^{4}, He 10^{11} 8^{2}) or a social (Nu 18^{2}, Sir 10^{25}, 2 Co 9^{10}) unit. In such a sense priests may be said to minister in the house of God (2 Es 20^{36}), or the 'ministers' may be distinguished from the priests (2 Es 20^{39}). The word may be used of the work of prophets and teachers (Ac 13^{2}), and even of the ministry of the rich to the poor (Ro 9^{12} 15^{27}); and its technical use in non-sacrificial connexions is well authenticated. St. Paul accordingly applies the term to himself as a minister of Christ to the Gentiles, and by a familiar figure compares his functions with those of a sacrificing priest, the offering which he presents being that of converted men. Each of them in a figure presents himself as a sacrifice (Ro 12^{1}), their apostle in a figure presents them all. But that the ministry of the Church is in some special sense priestly and sacrificial is not said and not to be inferred. Similarly with Ph 2^{17}—'If I am offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith'—the metaphor does not make St. Paul the priest, but the Philippians themselves, while their faith with the accompanying works is the sacrifice. So great is the Apostle's eagerness to help them that he is ready to die for Christ's sake in their behalf, or, as he puts it, to have his blood poured out as a libation, according to the practice in the heathen rites with which they were familiar (see Lightfoot, *in loc.*).

(*b*) This silence of Scripture in regard to the priestly character of the ministry is not relieved by an assumed identification of the ministry with the priests of Judaism or by the assumption of a parallel between them. There is no such parallel, as far as our period is concerned; for the line of typological development from the OT conception, as we have seen, runs up directly to Jesus Christ and terminates in Him, while the circle of analogy encompasses all the faithful, investing them with common privileges and the same obligations, and recognizing no distinction between the classes of clergy and of laity. All alike are priests of God, required each to present himself a living sacrifice; and the priestly work of Christ is so completely done that the intervention of any official to repair or supplement it is superfluous in regard to man and an undesigned reflexion upon the Saviour.

(*c*) It is the non-sacrificial term 'presbyter' that is consistently used in the NT as the chief and technical designation of a Christian minister. Other officials of lower rank, and, in later centuries, of higher rank, were appointed in the interest of fitness and efficiency (1 Co 14^{40}); but to none of them did sacerdotal functions appertain. The ministers of a congregation, whether engaged in teaching or administration (1 Ti 5^{17}), were called elders or presbyters, probably in imitation of the practice of the synagogue (Ac 11^{30} 14^{23} 15^{2}). For this term 'bishops' was sometimes substituted in churches where Hellenistic influence was strong (Ac 20^{28}, Ph 1^{1}, 1 Ti 3^{1}, Tit 1^{7}, 1 P $5^{1.2}$), the new term being familiar to the people as the title of the presiding official in their local confraternities and gilds. In NT times and afterwards the terms were interchangeable (1 Clem. 21, 42, 44), and for either substitutes could be used. The holders of the office were responsible rulers (Ro 12^{8}, 1 Th 5^{12}, He 13^{24}, 1 Clem. 1), stewards of God (Tit 1^{7}), messengers of the churches (2 Co 8^{23}), ministers (1 Ti 4^{6}), and servants (Ph 1^{1}) of Christ Jesus; but of sacrificial duties they had none, and in sacerdotal rank they ranged with the laity, whose worship they shared and conducted, and over whose faith they watched. Of actual altar and literal sacrifice since Christ died there is no need; for even the altar of He 13^{10} is that of Christ, on which each Christian must offer for himself the sacrifice of praise (He $13^{15f.}$) and good works. In all such things the minister should be an ensample (1 Ti 4^{12}, Tit 2^{7}, 1 P 5^{3}); but with the passing away of the sacrificial ritual there ceased also the need and the possibility of any sacerdotal or vicarious activities. For the sake of order, the minister still leads and represents the people, and speaks with authority when he proclaims the word of God; but he is himself one of them, separated from them by no personal quality or privilege whatever. He has no offering to make in anybody's behalf except his own, and no immunity or personal sanctity except such as arises from his own relation to God.

(*d*) Nor is there any trace in the Apostolic Age of the emergence of a ministerial theory to which the sacerdotal factor was integral. (1) The apostles proper never claimed either to be or to appoint priestly officers. Their specific work was to bear the witness of their senses to the historical Christ (Ac 1^{21}, 1 Jn 1^{1-3}); and while they were shrewd enough to take steps for the effective organization of the little groups of disciples they attracted, they never pretended to link on to the new Church any fragments of a sacrificial system that was in their opinion outworn and spent. (2) Or, if it be assumed that the ministerial office soon began to be conceived as the result of a fusion of apostolic and presbyteral functions, as there was no priestly element in either of the original constituents, there could be none in their conflation. If, consequently, such an element subsequently appeared, its introduction must have been surreptitious, and a legitimate descent from Scriptural teaching cannot be claimed. The minister was regarded as a priest in no other sense than was every disciple. Every disciple had access through Christ to God, and was charged with the priestly function of evangelism or the establishment of real contact between man and God. When the communities became organized, suitable disciples were appointed to the various offices; and the appointment to at least the presbyterate involved three concurrent actions—the commission of God (Ro 10^{5}, 1 Co 9^{16}; cf. Jn 17^{18}), and selection by church leaders or 'men of repute,' with the consent of the church (Ac 14^{23} 15^{27}, 1 Ti 2^{2}, Tit 1^{5}, 1 Clem. 44). But while such appointment carried the right to preside at the Eucharist and other church meetings, it added no priestly quality or prerogative to those which the minister already as a disciple possessed.

LITERATURE.—Comm. on the passages cited, especially B. F. Westcott, *Hebrews*, 1889; Sanday-Headlam, *Romans*^{5} (*ICC*, 1902); J. B. Lightfoot, *Philippians*^{4}, 1878, with appended dissertation on 'The Christian Ministry.' The principal Patristic literature is *Epistle of Barnabas* (A.D. 75[?]), in which, however, there is no description of ministerial qualifications or functions, and no mention of the Eucharist, but all Christians have personal access to saving knowledge; and Clement of Rome's *Ep. to Corinthians* (A.D. 96 or 97), for which see J. B. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, pt. i. (1890). See also W. Milligan, *Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood of Our Lord*, 1892; E. Hatch, *Organization of the Early Christian Churches*, 1881; F. J. A. Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, 1897; W. Lefroy, *The Christian Ministry*, 1890; T. Powell, *Essay on Apostolical Succession*^{2}, 1840; C. Gore, *The Ministry of the Christian Church*^{2}, 1889, and *Orders and Unity*, 1909; T. M. Lindsay, *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries*, 1902; R. C. Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood*^{2}, 1907; A. E. J. Rawlinson, in *Foundations*, 1912, pp. 362–422; and C. H. Turner, *Studies in Early Church History*, 1912, pp. 1–70.

R. W. MOSS.

PRINCE.—This is the rendering of two Gr. words in the NT, viz. ἀρχηγός and ἄρχων. The translation 'prince' is assigned to ἀρχηγός in two passages in Acts, viz. $3^{14f.}$, 'desired a murderer to be granted unto you; and killed the Prince of life' (AVm and RVm 'Author'); and 5^{31}, 'Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour.' In the latter passage the title evidently denotes the royal dignity to which Jesus has been raised by the Resurrection; but in the other quotation ἀρχηγὸς τῆς ζωῆς rather refers to His work as Saviour, and thus the marginal translation is preferable. He is the Author of life in the sense that He is the Mediator to others of eternal life (cf. He 2^{10}, ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν [AV and RVm 'captain of their salvation,' RV 'author'], and 5^{9}, αἴτιος σωτηρίας αἰωνίου [AV and RV 'author of eternal salvation,' RVm 'cause']). The title 'author of life' is specially suggestive in the passage in Acts in virtue of the contrast it presents to the 'murderer' whom they desired instead.

The title 'Prince' (ἄρχων) is applied to Jesus Christ in Rev 1^{5}, 'firstbegotten (RV 'firstborn') of the dead, and the prince (RV 'ruler') of the kings of the earth' (cf. Ps 89^{27}). In virtue of the Resurrection Jesus has been exalted to Divine Lordship (cf. Mt 28^{18}, Ph 2^{9}). The title 'prince of the kings of the earth' corresponds to the 'King of kings and Lord of lords' of Rev 17^{14} 19^{16}. It is characteristic of Rev., with its transference to the Christ of the attributes of the theocratic king, to emphasize the sovereignty of the Exalted Christ over all earthly potentates.

There are two other passages in the apostolic writings in which ἄρχων is translated 'prince.' In one, Eph 2^{2}, 'the prince of the power of the air' (ὁ ἄρχων τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος), the reference is plainly to Satan. ἐξουσία is here used collectively to denote the whole array of the hosts of evil. These are conceived as having their dwelling in the air, *i.e.* midway between heaven and earth (cf. 6^{12}, τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις). The other passage is 1 Co $2^{6.8}$. There is difference of opinion as to who are 'the princes of this world' (RV 'rulers of this world,' RVm 'age') here referred to. There are some who see merely a reference to those who through birth, culture, and power hold a high place in the esteem of their fellows. But others find in the passage an allusion to the evil spirits to which there was a tendency in later

Judaism to assign part at least of the government of the world. These spirits are represented as having brought about the death of Christ in their blind ignorance of the Divine wisdom. Had they known the Lord of glory, they would never have committed such a fatal mistake.

LITERATURE.—H. Lietzmann's *Handbuch zum NT*, 1912, comm. on 1 Co 2^{6}; W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutest. Zeitalter*^{2}, 1906, p. 371 ff.; F. H. Chase, *The Credibility of the Acts*, 1902, p. 129 f.; *HDB*, art. 'Prince.'

G. WAUCHOPE STEWART.

PRINCE OF THE POWER OF THE AIR.—See AIR.

PRINCIPALITY, PRINCIPALITIES (ἀρχή, 'the first place, principality, rule, magistracy' [Grimm-Thayer]).—In the Epistles the Gr. word occurs four times in the singular in this sense (1 Co 15^{24}, Eph 1^{21}, Col 2^{10}, Jude ^{6}), and six times in the plural (Ro 8^{38}, Eph 3^{10} 6^{12}, Col 1^{16} 2^{15}, Tit 3^{1}). The AV gives 'principalities' uniformly for the latter, and 'principality' in two of the former, preferring 'rule' in 1 Co 15^{24}, and 'first estate' in Jude ^{6}. The RV appears to use 'principality' only where the reference to angelic beings is undoubted; it gives 'rulers' in Tit 3^{1}, and 'rule' in 1 Co 15^{24} and Eph 1^{21}, where earthly powers may be included (T. K. Abbott thinks that this applies also to Col 1^{16}). So in Lk 12^{11} 20^{20} the RV gives 'rulers' and 'rule.'

For the term as used of angels compare certain passages in Daniel ($10^{13.21}$ 12^{1}), where Michael is called the 'prince' of the Jews (LXX ἄρχων), and there is also a hostile angel, 'the prince of the kingdom of Persia.'

It is convenient to consider in this article the various special terms applied to angels in the Epistles, viz. thrones (θρόνοι), dominions (κυριότητες), principalities (ἀρχαί), authorities (ἐξουσίαι), and powers (δυνάμεις).

Ro 8^{38}—'angels, principalities, powers.'
1 Co 15^{24}—'rule (ἀρχή), authority, power.'
Eph 1^{21}—'rule (ἀρχή), authority, power, dominion.'
Eph 3^{10} 6^{12}—'principalities, powers.'
Col 1^{16}—'thrones, dominions, principalities, powers.'
Col 2^{10}—'principality, power.'
Col 2^{15}—'principalities, powers.'
1 P 3^{22}—'angels, authorities, powers.'

The contexts show that in some of the above passages all possible kinds of power, spiritual and earthly, are included; in some the reference is limited to good angels, and in others to evil angels, as Eph 6^{12}. It may be noted that Milton uses these titles for unfallen and fallen angels alike (*Paradise Lost*, ii. 11 and v. 601, 769).

Do these titles correspond to any objective revelation in the minds of the writers? Lightfoot's opinion, which Abbott (on Eph 1^{21}) adopts without any hesitation, is that 'in this catalogue [Col 1^{16}] St. Paul does not profess to describe objective realities, but contents himself with repeating subjective opinions.' The Apostle takes the terms used by Colossian teachers and does not inquire how much or how little truth is in them; Christ is elevated above them all. Salmond (on Eph 1^{21}) says that we must take the terms not as teaching or implying any doctrine of graduated ranks, but as rhetorical terms brought together to express the unique supremacy and absolute sovereignty proper to Christ. And Beet (on Col 1^{16}) states that 'in this verse . . . the existence of angelic powers is not absolutely assumed. Paul merely says that if there be such, be they what they may, they were created in the Son of God.' If the terms were found only in Col., where a tendency to angel worship had to be met, this might be admitted, but similar terms are found in Eph., where there is no such polemical reference, and elsewhere. On the other side may be quoted Ellicott (on Col 1^{16}), who holds that it is by no means so certain as it is assumed to be that St. Paul is simply repeating subjective opinions; there is nothing to show that he regarded these grades and orders as mere theosophical speculations. Peake says: 'in face of the detailed proof that St. Paul accepted the doctrine of various orders of angels, Lightfoot's remark (on Col 1^{16}) that a spirit of impatience is shown cannot be maintained, nor is there any polemical reference in Eph 1^{21}'; and Moule's opinion is that 'St. Paul is glorifying the Son of God by a view of His relation to created being; and assuredly this would not be best done by alluding to phases of created being which might all the while be figments of the imagination.' St. Paul's experience (2 Co 12^{1-4}) must not be forgotten, and Alexander says that not without reason has a Greek Father (St. Gregory, in *Hom. in Ezek.* 8) found in these glowing words a probable reminiscence of that which was actually beheld by him who was 'caught up to the third heaven.'

A further question is—Can anything be inferred from the order in which these terms occur? No list contains them all; Eph 1^{21} and Col 1^{16} have four each, but they are not the same four, and while 'dominion' is last in Eph. it is second in Col. Fritzsche and Meyer think that in Col. the superior and inferior classes form pairs, but this is precarious. It may be noted, however, that principalities, authorities, and powers (ἀρχαί, ἐξουσίαι, δυνάμεις) always occur in the same order; one may be omitted, but they are never reversed. It is quite possible that in Col. the Apostle is following the order of the false teachers. The Rabbis had a classification of ten orders (see Fritzsche on Ro $8^{38.39}$), but it was elaborated under the influence of Platonism, and evidently at a later date than St. Paul (Meyer). The names, too, are quite different from those of the NT. The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (*Levi*, 3) arranges the angels in seven heavens, placing powers (δυνάμεις τῶν παρεμβολῶν) in the third, and thrones and authorities in the fourth. The *Slavonic Enoch* (xx. 1) says that in the seventh heaven 'Enoch saw . . . all the fiery hosts of great archangels, and incorporeal powers, and lordships, and principalities, and powers; cherubim and seraphim, thrones and the watchfulness of many eyes' (quoted in Peake, *Colossians*).

Turning to Christian writings, we find that various systems of angelology were put forward, but it is difficult to say how far they are independent of St. Paul. From Hermas (*Vis.* iii. 4) we learn that instruction as to the positions of angels (τοποθεσίας τὰς ἀγγελικάς) was regarded as teaching for the more perfect. The lists given by the Fathers vary. Thus Origen (on Jn 1^{34}) gives thrones, principalities, dominions, authorities, adding that there are other names not so familiarly in use (cf. Eph 1^{21}); but in *de Principiis* (I. v. 3, vi. 2) he gives in an ascending scale a different order—principalities, authorities, thrones, dominions. Ephrem Syrus (*Op. Syr.* i. 270) arranges them in three classes: (1) gods, thrones, dominions; (2) archangels, principalities, authorities; (3) angels, powers, cherubim, seraphim. The same order appears in Basil of Seleucia (*Orat.* 39). Gregory of Nazianzus (*Orat.* xxviii. 31) mentions angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, principalities, authorities, splendours, ascents, intellectual powers or intelligences. The pseudo-Dionysius gives (1) thrones, cherubim, seraphim; (2) authorities, dominions, powers; (3) angels, archangels, principalities. And Gregory the Great (*Hom. in Ezek.* xxxiv. 7) has the following classes—angels, archangels, powers, authorities, principalities, dominions, thrones, cherubim, and seraphim.

These variations will confirm the opinion of St. Augustine when he says (*Enchir.* 58): 'what the organization is of that supremely happy society in heaven: what the differences of rank are, . . . and what are the various significations of those four names under which the apostle seems to embrace the whole heavenly company without exception, "whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers": — let those who are able answer these questions, if they can also prove their answers to be true; but as for me, I confess my ignorance.' Meyer's conclusion is that for Christian faith there remains and suffices the testimony as to different and distinctively designated stages and categories in the angelic world (cf. Mt 18^{10}), while any attempt to ascertain more than is written in Scripture passes into the fanciful domain of theosophy (on Col 1^{16}).

Two of the above passages require a more detailed examination, viz. Col 2^{15}, Ro 8^{38}. In Col 2^{15} (RV 'having put off from himself the principalities and the powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it'; AV 'having spoiled') there is hardly a phrase the meaning of which is undisputed. The Greek is *ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας ἐδειγμάτισεν ἐν παρρησίᾳ, θριαμβεύσας αὐτοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ. ἀπεκδυσάμενος* is a rare word which does not appear to occur before St. Paul (though Meyer thinks it is the right reading in Plato, *Rep.* 612A); and being middle it should mean 'having put off from himself' (cf. Old Lat. *exuens se principatibus*): so the RV. The older EVV, following the Vulg., give it the active meaning 'having spoiled,' which is preferred by Bengel, Meyer, Moule, and Peake. It is admitted that the middle is a difficulty, but it is explained as implying victorious self-interest (*sibi exspolians*). It might apply to good or bad angels, according to the context. If, with the RV, we take it in the natural middle meaning, the next questions are—What was put off? and Who is the subject? Many of the Greek Fathers and others say that the evil angels were put off, that the Lord by His death stripped away all the opposing powers of evil which sought to win a victory over Him in His human nature. 'When He died on the cross, when He dissolved that temple into which they, both in earlier, and later and perhaps redoubled efforts of temptation, had vainly endeavoured to make sacrilegious entry, He reft them away for ever, and vindicated His regal power' (Ellicott). There are two objections to this view. (1) When and in what sense did Christ wear these opposing powers as a robe? Lightfoot says that 'the powers of evil, which had clung like a Nessus robe about His humanity, were torn off and cast aside for ever'; on which Beet's criticism is: 'I do not know that enemies attacking are ever so described: and of such desperate struggle with evil powers we have as yet in this place no hint.' (2) It necessitates a change of subject, of which the context gives no intimation; in vv.$^{12. 13. 14}$ the subject is God the Father, and no one would think of changing it but for the difficulty of otherwise giving to 'principalities and powers' the meaning of evil angels. The common interpretation of the Latin Fathers was 'putting off from Himself *His body*' (see RVm), and it found its way into the text of G (*τὴν σάρκα καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας, ἀρχὰς* being omitted; 'having laid aside His flesh, He made a show of the powers'). The introduction of the metaphor is very abrupt, and there is again the change of subject.

But it is possible to keep the middle meaning of *ἀπεκδυσάμενος*, and the same subject throughout, if 'principalities and powers' are good angels. This was first suggested by J. Peirce (in *A Paraphrase and Notes on Colossians*², 1729) and adopted by Alford, Ritschl, Beet, Findlay, and Peake. It is consistent with 2^{10} and 1^{16}, where good angels are meant, and there is no allusion in the Epistle to hostile angels. Peirce's paraphrase is, 'and having taken from the good angels their authority, He subjected them to Christ, and proposed them publicly as an example of cheerful obedience to Him (*i.e.* to Christ), causing them to triumph in Christ.' What was this authority? In Gal 3^{19}, He 2^2, Ac 7^{53} angels are described as the medium through which God revealed Himself at the Law-giving, and in this sense they might be called His robe or veil. But when Christ came the veil was laid aside and the angels took an inferior position (cf. He 1^6), God henceforth manifesting Himself in the Person of His Son. 'He has put off and laid aside the garb of angelic mediation in which, under the Law, He was wont to hold intercourse with men' (Findlay). On this view, 'made a show of them' implies no shame, only that He exhibited them in a true position of inferiority, and therefore not to be worshipped. The chief objection lies in the word 'triumphing,' which, if taken in the Roman sense of 'captives led in triumph by a victorious general,' seems to require that the principalities and powers should be hostile angels. This is obviated if Findlay's contention can be established, viz. that 'triumph' (*θριαμβεύω*) here has the meaning of *θρίαμβος*—a hymn sung in procession in honour of Dionysus; accordingly, the sense would be—God has formed them into a festal chorus 'who follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth,' hymning His praises, and devoted to His service.

In Ro $8^{38. 39}$: 'I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers . . . shall be able to separate us from the love of God' (RV), the same question arises as in Col 2^{15}. As the other influences are in pairs of opposites, some find here also a contrast, 'angels' being heavenly beings and 'principalities' earthly; or 'angels' being good spirits and 'principalities' evil. Others think that both terms mean evil angels, arguing that the good would not try to separate us from the love of God. But this may be only a hypothesis like Gal 1^8, and the point is that nothing, however powerful, whether likely to harm us or not, can separate us from the love of God; and Godet well says that what is itself good may contribute to lead us astray, if our attachment or adoration stops short at the creature, instead of rising to God. See artt. AUTHORITY, DOMINION, POWER, THRONE.

LITERATURE.—Commentaries on *Romans*: C. F. A. Fritzsche, 1836–43, F. Godet (Eng. tr., 2 vols., 1881–82); *Ephesians*: H. A. W. Meyer (Eng. tr., 1880), S. D. F. Salmond (in *EGT*, 1903); *Colossians*: J. Peirce (²1729), H. A. W. Meyer (Eng. tr., 1875), C. J. Ellicott (³1865), J. B. Lightfoot (³1879), J. A. Beet (1890), A. S. Peake (in *EGT*, 1903), W. Alexander (*Speaker's Commentary*, 1881); T. K. Abbott, *ICC*, 'Ephesians and Colossians,' 1897; G. G. Findlay, 'St. Paul's use of *θριαμβεύω*,' in *Exp*, 1st ser., x.² [1881]; Joseph Hall, 'The Invisible World,' in *Works*, new ed., viii. [1837]; and K. R. Hagenbach, *History of Christian Doctrines*, Eng. tr., ii. [1880] § 131.

W. H. DUNDAS.

PRINCIPLES (ἀρχή, He 5^{12} 6^1).—In Greek philosophy ἀρχή is an element or first principle—that by which anything begins to be. When it is distinguished from *στοιχεῖον* — the terms are often interchanged—it means the formal and active as opposed to the material cause. The two words are used together in He 5^{12}, 'the rudiments of the first principles of the oracles of God' (*τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ θεοῦ*). The tautology is studied and effective. The writer is chiding his readers for not endeavouring or perhaps caring to advance beyond the A B C (in Luther's phrase, *die ersten Buchstaben*) of the gospel. He reminds them that they are no longer *νήπιοι*. Milk is the natural food of babes, but babes are potential adults, and the food of men (*τελείων*, 'perfect,' *i.e.* 'full-grown,' is emphatic), and of those who aspire to be such, has to be more solid than that of infants (5^{14}). The backwardness which the writer reproves is alike intellectual and spiritual, while his grave tone differs from that of Horace's 'blandi doctores,' who give their pupils cakes 'elementa velint ut discere prima' (*Sat.* I. i. 25 f.). That there is an immense difference between the ἀρχή and the τέλος of Christianity; that Jesus is not only the Beginner but the Perfecter of our faith (ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειωτὴν, He 12^{2})—these are the truths he wishes to drive home. Childhood is beautiful, but only a false sentiment would prolong it. The same thought is frequent in St. Paul's writings (1 Co 3^{1} 13^{11}, Eph 4^{14}). The Rabbis spoke of their younger pupils as 'sucklings.' Perhaps in He 5$^{13.14}$ we have a case of one Alexandrian echoing another, for Philo says (*de Agric.* ii.): 'Since milk is the food of infants, but cakes of wheat (τὰ ἐκ πυρῶν πέμματα) are the food of full-grown men, so also the soul must have a milk-like nourishment in its age of childhood, namely, the elementary lessons of art and science (τὰ τῆς ἐγκυκλίου μουσικῆς προπαιδεύματα), but the perfect food which is for men is education in prudence, temperance, and every virtue.'

James Strahan.

PRISCA, PRISCILLA.—See Aquila.

PRISON.—1. Greek words translated 'prison.'—The term φυλακή is almost invariably rendered 'prison' in AV and RV. It is also used in a more restricted sense to designate a portion of a prison, in one instance 'the first and the second ward' (Ac 12^{10} AV and RV), traversed by the apostle Peter on his way to freedom; in another, 'the inner prison' (Ac 16^{24} AV and RV) in which St. Paul and Silas were immured by the Philippian jailer. The word δεσμωτήριον, frequently applied by Attic orators to the prison at Athens, and used in the Acts interchangeably with φυλακή, is translated 'prison-house' in the RV (5$^{21.23}$ 16^{26}). The word οἴκημα ('a room in a house'), a polite equivalent in Attic Greek for δεσμωτήριον, is used (Ac 12^{7}) to denote 'the cell' in which the apostle Peter was confined by order of Herod. Another word for prison, τήρησις, translated 'hold' (RV 'ward'), is employed in Ac 4^{3} to designate the place of confinement into which the apostles were thrown by the sacerdotal authorities at Jerusalem; also in Ac 5^{18} qualified by the adjective δημοσίᾳ (AV 'common prison,' RV 'public ward').

2. The prison in apostolic times.—In most of the instances mentioned in the NT, prisons appear to have been a part of buildings mainly devoted to other uses, such as palaces and fortresses, rather than buildings exclusively set apart for the purpose. The system then in vogue differed in this and other respects from the one that largely prevails at the present day. As a rule, prisons were intended not as places of punishment for convicted criminals, but as places of detention for persons awaiting trial, or pending their execution. In support of this view may be cited the imprisonment of the apostles recorded in Ac 4^{3} 5$^{18ff.}$, that of the apostle Peter in Ac 12$^{3-10}$, and that of the apostle Paul at Jerusalem, Cæsarea, and Rome. Among the Jews, as well as among the Greeks and Romans, it was usual to inflict other penalties than imprisonment for offences against law and order, *e.g.*, fines, scourging, death.

In Philippi, which was a Roman colony, the prison into which St. Paul and Silas were cast seems to have been a separate establishment devoted to the purpose. But it is rash to assume that prisons in the provinces were planned on the same principle as the Mamertine prison at Rome. There is nothing to indicate that 'the inner prison' in which the Apostle and his companion were incarcerated was a subterranean dungeon. The reference to 'doors' (Ac 16^{26}) and to the circumstance that the jailer 'sprang in' (v.^{29}) points to the fact that their portion of the prison was on a level with the other portions. The narrative affords us one of the few glimpses obtainable into the interior of a Roman prison, with its different cells, provided with the inevitable appurtenances of chains and stocks, and its governor's house above. In Ac 12$^{3-10}$ an interesting glimpse is also given into the interior of the prison in which the apostle Peter was confined at Jerusalem. This was probably a guard-room in the fortress Antonia, situated at the north-west corner of the Temple area, escape from which could be effected only by passing through 'the first and the second wards,' lying between it and the iron gate leading into the city. The place of custody to which the apostles were committed by the Temple guard (Ac 4$^{1-3}$ 5$^{18ff.}$) was probably attached to the Temple or high priest's palace, as it would appear to have been adjacent to the court in which the Sanhedrin subsequently met for the trial.

Among the evidences which St. Paul adduces of his pre-eminence in suffering is his 'more frequent' confinement 'in prisons' (2 Co 11^{23}). Besides his imprisonment at Philippi and other unrecorded instances which preceded the writing of 2 Cor., he became painfully familiar with custody in prison and out of prison at subsequent dates. (1) As the result of the riot in the Temple, set on foot by the fanatical Jews of Asia, he was consigned for a time to the barracks (παρεμβολή, AV and RV 'castle') connected with the fortress Antonia (Ac 21^{34}), the scene of St. Peter's imprisonment at an earlier date. (2) The discovery of the plot aiming at his assassination led to his being transferred to Cæsarea, where he was detained for upwards of two years in the prætorium of Herod, now the residence of the procurator (Ac 23^{35}). Here the strictness of his confinement was sufficiently relaxed to admit of his friends having free access to him. (3) On his being transferred to Rome, as the result of his appeal to Cæsar, a still larger measure of liberty was granted him. 'He dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him' (Ac 28^{30}). (4) If we are to assume a second imprisonment at Rome—a subject still under discussion—it seems not unlikely, judging from references in 2 Tim., that he was subjected to severer treatment. According to tradition, his place of custody was the Mamertine prison, in the lower dungeon of which, known as the Tullianum, prisoners condemned for crimes against the State were executed.

3. Metaphorical use of 'prison.'—The word 'prison' is applied in a figurative sense (1) to the place of confinement of the spirits 'which were disobedient . . . in the days of Noah' (1 P 3$^{19f.}$; cf. Gn 6$^{2-4}$).* These are probably to be identified with 'the angels which kept not their first estate,' declared in Jude (v.^{6}) to be 'reserved in everlasting chains under darkness to the judgment of the great day,' and with 'the angels that sinned,' who are 'consigned to Tartarus' (2 P 2^{4}, ταρταρώσας), as distinguished from Gehenna, 'to be reserved unto judgment.' The allusion in all these passages appears to be to the *Book of Enoch*, which represents the fallen angels as undergoing temporary punishment (in Tartarus, xix. 1–3; cf. xx. 2) until the day of their final doom. (2) The term 'prison' is also applied to 'the bottomless pit' (RV 'the abyss'), in which Satan is bound a thousand years (Rev 20^{7}; cf. v.^{1}).

Literature.—Artt. 'Carcer' in Smith's *DGRA*^{2}, 1875, 'Prison' in McClintock-Strong's *Bibl. Cyclopædia*, viii. [1879], in *HDB* iv. [1902], and *DCG* ii. [1908]. For instances of imprisonment in the life of St. Paul, see Lives by Conybeare-Howson (new ed., 1877), F. W. Farrar (1897), and others.

W. S. Montgomery.

---

* See art. Spirits in Prison.

PRIZE.—According to the Gospels, reward (*μισθός*) finds a place in the teaching of the Kingdom of God. But the doctrine is redeemed from mercenariness by the fact that the reward is reckoned of grace and not of debt (Mt 20^{1-16}, Lk 17^{10}) as well as by the nature of the reward. It is no mere external or material reward. Generally speaking, it is the Kingdom of God or, according to the Fourth Gospel, eternal life, that our Lord sets before His followers as the reward to which they may look forward. The blessedness which is to be theirs consists in the attainment of that moral perfection after which they strive. They that hunger and thirst after righteousness shall be filled: the merciful shall obtain mercy: the pure in heart shall see God.

The same doctrine is found in the apostolic writings. But here the reward is described as a prize. This phraseology is most common in the speeches and Epistles of St. Paul, but it occurs also in the Epistles of St. James and St. John and in the Revelation of St. John. The imagery is taken from the Greek games which occupied such a large place in Greek life and were invested with almost religious significance. The four great festivals were the Isthmian, the Nemean, the Olympian, and the Pythian games. Of these the Olympian were pre-eminent in theory, being the chief national festival of the Greeks, and in practice they outlasted all the others, continuing to be celebrated till the reign of Theodosius. But when the Epistles of St. Paul were written the chief interest of Greece was in the Isthmian games, which also from their proximity to Corinth were likely to supply the Apostle with the metaphors of the foot-race, the pugilistic contest, and the prize, of which he makes frequent use. The Isthmian games were held on the Isthmus of Corinth, in a grove of pine-trees sacred to Poseidon, near the shrines of the Isthmian Poseidon and Melicertes, in the first month of spring, in the second and fourth year of each Olympiad. The contests consisted of gymnastic exercises, horse races, and competitions in music. Besides the customary palm the prize in Pindar's time consisted of a wreath of dry *σέλινον* (often translated 'parsley,' but more probably identical with the 'wild celery'—*apium graveolens*). After the destruction of Corinth, a crown of pine-leaves was substituted for it. The Nemean games, which were celebrated in the valley of Nemea in the territory of the Argive town Cleonæ, consisted of gymnastic, equestrian, and musical contests. The prize was a palm-branch and a garland of fresh *σέλινον*. The Olympian games, held in honour of Zeus at Olympia in the Peloponnesian district of Pisatis, consisted of foot-races, chariot-races, leaping, quoit and spear throwing, wrestling and boxing; and the prize was a wreath of the leaves of the sacred wild olive, said to have been originally planted by Heracles, which had been cut with a golden knife. The Pythian games, held on the Crissæan plain below Delphi, consisted of gymnastic and athletic contests similar to those held at Olympia, with the addition of musical ceremonies. The prizes were a wreath from the sacred bay-tree in the Vale of Tempe and a palm-branch (Seyffert, *Dict. Class. Ant.*, pp. 326, 413, 427, 531).

It was doubtless these games, more particularly the Isthmian games, that suggested to St. Paul the comparison of the Christian life to a race and to a boxing-match, and led him to insist on the need for discipline and self-denial in order to gain success. And it is from these games that he borrows the figure of the prize which awaits the successful runner of the Christian race. In two passages (1 Co 9^{24}, Ph 3^{14}) the term used is *βραβεῖον*, the word regularly employed to denote the award to the victor in the games, a prize (Grimm-Thayer, *s.v.*). It is also used by Clem. Rom. *Ep. ad Cor.* i. 5, *ὑπομονῆς βραβεῖον*; cf. *Mart. Polyc.* 17, and Tatian, *ad Græc.* 33. The word occurs in its Latin dress, *bravium* or *brabium*, in Tertullian, in the translation of Irenæus, and in the Latin versions of the Scriptures. In 1 Co 9^{25}, 2 Ti 4^{8}, Ja 1^{12}, 1 P 5^{4}, Rev 2^{10} 3^{11} the word used is *στέφανος*, meaning 'wreath' or 'garland,' such as was given as a prize to victors in the public games (Grimm-Thayer, *s.v.*), whilst in 2 Ti 2^{5} the verb *στεφανοῦται* is used with the same reference. That the metaphor was borrowed from the Greek games is evident from 1 Co $9^{24.\,25}$, where not only is mention made of *οἱ ἐν σταδίῳ τρέχοντες*, but the *φθαρτὸς στέφανος* won by the successful competitor in the games is contrasted with the *ἄφθαρτος στέφανος* aimed at by the Christian.

The nature of the *ἄφθαρτος στέφανος* set before the Christian is further defined in the NT. In 2 Ti 4^{8} it is described as *ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης στέφανος*, 'the crown or garland which belongs to, or is the due reward of, righteousness'; in Ja 1^{12} and Rev 2^{10} as *τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς*, 'the crown or garland which consists of eternal life' (cf. 1 Ti 6^{12}); and in 1 P 5^{4} as *τὸν ἀμαράντινον τῆς δόξης στέφανον*, 'the crown or garland consisting of glory which will never fade,' in contrast to the garlands of *σέλινον*, olive, laurel, or pine won by the competitors in the games, which withered sooner or later. *βραβεῖον* is described in Ph 3^{14} as *τὸ βραβεῖον τῆς ἄνω κλήσεως τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*, 'the prize of God's high call in Christ Jesus' (J. Moffatt, *The New Testament: A New Translation*^{3}, London, 1914, *ad loc.*).

That the prospect of winning this prize is a legitimate motive in inciting the Christian to exert himself to the utmost in the Christian *ἀγών* and *δρόμος* is implied in 2 Ti $4^{7.\,8}$, where it is evident that St. Paul was inspired to fight the good fight, to finish the course, to keep the faith, by the hope of having *τὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης στέφανον* bestowed on him by the righteous Judge at that day: and it is explicitly asserted by him in 1 Co 9^{24-27} and Ph 3^{12-14}. In 1 Co 9^{24-27} St. Paul, taking the foot-race as his illustration, says in effect to his readers, 'It is not enough merely to run—all run; but as there is only one who is victorious, so you must run, not with the slowness of the many, but with the energy of the one' (Stanley, *ad loc.*). 'In the Christian race there is no competition. The prize is within the reach of all. But then each runner must be as much in earnest as though there were competition and only one prize. And this is what the Apostle expresses. He does not say "run so—in such a way—as to obtain"—but, "run so—as those runners run—in order that ye may obtain." In their case there is rivalry, and therefore they are in earnest. In your case there is no rivalry; but their earnestness of purpose is an example to you' (Howson, *Metaphors of St. Paul*, pp. 151, 152). When St. Paul adds (v.^{25}), 'They do it to win a fading crown, we do it for an unfading,' he makes still clearer the reference to the Greek games, and also the legitimacy of the desire for the prize as a motive to Christian exertion. According to his teaching in this passage the hope of the prize conduces to earnestness of purpose, self-restraint, definiteness of aim, and persevering effort. The same truths are expressed in Ph 3^{12-14}, where, speaking of himself, St. Paul says, 'I press on, if so be that I may apprehend that for which also I was apprehended by Christ Jesus. . . . One thing I do, forgetting the things which are behind, and stretching forward to the things which are before, I press on toward the goal unto the prize (*βραβεῖον*) of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus,' where the imagery and terminology are plainly borrowed from the Greek games, more particularly the foot-race, and where the prospect of the *βραβεῖον* nerves the Apostle to press on and reach forward toward the goal. In agreement with this is Rev 2^{10}, where the hope of receiving *τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς* is held out as a reason for being faithful unto death; and also Rev 3^{11}, where the angel of the Church in Philadelphia is exhorted to hold fast 'that which thou hast, that no one take thy crown' (*τὸν στέφανόν σου*). Thus all the passages in the writings of the Apostolic Church in which reward is represented as a prize (*βραβεῖον*) or garland of victory (*στέφανος*) uniformly teach that the hope of winning the prize or garland is a legitimate motive in stimulating the Christian to greater earnestness and faithfulness and persevering effort.

LITERATURE.—O. Seyffert, *Dict. Class. Ant.*, ed. Nettleship and Sandys, London, 1902; Liddell and Scott's *Gr.-Eng. Lex.*, Oxford, 1869; Grimm-Thayer, *Gr.-Eng. Lex. of the NT*², Edinburgh, 1890; J. B. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, pt. i. [London, 1890] vol. ii.; R. Mackintosh, art. 'Reward' in *DCG*; *Exp*, 2nd ser., i. [1881] 401, 7th ser., x. [1910] 97, 224; W. J. Conybeare-J. S. Howson, *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, London, 1870, vol. ii. ch. xx.; J. S. Howson, *Metaphors of St. Paul*, do., 1870; Comm. on passages quoted, esp. A. P. Stanley, *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians*³, do., 1865, where notes on 1 Co 9^{24-27} are of special value.

J. W. SLATER.

PROCHORUS.—Prochorus was one of the Seven appointed and ordained in Ac 6^{5}. He is said to have been a bishop of Nicomedia, and martyred at Antioch.

W. A. SPOONER.

PROCONSUL.—Down to the time of Augustus this word had not become one, but was still two words—*pro consule*, 'in place of a consul.' It signified a man with the rank and insignia of a consul, whether he had already held the office or not. In practice the title was conferred on certain governors of provinces, and only the Emperor possessed the power belonging to this office within the walls of the city of Rome. Nothing need here be said of such governors during the Republican period. By the arrangements of January, 27 B.C., all the provinces of the Roman Empire (see PROVINCE) were divided between the Senate and the Emperor Augustus. In conformity with his desire to keep all the real power in his own hands, while the semblance was left in the hands of the Senate, the governors of Imperial provinces were given humble titles such as *legati Augusti pro prætore*, etc., whatever had been their career, but all governors of senatorial provinces were called *proconsules*. The senatorial provinces were divided into two grades—the higher grade, open only to ex-consuls, comprising Asia and Africa; and the lower, open to ex-prætors, comprising all the other senatorial provinces. The governors of Asia and Africa were provided with three *legati* each. In the NT only three proconsuls are referred to—the proconsul of Cyprus, Sergius Paulus (Ac $13^{7ff.}$), the proconsul of Achaia, Gallio (18^{12}), and the proconsul of Asia (19^{38}, the plural is generalizing, and does not imply more than one at a time).

A. SOUTER.

PROCURATOR.—The position of procurator, in the sense in which we are familiar with the word, cannot be understood without a knowledge of the word's history. Before the Roman Empire was ever thought of, and regularly also after it had come into existence, a *procurator* (Greek, *ἐπίτροπος*) was one *qui procurat*, 'who attends to' or 'manages,' particularly the affairs of a household or an estate—an agent, steward, or bailiff, in fact. Such a person was a superior servant, acting for his master, but still a servant. The Emperor required servants to manage his property in various parts of the Empire, and these were regularly known by the name *procuratores*. They derived what importance they had solely from the high position of their master. If this had been clearly understood, probably we should have been spared much cheap criticism of a man like Pilate, procurator of Judæa, whose career could be made or marred by a master's whim. Such a man was in an entirely different position from an ordinary governor of a province, who would be a member of the Senate, still a privileged body, and might be of as good as, or of better blood than, the Emperor himself. It is true that an Emperor could also get rid of such, but not so easily.

Procuratores were of many kinds, but were never of higher rank than the equestrian. Once or twice they were Imperial freedmen. The Emperor had *procuratores* in all provinces, senatorial and Imperial alike, who attended to his financial interests there. The Emperors had private property in the provinces, often consisting of estates that had belonged to the domains of various gods and goddesses. These demanded a large staff of workers of many kinds, and over them were set *procuratores*. Sometimes these would take over the command of a province on the occasion of the death or absence of the real governor. They are to be distinguished from the *procuratores* who were actually set over provinces as governors. Only Imperial provinces were thus governed, and only the less important of these (see GOVERNOR, PROVINCE). They took the place of the earlier military prefects. The following provinces among others were governed at one time or another by them—the two Mauretaniæ, Rætia, Noricum, Alpes Maritimæ, Alpes Cottiæ, Judæa, Cappadocia, Epirus, the Hellespont, Corsica, Sardinia, Bithynia, Pamphylia. To the student of Christian origins Judæa is the most interesting. Of Pontius Pilate we know almost nothing, but Felix was the first man born a slave who governed a Roman province and commanded the troops in it. Antonius Felix was brother of Claudius' great minister of finance (*a rationibus*), Pallas, and, probably on account of his marriage into a higher class, was raised to the equestrian order before his appointment to Judæa. Such governors had a lower status than the finance procurators in other provinces. The troops under their command were auxiliaries, which were for the most part drawn from the country itself, and militia formed from the able-bodied men of the province. Such troops did not belong to the Imperial army in the strict sense. In Judæa, *e.g.*, there was an *ala* formed of *Cæsariani* and *Sebastēni*, the *ala prima gemina Sebastenorum* (apparently drafted in Vespasian's time to Mauretania), and five cohorts (cf. Ac 10^{1} for the name of one of them), which also appear to have been raised entirely in the country, and were probably in part also commanded by officers of Eastern birth (*e.g.*, probably, Claudius Lysias, Ac 23^{26}). Only one of these cohorts had its quarters in Jerusalem. The 200 *δεξιολάβοι* (probably 'slingers') who were sent as an escort with St. Paul (Ac 23^{23}) probably did not form a separate troop. In their quality of commanders of troops the procurators had *beneficiarii* under them. Sometimes also a sub-procurator (*ἀντεπίτροπος*) of equestrian rank is mentioned as an assistant to the procurator. Lower posts, filled by Imperial freedmen and slaves, were those of the *tabularii, commentarienses, librarii, arcarii* (cf. Ro 16^{23}, where *dispensator* would be a more exact translation; also *CIL* iii. 556, v. 8818), and *dispensatores* with their *vicarii*, to which titles the name of the province is always added. These officials, to avoid the appearance of partiality, were never natives of the provinces in which they served.

The functions of the procurators were judicial, financial, and military. The last tended to become less important in the later Empire. They had supervision of the taxes. They had to pay the soldiers, not only in procuratorial but also in the other Imperial provinces. Each had charge of the carrying out of road-building and other buildings in his province. In the more important Imperial provinces the financial procurators acted ordinarily with the governors in the supervision of building and also in the settlement of boundary disputes, but also sometimes independently. In the ordinary Civil Court (Recorder's Court, Court of Common Pleas) they had a jurisdiction like that of other governors, and in later times at least they could appoint a guardian to a ward (*tutoris datio*). Criminal jurisdiction over non-citizens was extended to them in Judæa already in Augustus' time in full compass (Jn 19^{10}), but over Roman citizens they had no power of life and death (*ius gladii*), unless this had been communicated to them in a special mandate from the Emperor. The right of pardon belonged only to the Emperor, and the liberation of such a criminal as Barabbas can have been made possible only by a clause in the special *lex prouinciæ*, according to which Judæa was governed (Jn 18^{39}). The procurator of Judæa appears to have stood in a special position of dependence under the governor of the Imperial province of Syria. Pilate was deposed, or at least suspended, by L. Vitellius, the governor of Syria (Josephus, *Ant.* XVIII. iv. 2), with the command that he should appear before the Emperor in Rome, and a provisional governor appointed for Judæa. A similar experience fell to the lot of later procurators of Judæa, Felix and Cumanus, at the hands of Ummidius Quadratus, governor of Syria. But it has been pointed out that both these governors had a wider command than Syria, extending in fact over the neighbouring provinces as well. There was, however, a close connexion between Judæa and Syria, the result of Syria's importance as a frontier province with four legions stationed in it.

LITERATURE.—**O. Hirschfeld**, *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diocletian*^{2}, Berlin, 1905, pp. 410–465. On Imperial estates, formerly the property of gods or goddesses, see **W. M. Ramsay**, 'The Tekmoreian Guest-Friends: an Anti-Christian Society on the Imperial Estates at Pisidian Antioch,' in *Studies in the History and Art of the Eastern Provinces of the Roman Empire*, 1906, pp. 305–377, *Athenæum*, 12 Aug. 1911, p. 193, 'Iconium and Antioch,' in *Exp*, 8th ser., ii. [1911] 257 ff., *JHS* xxxii. [1912] 151 ff.; **J. G. C. Anderson**, in *JRS* iii. [1913] 267 ff.; **M. Rostowzew**, *Studien zur Gesch. des röm. Kolonates*, Leipzig, 1910.

A. SOUTER.

PROFANE (*βέβηλος*, 'trodden under foot'; *profanus*, 'outside the shrine').—The word denotes not simply what is common (see CLEAN), but a temper which despises sacred things (1 Ti 1^9); cf. '*profane* language.' Esau was 'profane' (He 12^{16}) because he despised his spiritual birthright. St. Paul is accused of 'profaning' the Temple (Ac 24^6) by bringing Gentiles into it. It is the temper of those who know the good and yet despise it. In the early days of Christianity we do not find this sin remarked on, because Christianity was then novel and unrecognized, and hostility to it was passionate rather than profane. But later, as in 1 and 2 Tim., when it became a tried institution with recognized doctrine (1 Ti 4^6), and had a clientele amongst men, then there was room for this sin. The term 'profane' is applied especially to those who under cover of Christianity foist their own errors and deceits upon the Church. Judaism from behind and Gnosticism coming on in front are the worst offenders. They simulated Christianity and brought their mischief into its very centre. Thus 'profane fables' (1 Ti 4^7) recalls the foolish stories of Rabbinical preaching (Tit 1$^{10. 14}$). 'Profane babblings and oppositions of knowledge falsely so-called' (1 Ti 6^{20}, 2 Ti 2^{16}), if they are not Gnostic, are leading to Gnosticism, its hair-splittings, cloud of words, pride of knowledge, unnatural asceticism, and moral looseness. Gnosticism, with all that led up to it, was peculiarly *profane*, because it brought into the meekness of Christianity the dialectical pride of the West and the 'caste' feeling of the East; it pretended to have special knowledge; it made purity into a formal distinction between matter and spirit (see CLEAN); it indulged in capricious philosophical views of Christian truth, and became a masquerade of sacred things.

LITERATURE.—**A. Edersheim**, *LT*^{4}, 1887, i. 448; **F. J. A. Hort**, *Judaistic Christianity*, 1894, p. 138; **W. Moeller**, *History of the Christian Church*, Eng. tr., i. [1892] 129–153; **J. B. Lightfoot**, *Colossians and Philemon*, new ed., 1879, pp. 73–113; for analysis of present-day Gnosticism, **P. T. Forsyth**, *Positive Preaching and Modern Mind*, 1907, pp. 118–123.

SHERWIN SMITH.

PROFESSION.—Several words are used in Acts and the Epistles to express avowal, professing, or confessing. (1) In the general sense of professing or avowing something we have *φάσκειν* ('professing themselves to be wise, they became fools,' Ro 1^{22}) and *ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι* ('which becometh women professing godliness,' 1 Ti 2^{10}; 'they profess that they know God,' Tit 1^{16}). (2) In the particular sense of professing or confessing faith, the words *ὁμολογεῖν* and *ὁμολογία* are regularly used. In this connexion the word 'profession' disappears from the RV and the more accurate word 'confession' takes its place: *e.g.* 'Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed the good confession' (1 Ti 6^{13}). In the specific sense of confessing faith in Jesus Christ it is the technical term. The *locus classicus* is Ro 10$^{9. 10}$: 'If thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord . . . thou shalt be saved: for with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation' (cf. Ac 24^{14}, 2 Co 9^{13}, 1 Ti 6^{12}, He 3^1 4^{14}). In the 1st and 2nd Epistles of John, particular stress is laid on the confession of the reality of the human life of Jesus—no doubt with reference to the Docetic heresy: *e.g.* 'Every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God' (1 Jn 4^2, also 4^3, 2 Jn ^{7}).

The etymological meaning of *ὁμολογεῖν* is 'to say the same thing' as others. It fitly expresses the condition necessary for joining the company or society of those who believed in Jesus Christ. Those who confessed their faith 'said the same things' about Him as those who were already in the society. At first the contents of the confession were very simple. Most probably the confession was the avowal of belief in Jesus as the Messiah, as in the great confession of Peter, 'Thou art the Christ' (Mk 8^{29}). To the Christian Jew of Palestine He was the 'Messiah'; to the Hellenistic Christian Jew He was the 'Christ'; to the Christian Gentile He was the 'Lord.' Cf. 'No man can say, Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit' (1 Co 12^3; see *ExpT* xv. [1903–04] 289, 296 ff.). Out of that simple confession there quickly grew other relative beliefs which were implicit in it, *e.g.* His resurrection (Ro 10^9), His Divine Sonship (1 Jn 1$^{4. 7}$), His coming in the flesh (1 Jn 4^2), and the baptismal confession or formula (Mt 28^{19}).

Some writers on the Creeds believe that there are references to statements of belief, or summaries of doctrines which may have been included in the confession, in such phrases as 'the form of sound words' (2 Ti 1^{13}), the 'first principles of Christ' (He 6^1), etc., but it is more likely that all such passages have only a general meaning (see art. 'Creeds,' *EBr*^{11} vii. 393). Not till the time of Irenæus and Tertullian (A.D. 175-200) is there evidence of definite credal statements, embodying the faith of the Church. It is, however, highly probable that there were some summaries of Christian doctrine before that time. As the custom of baptizing immediately after conversion gave way to the system of the catechumenate, the particular elements of Christian doctrine in which the catechumens had been instructed would naturally reappear in the questions that were asked, or the confession of faith that was made, before baptism. The process of creed-formation was largely assisted by the catechizing of the candidates for baptism (*q.v.*). The rise of error also had a marked influence in determining the particular beliefs that were to be confessed at different times, or at least the particular form in which they were to be confessed.

In the early Church the confession of faith was made in public, or before the Church. The Pauline principle, 'If thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord' (Ro 10^{9}), was decisive on that point, to say nothing of our Lord's evident dislike for secret disciples. The public confession was not only a testimony for Christ, leading, it might be, to the conversion of others; it had a strong psychological effect on those who made the confession, confirming them in their relation to Christ, and calling certain forces of their nature to the side of devotion. Those who were to be received into the Church sometimes had a form of words provided for them which they might use, but the convert was also allowed to speak for himself, as in the famous instance of Victorinus, whose testimony or confession can still be read with interest (see Augustine's *Confessions*, bk. viii. ch. 2).

LITERATURE.—In addition to the works already mentioned, see P. Wernle, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Eng. tr., i. [1903] 139, 154; J. C. Lambert, art. 'Confession (of Christ),' in *DCG*; W. A. Curtis, art. 'Confessions,' in *ERE* iii.

JOHN REID.

PROMISE.—The idea of promise is one of the great elements of Scripture teaching. It is a peculiarity of the Bible; no other religious book has that as a distinguishing feature. It is the element of promise that runs through its various books, binds them into an organic whole, and unites in a vital union the OT and the NT. The promise of the OT is fulfilled in the blessing of the NT. Many promises may be taken as predictions. They constitute at least part of the content of prophecy. To write about promise in all its relations would involve the discussion of prophecy, the preparation for the coming of Christ, the manifestation of the grace of God, etc. In what follows, reference is restricted to 'promise' in the apostolic writings of the NT.

In Acts and the Epistles the element of promise is very prominent. The words *ἐπαγγελία*, *ἐπάγγελμα*, *ἐπαγγέλλομαι* are of frequent occurrence.

(1) They are used in a general sense as in the phrases 'looking for a promise from thee' (Ac 23^{21}); 'the first commandment with promise' (Eph 6^{2}; also 1 Ti 4^{8}, 2 P 2^{19}).

(2) They are employed with special reference to the promises of God, out of which arose the economy of grace as it is set forth in all the variety of its blessing in the NT. Reference is often made (*a*) to the great fundamental promises given to Abraham, relating to the birth of Isaac, the blessing of his descendants, and the inheritance of the land of Canaan (*e.g.* 'for this is a word of promise . . . Sarah shall have a son' [Ro 9^{9}; also 4^{20}, Gal 4^{23}, Ac 7^{17}, He $11^{9.\ 13.\ 17}$, etc.]); (*b*) to the whole spiritual content of the Messianic blessing involved in the promise (*e.g.* 'Now I stand here to be judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers' [Ac 26^{6}], 'strangers from the covenants of the promise' [Eph 2^{12}; also Ro 9^{4}, Gal $3^{16.\ 17}$, He 6^{12}, etc.]). The passage where the significance of 'promise' is expressed is Gal 3^{6-29} (cf. also Ro 4^{13-21}). St. Paul is the chief exponent of the meaning of the promise given to Abraham and his seed. He emphasizes the fact that the promises in all their variety and fullness were fulfilled in Christ, 'for how many soever be the promises of God, in him is the yea: wherefore also through him is the Amen' (2 Co 1^{20}). The blessings of the promise are those which Christ brings ('fellow-partakers of the promise in Christ Jesus through the gospel' [Eph 3^{6}]). They who receive the blessings are those who belong to Christ: 'if ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise' (Gal 3^{29}). Faith is the general condition of receiving: 'the scripture hath shut up all things under sin, that the promise by faith in Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe' (Gal 3^{22}). Particular emphasis is laid on the fact that the promise is of grace, and not of works of the law; 'for this cause it is of faith, that it might be according to grace; to the end that the promise may be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all' (Ro 4^{16}). The term 'promise' is itself a witness to the spontaneity of the grace of God. Among the Messianic blessings the promise is sometimes identified with the gift of the Holy Ghost: 'that upon the Gentiles might come the blessing of Abraham in Christ Jesus; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit' (Gal 3^{14}; also Ac 2^{39}, Eph 1^{13}). The forgiveness of sins is also regarded as included in the promise (Ac $2^{38.\ 39}$).

(3) The Messianic promises of the OT are not only fulfilled in Christ, but out of His work many other promises are referred to, as 'whereby he hath granted unto us his precious and exceeding great promises' (2 P 1^{4}). Among these we must include 'life' (2 Ti 1^{1}), 'eternal life' (1 Jn 2^{25}), 'the crown of life' (Ja 1^{12}), 'new heavens and a new earth' (2 P 3^{13}, etc.).

LITERATURE.—Art. 'Promise' in *HDB* (J. Denney) and *CE* (J. F. Driscoll); J. Orr, *The Problem of the OT*, 1907, pp. 35 ff., 42.

JOHN REID.

PROPERTY.—See WEALTH and COMMUNITY OF GOODS.

PROPHECY, PROPHET, PROPHETESS.—Christianity produced a revival of the ancient gift of prophecy, which was so marked a feature of the religious life of Israel. It was the spoken utterance of the man of vision and inspiration; it was a declaration of the 'word of Jahweh'; it was a revelation of the Divine will not so much in the sense of prediction—an aspect of prophecy not original, but subordinate—but rather in the sense of spiritual instruction involving a special degree of religious and ethical insight. John the Baptist, the herald of Christ, may be called the last of the older prophets. Christianity did not supersede the earlier revelation but fulfilled it, as the first and greatest Prophet of the new order declared (Mt 5^{19}); hence Christian prophecy is continuous with the prophecy of Israel, and the functions of both Jewish and Christian prophet are substantially the same. It was the *content* of the prophecy which was changed with the new revelation of God in Jesus Christ. Christian prophecy was born on the Day of Pentecost, the day of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, which seemed to St. Peter to be a direct fulfilment of ancient prophecy (cf. Jl $2^{28f.}$).

1. The office of prophet.—It is natural to look for the prophet in the earliest environment of Christianity; and, as a matter of fact, we find prophets and prophetesses from the very beginning of the early Jewish Church. Christian prophets are referred to in the context of Ac 2^{18}, where *προφητεύσουσιν* is not part of the original quotation; and the gift which developed at Pentecost in the Church at Jerusalem was destined to spread wherever a Christian society came into being. To take the word 'prophetess' first, we find in Lk 2^{36} Anna described as a prophetess, in Ac 21^{9} the four daughters of Philip the Evangelist, and in Rev 2^{20} Jezebel, 'which called herself a prophetess.' It was evidently a function in which women might share, as we gather from 1 Co 11^{5}, where public prophecy and public prayer are associated as gifts of Christian women. Prophets are mentioned in the Acts—Agabus (11^{28} 21^{10}), Symeon Niger, Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, in addition to Barnabas and Saul (13^{1}), and Judas and Silas (15^{32}). We have evidence of prophecy not only in the churches of Jerusalem and Cæsarea, but also in Antioch (Ac 11^{27} 13^{1}), in Rome, Corinth, and Thessalonica (Ro $12^{6f.}$, 1 Co $14^{32f.}$, 1 Th 5^{20}).

'The three members of the Christian group—apostles, prophets, teachers—were already to be met with in contemporary Judaism,' but 'the grouping of these three classes, and the special development of the apostleship, were the special work of the Christian church' (Harnack, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity*^{2}, Eng. tr., i. 334). The 'apostles' were the itinerant missionaries of the Christian Church; they were also by nature of their office prophets and teachers (cf. Eph 2^{20}, 'the foundation of the apostles and prophets,' where the two are virtually identified; also 3^{15} and 4^{11}, where 'classes of functions rather than persons' are indicated; see Hort, *Christian Ecclesia*, p. 166). 'Prophet' stands second in the list, but there is a wide sense in which this term could be applied to each of the three classes. The prophet in *Did.* xi. 10 is called a teacher, and teaching was undoubtedly an element in the prophetic gift (cf. Polycarp, *ap.* Eus. *HE* IV. xv. 30, διδάσκαλος ἀποστολικὸς καὶ προφητικός). But though all three were speakers of the word (λαλοῦντες τὸν λόγον [*Did.* iv. 1]), prophecy was a distinctive χάρισμα (see GIFTS), distinguishable from that of the 'apostle' and the 'teacher.' While the 'apostle' is a wandering missionary, the 'prophets' and 'teachers' were in general attached to a local church; *e.g.* Silas and Judas, prophets of the Church of Jerusalem, are described as ἡγούμενοι (Ac 15^{22}); and in He 13^{7} such ἡγούμενοι or leaders are described as speaking 'the word of God.' Neither the 'prophet' nor the 'teacher' was appointed by the apostles, as were 'bishops' and 'elders'; their gifts were an endowment of the Spirit, and both fulfilled the function of speaking in the spirit (λαλεῖν ἐν πνεύματι).

2. The nature of prophecy.—The characteristic quality of the prophet was not his power of expounding the facts of the Christian faith in their relation to each other or to life and conduct; it was 'revelation.' This did not necessarily mean rapture or ecstasy accompanied by unintelligible utterances. On the contrary, 'prophecy' is a greater gift, a nobler function than γλωσσολαλία or 'tongue-speaking.' 'The former gift was exercised with the consciousness of the subject, and it issued in something logically intelligible. To use the latter gift, which issued in a jargon of words and unduly excited the speaker, was to speak to God instead of man' (Selwyn, *Christian Prophets*, p. 1 f.). 'Prophecy' is of course a larger term than 'revelation' (ἀποκάλυψις; see art. APOCALYPSE): it includes 'revelation' among its specific forms of expression and yet may be distinguished from it, *e.g.* 1 Co 14^{6} (where the Apostle might speak 'either by apocalypse, or gnosis, or prophecy, or teaching'). Prophecy is connected not only with revelations, but with 'visions' (2 Co 12^{1-3}). 'The Apocalypse, which is the great prophetic book of the NT and the most conspicuous relic we have of the prophecy of the primitive Christian Church, is a series of visions seen by a prophet and related by him' (T. M. Lindsay, *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries*^{2}, 1903, p. 95, who further refers to the *Shepherd* of Hermas, a Roman presbyter who was also a 'prophet'). In 1 Ti 1^{18} St. Paul expresses himself as guided by 'prophecies' in relation to the separation of Timothy for the Christian ministry. These apparently were 'mysterious monitions of the kind called prophetic' (Hort, *op. cit.* p. 182), either arising within himself or through the lips of Silas, or both; cf. also 'prophecy' as the medium of the spiritual gift which was imparted at Timothy's ordination (1 Ti 4^{14}). There was undoubtedly a mystical or ecstatic element in prophecy, but it had a practical aim. In 1 Co 14^{3} St. Paul mentions three functions of the prophet: 'He that prophesieth speaketh unto men edification, and comfort, and consolation': in other words, he builds up the Christian character, utters ethical precepts and warnings, and gives the encouragement arising from personal testimony, example, and sympathy. 'He edifieth a church,' while 'the speaker with tongues edifieth himself.' In Ro 12^{6} by the use of the phrase ἀναλογία τῆς πίστεως the Apostle declares that a prophecy is required to agree with the accepted doctrines of the faith; while 1 Co 12^{10} (διακρίσεις πνευμάτων) shows that criticism of prophecy was a regular practice (cf. 14^{29}). The canon of edification is conspicuous in the remarkable set of rules laid down in 1 Co $14^{26f.}$ for prophetic and other ecstatic utterances. Two or three prophets may speak, while the rest are to discriminate as to the character of their addresses; but if a 'revelation' be given to another sitting by, the first prophet must keep silence. 'Ye can all prophesy one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted (and the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets),' which means that, although individual inspiration is legitimate and undoubted, it is subject to the control of the prophets collectively. Thus, St. Paul did not limit freedom of speech, but in urging that only two or three prophets should address a given meeting he aimed at securing not only spiritual edification, but reverence and order in the assembly. Even if we had no evidence of the apocalyptic character of prophecy beyond the statements of St. Paul, it would not be going too far to argue that the expectation of the Parousia would naturally give rise to a predictive element in prophetic utterances. The author of Revelation speaks of the prophets as his fellow-servants, and of the Church as made up of 'saints, apostles, and prophets' (18^{20}), 'prophets and saints' (v.^{24}), and 'saints and prophets' (16^{6}); and in such a connexion it is easy to understand how ecstasy might lead to a vivid realization of the circumstances of the Parousia. But the general evidence is in favour of the spiritual and ethical quality of the prophetic utterances, which, as we gather from 1 Co 14^{24}, were addressed to pagans as well as to Christians.

3. The history of prophecy in the sub-Apostolic Age.—The *locus classicus* for the subsequent development of prophecy in post-apostolic times is *Did.* 11, which is the clearest evidence afforded by extra-canonical literature of the established influence of Christian prophecy in the Church. The prophet is rooted in the life of the Church; but there are divergences from the Pauline tradition. No apostle is ever to remain more than three days in one place, otherwise he is a false prophet (ψευδοπροφήτης). The spiritual test of his genuineness is not so definite as St. Paul's ('no man can say that Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit' [1 Co 12^{3}]). He has indeed to speak ἐν πνεύματι; but his speech is to be confirmed by his possession of 'the ways of the Lord,' *i.e.* the general test of his Christian conduct. This is so far sound; but the subordinate tests (*e.g.*, asking for money, ordering a table [*i.e.* an Agape] in which he himself is to participate, not practising what he teaches) suggest a lower type of spirituality both in prophet and people. There is further the obscure proviso that he is not to 'make assemblies for a worldly mystery' (or to 'act for a worldly mystery of the church'), but the difficulty of understanding the phrase as it stands forbids any deduction as to the character of this test. Again, the prophet when he speaks in ecstasy is above criticism: to criticize one who 'speaks in the spirit' is the unpardonable sin. He is to receive 'the first-fruits': for 'the prophets are your high-priests.' Both 'prophets' and 'apostles' hold a higher rank in the *Didache* than bishops and deacons (presbyters are not mentioned), concerning whom the warning is given not to 'despise' them. The apocalypse with which the *Didache* closes has many phrases that recall Mt 24, *e.g.*, the warning against false prophets, and the prediction of lawlessness and persecution and of the appearance of the world-deceiver (ὁ κοσμοπλάνος). Thus it would appear that the authority of the prophets was already beginning to be undermined by the appearance of false and covetous prophets. In the Apostolic Fathers 'prophets' are not mentioned; when Ignatius speaks of prophets, they are OT prophets: at the same time, he claims to receive revelations, lofty and incommunicable (*Trall.* 5), and waits for such (*Eph.* xx. 1), while Polycarp is to pray for them (*Polyc.* ii. 2). Hermas considers himself to be a prophet commissioned by God to comfort and persuade his hearers and to sound the call to repentance (*Mand.* XII. iii. 2–3). Harnack's suggestion that the silence of Hermas as to prophecies is due to the fact that he reckoned himself a prophet is not convincing (*op. cit.* p. 340). In *Mand.* XI. he refers to false prophets as mere magicians practising on people of wavering faith who apply to them ὡς ἐπὶ μάντιν. If the *Didache* represents the situation immediately after the Apostolic Age, the *Shepherd* of Hermas may be reasonably regarded as fixing the time when the authority of Christian prophecy was beginning to decline. Ecstasy in either its orderly or irregular forms was gradually to die under the development of the Church Order as represented by bishops and elders. We have to wait for the rise of Montanism in the 4th cent. for a revival of the extemporaneous enthusiasm and unconventional apocalypses of individual Christians. But it is more likely that the decline of prophecy was due less to Church organization and discipline than to the fact that the gift was so open to abuse. Even the apostolic safeguards could not save it: these depended on a high ideal of Christian conduct for their efficacy. Prophecy disappeared because its spiritual dignity and power were difficult to maintain in a community where the degrees of spirituality differed so widely, and where the mystical elements of the faith had necessarily to be subordinated to the practical in the evolution of Christian character. On the other hand, prophecy in its less reputable forms became a barrier to Christian progress and lent colour to the criticisms of outsiders like Celsus (see Origen, *c. Cels.* vii. 9), whose intellectual tastes were offended by the excesses of certain types of prophet, and who had not sufficient insight or tolerance to estimate the spiritual value of prophecy as a whole.

LITERATURE.—In addition to the Literature named under artt. GIFTS, and TONGUES, GIFT OF, the following may be consulted: A. Harnack, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity*^{2}, Eng. tr., 1908; E. von Dobschütz, *Christian Life in the Primitive Church*, Eng. tr., 1904; E. C. Selwyn, *The Christian Prophets*, 1900; P. D. Scott-Moncrieff, *Paganism and Christianity in Egypt*, 1913; F. J. A. Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, 1897; C. von Weizsäcker, *The Apostolic Age*, Eng. tr., 1894–95.

R. MARTIN POPE.

PROPITIATION.—Propitiation occurs in the apostolic literature of the NT only four times: (1) Ro 3^{25} as the rendering of ἱλαστήριον: 'whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, by his blood, to shew his righteousness, because of the passing over of sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God'; (2) as the rendering of ἱλασμός, 1 Jn 2^{2}: 'and he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the whole world'; (3) 1 Jn 4^{10}: 'Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins'; (4) in RV it is also used in He 2^{17} as the translation of τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι: 'Wherefore it behoved him in all things to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people'; ἱλαστήριον also occurs in He 9^{5}, rendered 'mercy-seat' (RVm 'Gr. *the propitiatory*'). These, with the verbal form ἱλάσθητι in the story of the Pharisee and the Publican (Lk 18^{13}, 'God be merciful,' RVm 'be propitiated'), and the use of the adjective ἵλεως twice (Mt 16^{22}, He 8^{12}) constitute all the guidance afforded by the NT in seeking the meaning of 'propitiation,' a term of much importance in apostolic thought. Consequently we are largely dependent for help in its interpretation upon what we know of the use of cognate terms in the LXX, and upon the ideas associated with their Hebrew equivalents in the OT; for the classical use of the Greek terms from Homer downwards helps mostly by contrast, presenting a usage different from that found in the LXX and the NT. (For details and discussion of Heb. and Gr. usage see art. 'Propitiation' by Driver in *HDB*; also for Gr. usage B. F. Westcott, *Epistles of St. John*^{3}, p. 85 f., and an interesting discussion in T. V. Tymms, *The Christian Idea of Atonement*, p. 191 ff.; and for the opposite view, maintaining the classical and pagan use of the Gr. term in the apostolic literature, see G. Smeaton, *The Apostles' Doctrine of the Atonement*, p. 455 ff.) H. Bushnell also maintains that the language of Scripture accords with the pagan idea of propitiation, but he rejects the idea itself on ethical grounds, suggesting that the apostolic writers did not really mean what their words mean—an evasion which creates an exegetical *impasse* (cf. *The Vicarious Sacrifice*, London, 1866, p. 447 ff.).

In classical Greek the verb 'propitiate' (ἱλάσκομαι) is common, but it is construed regularly with the accusative of the deity (or person) propitiated. This construction is never used by apostolic writers; it is very rarely found in the LXX, even when used of a human subject (cf. Gn 32^{20}, Zec 7^{2}, Pr 16^{14}). In the LXX it is commonly construed with περί ('on behalf of'), followed by the person on whose behalf the propitiatory act is performed. This difference of construction marks a difference between pagan and biblical ideas; for although propitiating God may be indirectly involved in phrases used in the OT, it is not direct and prominent as in non-biblical writers. The restoration of God's favour and the forgiveness of the worshipper are generally the aim of the propitiatory sacrifice (cf. Lv 4^{20}); but the idea of directly appeasing one who is angry with a personal resentment against the offender, which is implied when the deity is the direct object of the verb, is foreign to biblical usage. This distinction of usage corresponds with the fact that the higher biblical conception of God is more ethical and less anthropomorphic than the conception in heathen writers; it also accords with the fact that the Hebrew term represented in the LXX by ἱλάσκομαι and its derivatives early came to be used in a specialized rather than in a literal sense in its application to the acknowledged ethical relations between the God of Israel and His people. The root meaning of this term (*kipper*, כִּפֶּר) is probably 'cover over'; so Arabic also; the Syriac (and probably the Assyrian) cognate = 'wipe' (cf. Pr 30^{20}), or 'wipe away,' *e.g.* tears or sins, and therefore 'disperse' or 'abolish.' W. R. Smith (*The OT in the Jewish Church*, Edinburgh, 1881, p. 438 f.) adopts the latter as the primary meaning—*e.g.*, 'to wipe clean the face blackened by displeasure' (cf. Gn 32^{21}). Obviously both 'cover over' and 'wipe away' are convenient metaphors for the common idea of rendering null and void; the OT supplies frequent examples of the use of each in regard to sin (cf. Ps 32^{1} 85^{2}, Is 43^{25} 44^{22}, Jer 18^{23}; see also *HDB* iv. 128; P. Haupt in *JBL* xix. [1900] 61, 80). But in OT theological terminology, *kipper*, which holds an important place, is used always in a figurative or moral sense with the collateral idea, which in time became the dominant if not the exclusive one, of conciliating an offended person or screening an offence or offender. Guilt is covered or withdrawn from the sight of the person propitiated, so that the way is clear for the guilty to approach him with confidence. G. F. Moore objects altogether to the use of etymological meanings, as a fault of method, and as fruitful of error. Plain facts of usage, which suggest no reference to 'wiping out' or 'covering,' are the sole guide for interpreting the term (cf. *EBi* iv. 4220). Several points in the OT usage should be carefully noted. (*a*) Its subject is usually either God or the priest; its means, when indicated, either a gift or a sacrifice. (*b*) Its use in the Levitical system is especially associated with the sin-offering, whose characteristic potence lies in the blood of the sacrifice, because 'the blood is the life,' and it is followed by 'it shall be forgiven him' in reference to sin; whether the fault is ritual or moral is not always clearly distinguished. (*c*) The idea of appeasing God in the heathen sense by offering Him an inducement to alter His disposition towards the offerer is absent, 'nor is it ever implied that the offerer of such a sacrifice is outside God's dispensation of grace, or the object of His wrath' (Driver, *HDB* iv. 131); the propitiation is Divinely appointed; the motive as far as indicated is the grace of God. (*d*) The idea of the offender hiding or covering his sin is not tolerated; he is to confess and repent of it: 'the object is never the sin, but the person (or thing) on whose behalf the offering is made' (*ib.* iv. 130). (*e*) Propitiation was only for unintentional sins (except in four specified cases); for deliberate and wilful sin—sin 'with a high hand'—propitiatory provision was not made.

With some such connotation as here suggested the Hebrew term for 'propitiation' passed on through the LXX from OT usage to that of the apostolic writers, possibly hardened also by the priestly and Rabbinical emphasis of their times. It became for them a naturally serviceable term in which to state and interpret into current forms of religious speech the new experience of God's act of forgiveness of sins, which they unhesitatingly connected directly with the suffering death of Jesus Christ. But this transition was made in the light of the conviction that the transcendent and final character of the redemptive work of Christ raised a term connected chiefly with legal and ritual significance into a realm of ethical and spiritual realities of which its ancient use had been merely typical and tentative. Moreover, the apostles' application of the term as interpretative of the meaning of Christ's offering of His sinless life to do away with the power of sin to separate between God and man was marked by a certain personal freedom of usage. This freedom expresses itself in differences discernible in the use of the NT term. The Pauline usage may be distinguished from that of the writer of the Johannine Epistles and from that adopted by the writer to the Hebrews. These apostolic writers held in common the fundamental idea that it was by an offering in His blood which Christ made in His death that He fulfilled a function analogous to, but infinitely transcending, that to which the term 'propitiation' was applied in the OT. By this means the grace of God was expressed towards man, and became efficacious through the removal of the obstacle raised by the sin that hindered the freedom and confidence of his access to God. But the propitiation was always of God's providing, as it was also His setting forth. St. Paul in his use of the term is specially concerned to make clear 'the setting forth' of the propitiation in relation to the law of God's righteousness; the Johannine writer uses it to declare the source of an actual cleansing from the defilement of sin, whilst the writer to the Hebrews chooses it to express the resultant privilege of the propitiation revealed in direct access to God in the sanctuary of His holiness. But this illustrative use of the term by these three apostolic writers, whilst it contributes figuratively to a legal, ethical, and ceremonial interpretation of the one reality of a common spiritual experience of redemption in Christ's blood, involves no essential divergence in their respective teaching. Each writer selected a particular phase of the import of propitiation. This he did rather to meet the exigencies of the occasion for his writing than to indicate a difference of view respecting the historical fact or the spiritual experience involved; these last were central to all apostolic teaching. Consequently the several applications of 'propitiation' exhibit a diversity in unity. It seems improbable that practically the same term was used within nearly the same period in the primitive apostolic community with any essential difference of meaning, especially when we consider the common stock of OT and later Jewish ideas from which the term was taken over by each separate writer. Moreover, sin, whether regarded with St. Paul as guilt, with the Johannine writer as moral defilement, or with the writer to the Hebrews as a religious hindrance in access to God, is the one reality which is the occasion of 'propitiation.'

(1) *The Pauline use.*—The Pauline use (Ro 3^{25}) states the propitiation in relation to a Divine righteousness expressed in 'a wrath of God revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold down the truth in unrighteousness' (1^{18}); its purpose is to show God's righteousness to be consistent with the fact of His forbearance 'in the passing over of sins done aforetime': for there has never been a time under any dispensation when God has not dealt graciously with sinful men; He is always God the Saviour, 'whose property is always to have mercy.' But lest the persistent exercise of Divine grace in the forgiveness of sins should be considered as a challenge of God's righteous opposition to sin, He set forth Christ Jesus a propitiation by His blood that He 'might himself be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus' (3^{26}). In this propitiation something is done by God in Christ which demonstrates the consistency and inviolability of His righteousness in the presence of His mercy. What that something is St. Paul does not further define; he simply asserts the efficiency of the propitiation for the ethical situation implied. His chosen word (*ἱλαστήριον*) has caused his commentators great trouble, but the great majority of all schools agree that the view here expressed is in substance St. Paul's teaching. The opinion, formerly influentially supported (*e.g.* by Luther, Calvin, Ritschl, Cremer, Bruce), that *ἱλαστήριον* signifies 'the mercy-seat,' 'the lid of the ark,' as in He 9^{5}, is now generally rejected as fanciful and inadequate (for reasons see Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, Marburg, 1895, p. 121 f., Eng. tr., *Bible*

Studies, Edinburgh, 1901, p. 124 ff.; Stevens, *Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, p. 61). Its interpretation as 'a propitiatory offering'—a means of rendering God consistently favourable towards sinful men and the means of reconciliation between God and man—is the most natural, and is indeed the only meaning suitable to the context of Ro 3; other Pauline passages harmonize with it better than with any other meaning (cf. Ro 5^{9}, 1 Co 6^{20} 7^{23}, Gal 3^{13} 4^{5}).

It is evident that St. Paul regarded the propitiation as essential to the manifestation of the Divine nature in love and righteousness; it was not an arbitrary appointment dependent simply on God's mere good pleasure; it implied a rational and ethical necessity in His being. Judging from the affinities of St. Paul's thought generally, it is probable that he may have regarded propitiation less in the light of a Levitical sacrificial offering than in that of the prophetical ideal of vicarious suffering, or possibly even after the analogy of human sacrifice—one man dying for another (cf. Ro 5^{7}; see Bruce, *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, p. 167 ff.). St. Paul certainly held that the propitiation was provided by God; he expounded it as exhibiting the love rather than the wrath of God. Although such phrases as 'propitiating God' or God 'being propitiated' are foreign to apostolic teaching, the Pauline view relates the propitiation to God as recipient. The propitiation being thus provided by God and received by Him, the question has arisen, Does St. Paul teach that it is also offered by God—that is, that God propitiates Himself? Probably the best answer is that St. Paul constantly conceives of the propitiation as the work of God in Christ (cf. 2 Co $5^{18f.}$); it is not something done outside God, but 'God-in-Christ' stands for St. Paul's conception of God as Redeemer—that is, God united with human nature. It may, therefore, be the best approach to the sanctuary of the unfathomable mystery of God's redeeming work to suggest that strictly He did not propitiate Himself. God requiring, providing, receiving the propitiation, it was *offered* by Christ, who was God-in-man, acting not as God, but as the Representative of man. God gave humanity in Christ the means of making propitiation (cf. H. Cremer, *Bibl.-Theol. Lex.*^{3}, p. 91 ff.; *HDB* iv. 206). This suggestion is the more probable as it harmonizes with St. Paul's great doctrine of the self-identification of Christ with the human race, and through Him of the race with God (cf. Ro 5 and 6, 2 Co $5^{15ff.}$).

(2) *The Johannine use.*—Although the Johannine writer uses for 'propitiation' a different Greek word (ἱλασμός, not ἱλαστήριον) there is no satisfactory ground for maintaining a meaning essentially different from that presented in the Pauline thought; characteristic words of a common religion cannot safely be applied in a different sense where it is obvious that the same great circle of ideas is acknowledged. Propitiation is part of an apostolic system of ideas of redemption, and is found in the writings of St. John associated with its correlatives of sin and righteousness, and with the blood of Christ as the means of putting away sin and establishing righteousness, ideas with which it is vitally associated in the Pauline Epistles (for the opposite view cf. Stevens, *Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, p. 108 ff.). The Johannine conception of propitiation is inseparably associated with 'Jesus Christ the *righteous*,' in whom 'we have an Advocate with the Father' (1 Jn 2^{1}), implying that the righteous nature of God involves a righteous order in the Divine method of dealing with sin. Moreover, the declaration is unmistakable that Christ is a propitiation 'not for our sins only, but also for the whole world,' implying an objective accomplishment, a finished work for the whole world as the basis on which the individual forgiveness and cleansing from sin proceed; for the virtue of the propitiation extends beyond the subjective experience of those who actually are made partakers of its grace. Whilst these points of contact with the Pauline view of propitiation appear, there are nevertheless lines of distinction in the use of the term which constitute a Johannine variety distinguishable from that found in the Pauline usage. For instance, the propitiation is more vividly personal: 'He' is our propitiation; the life of Christ as well as His death is involved—His Person as well as His work. Then its perpetual persistence as a process as well as its achievement as a fact is a dominant Johannine idea: 'he *is* the propitiation,' 'his blood is cleansing us from all sin' (1 Jn 1^{7}). It is more than a completed act; the propitiation abides as a living, present energy residing in the personality of Christ Himself (cf. J. McLeod Campbell, *The Nature of the Atonement*, London, 1895, p. 170 f.). Hence the Johannine emphasis falls naturally upon the issues of the propitiation set forth in terms of cleansing from sin rather than of justification in the sight of the Law. But the main Johannine distinction is probably found in the wealth of the Divine love, in which the writer makes explicit what is elsewhere implied in the teaching on propitiation, where it is associated more closely with the righteousness of the Law. Universally assumed in the apostolic teaching, the love of God in the propitiation suffuses the whole Johannine conception with radiant light. So far from being contrasts, love and propitiation become interchangeable realities—necessary to one another, explaining one another, even lost in one another. The writer defines love by propitiation, and propitiation by love: 'in this have we come to know what love is, that he (ἐκεῖνος) for us (ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν) laid down his life' (1 Jn 3^{16}). 'Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins' (4^{10}). This is the writer's closer definition of what he means by 'God is love'; he can convey no idea of love in God beyond that which shows itself in propitiation; for that is love's last word; the ultimate meaning of propitiation is love's ultimate meaning too; contrast between them is unthinkable.

> 'If the propitiatory death of Jesus is eliminated from the love of God, it might be unfair to say that the love of God is robbed of all meaning, but it is certainly robbed of its apostolic meaning' (Denney, *Death of Christ*, p. 276).

(3) *Use in Hebrews.*—Propitiation in the Epistle to the Hebrews (2^{17}, 'to make propitiation for sins,' τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι) is interpreted in terms of sacrifice and comes nearest in apostolic teaching to the OT usage. Christ is the High Priest who offers Himself; He is at once Victim and Priest in a propitiation that procures forgiveness of sins and thereby the privilege of direct access to and communion with God. The writer noticeably departs from the classical construction of the verb, and adopts the biblical, making its object 'the sins of the people'; he thus avoids making God the object of the propitiation, producing in doing so a construction strange at the same time to Greek ears and to pagan ideas. What relation this propitiation bears to the nature of God this loose construction is too vague to indicate; clearly, however, it deals in some sacrificial way with the sin that separates from God. The writer assumes that propitiation is necessary for this end, and the only propitiation known to him is that made by a priest through sacrifice; but the necessity for it lies in a Divine fitness rather than in any definite legal obligation; the Pauline idea of the law of righteousness is absent. If a Pauline philosophy of redemption

lies behind the use in this Epistle of a term common to apostolic thought generally—as seems probable—the meaning would be that the propitiation Christ offered so dealt with sin that there no longer remained in the Divine mind an obstacle to sin's forgiveness (cf. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Theol.*^{2}, Tübingen, 1911, ii. 300, favouring this view, and Stevens, *Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, p. 84, criticizing it). The particular contribution, however, made by the writer of Hebrews to the apostolic teaching on propitiation is the discussion of the conception that the propitiation offered by Christ is capable of dealing with all and every kind of sin as a barrier between God and man, and not with sins of ignorance and infirmity alone; the key to the discussion is that Christ's is a 'better sacrifice,' which perfects the imperfect, abolishes the typical, and lifts the whole significance of propitiation from the circle of legal and ceremonial ideas into the realm of abiding ethical and spiritual realities; Jesus, 'who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish unto God,' thus becomes the author of eternal salvation—a salvation whose characteristic is finality; 'through his own blood, (he) entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption' (cf. He 9$^{11-15}$).

The Fathers of the Apostolic and the sub-Apostolic Ages adhered in their interpretation of propitiation to the sacrificial language of the OT and to the usage of NT terms by the apostles (cf. Polycarp, *ad Phil.* i. 8; Clement of Rome, *ad Cor.* i. 7, 32).

LITERATURE.—H. Schultz, *OT Theology*^{2}, Edinburgh, 1895, ii. 87 ff.; D. W. Simon, *The Redemption of Man*^{2}, London, 1906, p. 31 ff.; J. Denney, *The Death of Christ*, do., 1902; G. Smeaton, *The Apostles' Doctrine of Atonement*, Edinburgh, 1870; J. J. Lias, *The Atonement in the Light of Modern Difficulties*, London. 1884; T. V. Tymms, *The Christian Idea of the Atonement*, do., 1904, pp. 191–251; F. R. M. Hitchcock, *The Atonement and Modern Thought*, do., 1911, p. 132 ff.; W. F. Lofthouse, *Ethics and Atonement*, do., 1906, p. 148 ff.; A. B. Bruce, *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, Edinburgh, 1894, p. 167 ff.; G. B. Stevens, *Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, do., 1905, pp. 61 ff., 108 ff., *NT Theology*, London, 1899, pp. 412 ff., 589 f.; B. F. Westcott, *Epistles of St. John*^{3}, do., 1892, p. 85 f.; Sanday-Headlam, *ICC*, 'Romans'^{5}, Edinburgh, 1902, p. 92 f.; H. Cremer, *Bibl.-Theol. Lexicon*^{3}, do., 1880, p. 91 ff.; artt. 'Propitiation' in *HDB* and *DCG*.

FREDERIC PLATT.

PROPORTION.—The Greek word *ἀναλογία* is of frequent occurrence in classical writings, but in the NT it is found only in Ro 12^{6}, 'Whether prophecy [let us prophesy] according to the proportion of faith' (AV; RV 'according to the proportion of our faith'; RVm 'according to the proportion of the faith'). Interpreters are divided as to whether 'the faith' is to be taken subjectively (Meyer, Sanday-Headlam) or objectively (Vaughan, Liddon). The first alternative would mean that they who had received the gift of prophecy were to exercise it in consistency with the extent (or limits) of their own faith, the measure of which had been allotted to them (v.^{3}); the second, in harmony with 'the faith' as referring to the gospel as a whole. The latter is very attractive, but the usage of the NT is against it. There is no instance in the Epistles of St. Paul of the use of *ἡ πίστις* in the sense of 'the gospel.' It is, however. found in Jude $^{5.\ 20}$, and is one of the indications of its late date. The *ἀναλογία τῆς πίστεως* must be taken as parallel with, and not different from, *μέτρον πίστεως* (v.^{3}). (For an elaborate examination of 'Analogy considered as a guide to Truth' see the work of J. Buchanan, published under that title, Edinburgh, 1864.)

JOHN REID.

PROSELYTE.—1. Meaning of the term.—The word *προσήλυτος* is not found in classical Greek. It is still an open question whether those who formed the word from *προσέρχομαι* thought of the verb in its primary sense of 'advenio,' or in its religious sense of '(deum) adeo' (cf. He 7^{25}, *τοὺς προσερχομένους δι' αὐτοῦ τῷ Θεῷ*). In the former case, *προσήλυτος* originally meant *advena*, 'new-comer' (for which the classical equivalent is *ἔπηλυς*); in the latter, it meant 'proselyte' in the sense of 'one who comes or draws near to God.' In his exhaustive study of *προσήλυτος* in the LXX (*Exp*, 4th ser., x. 264 ff.), W. C. Allen argues from the fact that the word is correctly used in a majority of cases for the גֵּר to whom certain rights were conceded in Israel (*Oxf. Heb. Lex.*, *s.v.* גֵּר **2** [p. 158^{a}]), that its meaning was from the first that of 'proselyte'—the meaning of 'stranger' being secondary, and arising from the proselyte's having his home 'in a strange land' (like the Israelites themselves in Egypt: hence they are called *προσήλυτοι*, Ex 22^{21} 23^{9}, Lv 19^{34}, Dt 10^{19}). The statement of Philo (*de Monarch.* 1. 7, *τούτους δὲ καλεῖ προσηλύτους ἀπὸ τοῦ προσεληλυθέναι καινῇ καὶ φιλοθέῳ πολιτείᾳ*), and also the words of Josephus (*Ant.* XVIII. iii. 5, *νομίμοις προσεληλυθυῖα τοῖς Ἰουδαικοῖς*), are in favour of this view. What prevents us, however, from giving it our full adhesion is that the LXX does not use *προσήλυτος* in all the passages where גֵּר seems to mean or to approximate in meaning to 'proselyte,' but has sometimes *πάροικος*. This, of course, may be due to different hands having been employed in the work of translation. Valuable for guidance is W. R. Smith's note (*OTJC*^{2}, p. 342): 'In the Levitical legislation the word Gêr is already on the way to assume the later technical sense of proselyte' (cf. Driver, *ICC*, 'Deuteronomy,' p. 165).

The distinction drawn between 'the proselyte of the gate' (גֵּר תּוֹשָׁב, גֵּר הַשַּׁעַר), who accepted the 'Seven Noachian Laws' (*ERE* iv. 245^{a}), and 'the proselyte of righteousness' (גֵּר צֶדֶק, גֵּר הַבְּרִית), who by complete adoption of Israel's laws became incorporated with the covenant people (*HDB* ii. 157^{a}), belongs to Rabbinical Judaism (*ERE* vii. 592^{b}), and is not found in Scripture. It had its precedents, however, in the differences of religious standing observable among the גֵּרִים in Israel; while the *σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν* mentioned by Josephus (*Ant.* XIV. vii. 2), and frequently in Acts, may roughly represent the 'proselytes of the gate' of the Gemārā. It has been suggested that the יִרְאֵי יהוה of Ps 22^{23} 115$^{11.\ 13}$ 118^{4} 135^{20} are identical with the *φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν* of Ac 13$^{16.\ 26}$, but A. B. Davidson has shown that the general usage of the OT is against the identification (*ExpT* iii. 491). While Bertholet and others maintain that *προσήλυτοι*, *οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν* and *οἱ σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν* are synonymous (*EBi* iii. 3904), the view of Schürer (*HJP* II. ii. 314 ff.) that the first term means proselytes in the technical sense, and the other two those who, without having submitted to the rite of circumcision, joined in Jewish worship, has gained a wider acceptance. The adherence of Gentiles to Judaism in the centuries immediately preceding and following the fall of Jerusalem 'ranged over the entire gamut of possible degrees,' depending upon 'the different degrees in which the ceremonial precepts of the Law were observed' (Harnack, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity*^{2}, i. 12, 10). The following passage from Theodore Reinach well illustrates this:

> 'Judaism possessed the prudence and tact not to exact from its adepts [converts] at the outset full and complete adoption of the Jewish Law. The neophyte was at first simply a "friend" to the Jewish customs, observing the least enthralling ones—the Sabbath and the lighting of a fire on the previous evening; certain fast-days; abstention from pork. His sons frequented the synagogues and deserted the temples, studied the Law, and contributed their oboli to the treasury of Jerusalem [cf. Neh 10$^{32f.}$, *ERE* vii. 592^{a}]. By degrees habit accomplished the rest. At last the proselyte took the decisive step: he received the rite of circumcision, took the bath of purity . . ., and offered, doubtless in money, the sacrifice which signalized his definitive entrance into the bosom of Israel. Occasionally, in

> order to accentuate his conversion, he even adopted a Hebraic name. . . . In the third generation, according to Deut. xxiii. 8, there existed no distinction between the Jew by race and the Jew by adoption' (*JE* iv. 570).

'The bath of purity' here spoken of refers to the baptism of proselytes. This is described by W. Brandt (*ERE* ii. 408) as 'a practice of ceremonial ablution altogether new,' which 'we may safely assume . . . was not of later origin than Christian baptism.' It is not mentioned in the OT, and the traces of it found by Talmudic scholars in Gn 35^{2}, Ex 19^{10} are quite imaginary. It is referred to by Epictetus (who taught till A.D. 94) in his conversations as a matter of common knowledge: 'When a man,' he says, 'takes upon himself the arduous life of the baptized and the elect (*τοῦ βεβαμμένου καὶ ᾑρημένου*), then he is really what he calls himself, a Jew' (Arrian, *Diss. Epicteti*, ii. 9). The Babylonian Talmud reports that about the end of the 1st cent. two famous Rabbis disputed with one another as to its necessity, which shows that at that period it was not universally regarded as indispensable. It was designated in later times 'the immersion of proselytism,' and the manner of its administration was as follows: 'The individual who desired to become a Jew was conducted to the bath, and there immersed himself in the presence of the Rabbis, who recited to him portions of the Law' (cf. Plummer, art. 'Baptism,' in *HDB* i. 239 f. for other references).

2. NT passages referring to proselytes.—(1) Mt 23^{15}. Grätz's conjecture that this verse refers to an actual incident, the voyage of R. Gamaliel, R. Eliezer, R. Joshua, and R. Aḳiba to Rome, where they converted Flavius Clemens, the cousin of Domitian (cf. *ERE* vii. 592^{b}), would imply that the saying is not justly attributed to our Lord. It is probable, as Adolf Jellinek, the famous Austrian Rabbi and scholar (1821–1893), suggested, that what is here condemned is the Pharisees' practice of winning over every year at least one proselyte each (E. G. Hirsch, *JE* x. 221). (2) There were proselytes among the multitude who witnessed the miracle of Pentecost (Ac 2^{10}), some of whom may have been added to the Church; the selection of 'Nicolas a proselyte of Antioch' (6^{5}) as one of the seven deacons indicates that there was a certain proportion of men of his class in the primitive Christian community. (3) In Ac 13^{43} *τῶν σεβομένων προσηλύτων* is perhaps a conflate reading (*EBi* iii. 3902), but the phrase appears to be a popular designation of 'God-fearing proselytes'—the same whom St. Paul twice appeals to (13$^{16. 26}$) as *οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν*. (4) Ac 8^{27}. The chamberlain of Candace is included by Reinach among the 'distinguished recruits' of the Jewish faith (*JE* iv. 570^{b}). (5) Cornelius was one of the *φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν* (Ac 10$^{2. 22. 35}$); note that in v.^{35} St. Peter's words have not the breadth often assigned to them —he only goes the length of recognizing the manifest signs of God's acceptance of a Gentile who 'feareth him, and worketh righteousness.' (6) Lydia (Ac 16^{14}), Titus Justus (18^{7}), and the *σεβόμενοι* of Thessalonica and Athens (17$^{4. 17}$) illustrate the important aid that members of this class gave to St. Paul in his travels. He did not, however, always find the *σεβόμεναι γυναῖκες* favourable to the gospel (13^{50}). It was partly owing to the fact of the Christian faith having found so many adherents among the *σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν* that the class of 'half-proselytes' or 'half-converts' came to be regarded by Rabbinical teachers with doubtful approval.

3. Outline of the history of proselytism.—Conversions to Judaism went on unimpeded in NT times, both before and after the Jewish war (*Parting of the Roads*, pp. 286, 305). The chief source of our information on this point is Josephus, whose historical accuracy is now generally admitted (*HDB* v. 466). Some of the proselytes whom he mentions by name were acquisitions of very doubtful value, as the kings Azizus of Emesa and Polemo of Cilicia, who were prompted to embrace Judaism by the desire to contract advantageous marriages with Herodian princesses (*Ant.* XX. vii. 1, 3), and the Empress Poppæa, whom he calls *θεοσεβής* (*ib.* XX. viii. 11). On the other hand, the conversions of Helena, queen of Adiabene, and her son, Izates, seem to have been due to sincere conviction, and the chapters in which the historian records their life and virtuous deeds are some of the most attractive of his great work (*ib.* XX. ii.–iv.).

The bitterness engendered by the persecution which followed the failure of the rising against Hadrian (A.D. 132–135), and the growth of the Christian Church, were joint causes which led the Rabbis to make conversion to Judaism more difficult. 'Qualified conversions to Judaism' were 'regarded with increasing disfavor,' R. Joḥanan declaring 'that if after a probation of twelve months the ger toshab did not submit to the rite of circumcision, he was to be regarded as a heathen' (E. G. Hirsch, *JE* x. 222^{a}). But the גֵּר צֶדֶק—he who, in St. Paul's words, 'by receiving circumcision, became a debtor to do the whole law' (Gal 5^{3})—was always admitted with fervour. 'That proselytes are welcome in Israel and are beloved of God is the theme of many a rabbinical homily' (Hirsch, *loc. cit.*).

It should be mentioned that in two passages of the LXX where a proselyte proper is meant (Ex 12^{19}, Is 14^{1}) גֵּר is rendered, not by *προσήλυτος* but by *γειώρας*, an Aramaic word derived from גֵּר (*HDB* iv. 133^{a}; *Exp*, 4th ser., x. 269; cf. *HDB* ii. 157^{a}).

LITERATURE.—**W. C. Allen**, 'On the meaning of *προσήλυτος* in the Septuagint,' in *Exp*, 4th ser., x. [1894] 264 ff.; **Arrian**, *Dissertationes Epicteti*, ii. 9; *Oxf. Heb. Lex.*, *s.v.* גֵּר, p. 158; **A. B. Davidson**, 'They that fear the Lord,' in *ExpT* iii. [1891–92] 491; *HDB* v. 466; **S. R. Driver**, *ICC*, 'Deuteronomy'^{2}, Edinburgh, 1896, p. 165; **W. Brandt**, art. 'Baptism (Jewish),' in *ERE* ii. 408; **H. Hirschfeld**, art. 'Creeds (Jewish),' *ib.* iv. 245; **H. Loewe**, art. 'Judaism,' *ib.* vii. 592; **H. Grätz**, *Die jüdischen Proselyten im Römerreiche*, Breslau, 1884, p. 30; **A. Harnack**, *Mission and Expansion of Christianity*^{2}, London, 1908, pp. 10, 12; **T. Reinach**, art. 'Diaspora,' in *JE* iv. 570; **E. G. Hirsch**, art. 'Proselyte,' *ib.* x. 221, 222; **A. Jellinek**, *Beth-ha-Midrasch*, Vienna, 1853–78, pt. v. p. xlvi; **A. Plummer**, art. 'Baptism,' in *HDB* i. 239, 240; **F. C. Porter**, art. 'Proselyte,' *ib.* iv. 132 f.; **W. M. Ramsay**, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, London, 1895, p. 43; **E. Schürer**, *HJP* II. ii. [Edinburgh, 1885] 311 f., 315; **J. A. Selbie**, art. 'Ger,' in *HDB* ii. 157^{a}; **W. R. Smith**, *OTJC*^{2}, London, 1892, p. 342; **W. R. Smith** and **W. H. Bennett**, art. 'Proselyte,' in *EBi* iii. 3902, 3904; *The Parting of the Roads*, ed. F. J. Foakes Jackson, London, 1912, pp. 286, 305.

JAMES DONALD.

PROSEUCHE.—*προσευχή*, the name for the Jewish place of worship, originally meant 'prayer,' afterwards 'place of prayer' (*τόπος τῆς προσευχῆς*, 1 Mac 3^{46}). The word is found in 3 Mac 7^{20}; Philo, *in Flacc.* 6, 7, 14 (Mangey, ii. 523, 524, 535), *Leg. ad Gaium*, 20, 43, 46 (Mangey, ii. 565, 596, 600); Josephus, *Vita*, 54, where it is described as 'a large edifice capable of receiving a great number of people.' As a rule, however, the Proseuche was situated outside the city, near the river or the sea, where there was a supply of water for the ablutions required before prayer (see Ac 16$^{13f.}$ and Josephus, *Ant.* XIV. x. 23; cf. Tertullian, *de Jejuniis*, 16, *ad Nationes*, i. 13; and Epiphanius, *Hær.* lxxx. 1). Frequently these prayers seem to have been said in the open air (cf. also Josephus, *c. Apion.* II. ii. 2). This would best account for the strange opinion expressed by Juvenal (*Sat.* xiv. 97) and others that the Jews prayed to or worshipped the heavens. The name 'Proseuche' is frequently found in inscriptions. See E. Schürer, *GJV*^{3} ii. [1898] 443, note 53, and 447, notes 64 and 65. See also art. SYNAGOGUE.

K. KOHLER.

PROVINCE.—The word *prouincia*, the derivation of which is unknown, has originally no territorial application. *Prouincia* is in fact 'a sphere of duty,' whether that be in an office or court, like that of the urban prætor at Rome, or that of a governor of a vast district. It is only because it came to be generally associated with the rule of large districts out of Italy, that it ultimately obtained the territorial sense of 'subjugated territory out of Italy under Roman government' (R. Ogilvie, *Horæ Latinæ*, 1901, p. 229). The original wide sense of the word had not, however, died out in the classical period.

The Roman Empire grew by that inevitable process of expansion which is the lot of all great Empires. For the first two and a half centuries of the Republic expansion had been confined to Italy (see ROMAN EMPIRE). With the conclusion of the First Punic War (241 B.C.) a new situation had arisen. Having worsted a foreign people in a long-continued contest (264–241 B.C.), they found it necessary to maintain a stand beyond the bounds of Italy. The war itself had led to the construction of the earliest Roman fleet, and now the problem of governing overseas dominions faced them. One of the conditions of peace between Rome and Carthage was that Carthage should evacuate Sicily. This condition having been complied with, all of Sicily except Syracuse and its territory, which remained in the possession of King Hiero, the ally of Rome, became the first Roman province, *Prouincia Sicilia*, governed by an annual prætor, elected for the purpose, over and above the regular establishment of two prætors, who remained in the city of Rome.

During the Republic at least, the same method was always carried out in taking over a province. The Senate appointed commissioners (*legati*), usually (if not always) ten in number, who left Rome together for the country in question, and studied its circumstances on the spot. The normal Greek-speaking country of that time consisted of a number of πόλεις (*ciuitates*, 'city-States') with their territory surrounding them. Such of these States as had especially favoured Rome during the preceding war might receive preferential treatment. Individual States, *e.g.*, might be allowed to enter into a special, individual *fœdus* (treaty) with Rome, and thus join the class of *ciuitates fœderatæ*. Such a reciprocal treaty presupposed that the two parties to the treaty were in a sense on an equality. Subject States prized this position very highly. But the majority of the communities were treated as subjects in the fullest sense. After the commissioners, in consultation with the victorious general, had studied the conditions fully, they made a report to the Senate, which thereupon drafted a *lex prouinciæ*, which remained for the future the statute regulating the conditions under which that province was to be governed, the taxes to be paid, etc. For each Roman province there was in existence a special statute of this nature. The text of none is extant.

Our chief knowledge of provincial government during the Republic concerns Sicily and Cilicia. In the speeches of Cicero against Verres (70 B.C.) there is much information about the government and administration of Sicily, in which Cicero himself had been quæstor. From Cicero's letters we learn much of the details of his own government of the province Cilicia, where he was governor in the year 51–50 B.C. For the Imperial period we have the correspondence between Pliny, governor of Bithynia-Pontus, and the Emperor Trajan (*c.* A.D. 113). The experience of the Republic was invaluable to the Empire. For the most part, no doubt, the conditions in the provinces were the same in both periods, with the exception that in the later period extortion by governors was for various reasons much less frequent. In this article we must confine ourselves as far as possible to the Empire, under which the Apostolic Church came into existence.

In the middle of the 1st cent. A.D. the Roman provinces encircled the Mediterranean. The senatorial provinces, those belonging to the Senate and people by the arrangement of January, 27 B.C., were eleven in number—Asia, Africa, Hispania Bætica, Gallia Narbonensis, Sardinia et Corsica, Sicilia, Macedonia, Achæa, Creta et Cyrenæ, Cyprus, Bithynia et Pontus. These were in a peaceful state, and, with the exception of Africa, had no army. Asia and Africa were governed only by ex-consuls with three *legati* each, and were in a class by themselves. The others could be governed by ex-prætors, but all were entitled proconsuls (see PROCONSUL); each had one *legatus*. Asia comprised roughly the western third of the country we call Asia Minor, Africa corresponded roughly to the territory of modern Tunis, Hispania Bætica to Andalusia, and Gallia Narbonensis to the south-eastern quarter of France. The important Imperial provinces, which required the presence of an army, were twenty-one in number: Suria (Syria), Hispania Tarraconensis, Germania Superior, Germania Inferior, Britannia, Pannonia Superior, Pannonia Inferior, Moesia Superior, Moesia Inferior, Dalmatia, Lusitania, Gallia Aquitanica, Gallia Lugudunensis, Gallia Belgica, Galatia, Pamphylia, Lycia, Cilicia et Syria et Phœnice, Numidia, Cappadocia,* each governed by a *legatus Augusti pro prætore*, and Egypt, governed by an equestrian *præfectus Ægypti*, acting for his master the Emperor, who reigned as king of Egypt. Some further Imperial provinces of less importance were governed by *procuratores* (see under GOVERNMENT, PROCURATOR). It is inexact to speak of Judæa as a province at this period. It remained from the beginning down to the time of Vespasian a client-State, whether ruled by one king or by a number of princes, or by a Roman procurator in company with an ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ ἐθνάρχης. The king was subordinate to the governor of the province Syria. The procurator's position, however, was like that of the *præfectus Ægypti*. He took the place of the highest ruler (the Emperor), but neither Judæa nor Egypt was part of the Roman Empire in the strict sense of the term (T. Mommsen, *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. iii.: 'Juristische Schriften,' 1907, p. 431, n. 1, contradicting his earlier work, *The Provinces of the Roman Empire*, Eng. tr., vol. ii. p. 185).

During the Empire all the provinces were subject to taxation, even those *ciuitates* which had formerly been and were still *liberæ* being now compelled to contribute. This change is traced to Pompey. Immunity of cities was an exceptional privilege in the Empire, belonging exclusively, or almost exclusively, to *coloniæ*, in virtue of the fact that they, like the inhabitants of Italy, owned their soil. Augustus first grappled with the task of numbering the subjects of the Empire, and apportioning the fiscal burdens among the provinces and individuals in them. The census of Egypt occurred every fourteen years (A.D. 19–20 the earliest attested date), and the same or a similar arrangement was doubtless current in other provinces, though it must be remembered that the situation in Egypt was peculiar. The census-papers were the basis for the levy of the poll-tax, as well as for the fixing of the proportion of other public burdens due from each householder. The taxes were either land-taxes or imposts on the person. The land-tax in a few cases was paid in kind. The poll-tax pure and simple was rare; generally the basis of taxation was the profession, the income, or the value of the movable property. In the public provinces the *stipendium* (as it was called) was perhaps collected by the States themselves and by them handed over to the *quæstor*, while in the Imperial provinces the *tributum* ('war-tax,' properly) was paid direct to the *procurator*. But it must not be forgotten that the Emperor had his *procuratores* even in senatorial provinces: these, however, may have been specially concerned with the management of his private estates. The *publicani*, however, the middlemen farmers of taxes, still had their place in Nero's time, for measures had to be taken to repress their exactions. A definite allowance (*salarium*) was now given to governors of provinces, and this must have lessened extortion somewhat. The *legati* of proconsuls had more definite jurisdiction. The legions in the Imperial provinces had their own military commanders (*legatus legionis*) apart from the governors. While the proconsuls held office for one year only, the Emperor's legates were retained in office during his pleasure.

---

* For the Asia Minor provinces see the splendid map in Ramsay's *Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, 1899, opposite page 1.

The Romanization of the provinces was a gradual process. To begin with, it was against Roman practice to give a provincial constitution to a district until it had been civilized to a sufficient extent by its own ruler (or rulers), and so was ready for the further process. Romanization itself took place through the channels of social and trade intercourse, but in the West more conscious efforts were made towards it. We can see how proud the inhabitants of South Galatia were of their Roman connexion. One of the secrets of Rome's success was that her governors were always content to let well alone. No attempt was made to unify the type of administration throughout the Empire. In most cases slight adjustments and the gradual purifying of municipal life were sufficient to bring all the local machinery into harmony with the central government.

LITERATURE.—The standard work for the individual provinces is T. Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte*, v.^{2} [Berlin, 1885], tr. W. P. Dickson, *The Provinces of the Roman Empire from Cæsar to Diocletian*, 2 vols., London, 1886: improved and cheaper edition by F. Haverfield, one of the leading authorities on this subject, do., 1909. Otto Hirschfeld's *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diocletian*^{2}, Berlin, 1905, is invaluable. Principles of administration of the provinces in general are summarized in A. H. J. Greenidge, *Roman Public Life*, London, 1901, chs. viii. and xi. Students will find it helpful to concentrate on one province, and Galatia is suggested on account of the masterly treatment by W. M. Ramsay, *A Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, London, 1899. On the fourteen years' census in Egypt, cf. W. M. Ramsay, *Was Christ born in Bethlehem?*, London, 1898, and G. Milligan, *Selections from the Greek Papyri*, Cambridge, 1910, pp. 44 ff., 72 f.; both provide texts and mention other relevant literature.

A. SOUTER.

PSALMS.—'Psalms' in the Apostolic Church included OT Psalms and similar hymns of praise to God, as sung to musical accompaniment. In 1 Co 14^{15} St. Paul contemplates impromptu utterances under the influence of the Spirit, and appeals for the use of the reason in praise no less than in prayer. In v.^{26} he assumes that members of the congregation will bring their assembly psalms which they have composed or learnt and wish to sing with or before others. The *Psalms of Solomon*, which may be dated *c.* 50 B.C., prove the use of sacred poetry among the Jews at this period. Forceful hymns, full of noble indignation against Roman oppression and Jewish secularity, in their praise of patience and resignation they express the feeling that Israel deserves chastening. Like the *Benedictus* they look for a Messiah of the house of David. But they fall short of the canticles of the NT in spiritual insight. The tone is self-righteous and sometimes fierce.

The use of psalms in private is referred to in Ja 5^{13}: 'He that is merry let him sing psalms' (cf. Eph 5^{19}).

A. E. BURN.

PSALMS OF SOLOMON.—These Psalms are eighteen in number, and were probably written in the 1st cent. B.C. It is doubted whether they are even indirectly cited in the NT; but both the language and the thought in them are of importance for a complete study of the Apostolic Age.

1. MSS and VSS.—It is generally admitted and is practically certain that these Psalms were originally written in Hebrew; but not even a fragment of any Hebrew MS of them, nor any Hebrew quotation from them, exists. The MSS in which the Psalms have survived are (1) Greek, and (2) Syriac. The Syriac is a secondary version, made from the Greek; but the Greek is probably a direct version from the lost Hebrew original.

Eight Greek MSS are now known. Of these the earliest (H) was written in the 10th or 11th cent., the latest in 1419, the rest in the 11th to the 14th centuries. The first edition of the Greek text was published in 1626 by John Louis de la Cerda; it was printed from a faulty copy of a MS which is now in Vienna (V) and which is derived from H. Later editions of the Psalms, down to and including that of Ryle and James in 1891, also rested entirely on H, or MSS derived from it. A more accurate text became possible when use could be made of other MSS, especially R (reproduced in vol. iii. of Swete's *Old Testament in Greek*) and J, which, though written later, were independent of H and in many respects superior to it. A critical text based on the eight known MSS was published in 1895 by Oscar von Gebhardt.

The Syriac Version first became known in 1909, when Rendel Harris published the Syriac text from a nearly complete MS which came into his possession 'from the neighbourhood of the Tigris.' This MS is probably no older than the 16th or 17th century. Subsequently a fragment of another MS of the Syriac text was found in the Cambridge University Library, and yet another and much earlier (incomplete) MS in the British Museum.

The Syriac MS edited by Rendel Harris is defective both at the beginning and at the end, and title and colophon are consequently missing; the separate psalms are numbered, but are without titles. The same is true of the more ancient British Museum MS described by Burkitt (see Literature). A general title to the whole collection occurs only in the Greek MSS L, H which represent a late stage in the textual history. On the other hand, in most of the Greek MSS, including R and J, nearly every individual psalm is entitled 'of Solomon,' *τῷ Σαλωμών*, with which we may compare the *τῷ Δαυείδ* in the LXX version of the canonical Psalter. (For details, von Gebhardt's textual apparatus and his remarks on p. 47 f. should be consulted; see also E. A. Abbott, *Light on the Gospel from an Ancient Poet*, 1912, pp. 1–7.)

But for the connexion of Solomon's name with these Psalms we can pass behind the MSS. They originally stood in the Codex Alexandrinus (5th cent. A.D.) of the Bible; and, though the part which contained them has perished, the entry in the table of contents or catalogue at the beginning of the Codex survives and reads: 'Psalms of Solomon XVIII.' This entry constitutes the earliest direct external evidence not merely of the association of Solomon's name with the Psalms, but of the existence of the Psalms themselves.

Rather earlier indirect external evidence of the existence of the Psalms has sometimes been sought elsewhere; but it is at least doubtful whether the fifty-ninth canon of the Council of Laodicea (*c.* A.D. 360), when it directs that 'private psalms (ἰδιωτικοὺς ψαλμούς) are not to be read in the church,' and a similarly vague reference in Ambrose, refer to the Psalms of Solomon; and it is now certain that the *Odes* of Solomon mentioned in the *Pistis Sophia* (*c.* A.D. 250) and by Lactantius (4th cent.) are not these Psalms, but a different set of poems, which actually precede the 18 Psalms in Harris's Syriac MS.

The inclusion of these Psalms originally in the Codex Alexandrinus, and perhaps, too, in the Codex Sinaiticus, the association of them in most of the eight Greek MSS in which they now survive with other Solomonic works, canonical and apocryphal—the Psalms commonly standing between Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus—indicate the position which they occupied in the early history of the Church; but the paucity of references to them and quotations from them shows at the same time that they proved neither very attractive nor very influential: they probably owed their preservation to the fact that they bore the name of Solomon.

2. Contents.—The chief contents of the Psalms may be briefly indicated as follows:

Ps 1.—Suddenly, in the midst of prosperity, threatened with war and assault, Sion, confident in her righteousness, had appealed to God; but closer examination had convinced her that secret sins, surpassing those of the heathen, had been committed, and the sanctuary of God polluted.

Ps 2.—Foreigners have shattered the walls of Jerusalem with a battering-ram, and treated God's altar profanely. This and the captivity of many Jews that followed seem to the writer to be the punishment meted out by God for the previous profanation of the sacrifices by some of the Jews, 'the sons of Jerusalem,' themselves. Nevertheless, the foreign executant of God's anger had outgone his commission: he too is punished; he is slain in Egypt, and his body exposed to dishonour.

Ps 3.—The character, conduct, and faith of the righteous and unrighteous are contrasted.

Ps 4.—The 'men-pleasers' are described as hypocrites—outwardly, even extravagantly respectable and severe in their condemnation of sinners; but actually consumed with lust, in their gratification of which they destroy the peace of family after family. May God reward them with dishonour in life and death, with penury and lonely old age.

Ps 5.—The goodness of God towards animals and men alike is without stint: man's is a grudging goodness.

Ps 6.—Happy is the man who prays.

Ps 7.—Let God, if needs be, chasten Israel, but not by giving them up to the nations.

Ps 8.—A more elaborate treatment of the theme of the first Psalm: the wickedness of a party of the Jews had consisted in immorality and the profanation of the sacred precincts and the sacrifices by disregard of the laws of ritual cleanness. In vv.$^{15-24}$ a specific account is given of the progress of the invader and of his reception.

Ps 9.—Righteousness in God and man: man's free-will, and God's goodness to the penitent. Through God's goodness Israel hopes not to be rejected for ever.

Ps 10.—Happy is the man whom God chastiseth: Israel shall praise Him for His goodness.

Ps 11.—The return of the Diaspora to Jerusalem.

Ps 12.—May God curse the slanderers, and preserve the quiet and peace-loving.

Ps 13.—God has preserved the righteous at a time when the 'sinners' perished miserably. If God chastens the righteous, it is as a father his first-born. The life of the righteous and the destruction of the sinners are for ever.

Ps 14.—Eternal life and joy await the pious; but Sheol, darkness, and destruction are the lot of sinners, whose delight is in 'fleeting corruption.'

Ps 15.—Similar to 13 and 14.

Ps 16.—But for God's mercy and strength, even the righteous would slip down to the fate of the wicked. A prayer for preservation from sin, from beautiful but beguiling women, and for strength to bear affliction with cheerfulness.

Ps 17.—Sinners who had set up a non-Davidic monarchy have been removed: a man of alien race has laid waste the land of Judah and carried men captive to the West. The psalm closes (vv.$^{23-51}$) with a long description of the Messianic king, for whose advent the author prays.

Ps 18.—'Again of the anointed of the Lord.'

3. Date.—Two things in particular stand out clearly in these Psalms: (1) the Jewish nation is divided sharply into two sects or parties, the 'righteous,' to whom the writer belongs, and the 'sinners,' or the party of his opponents; (2) the nation has suffered severely from the invasion of unnamed foreigners. More than one period in Jewish history would satisfy these conditions, and certainly the period of the Maccabæan revolt (167 B.C. and following years); and in the profanation of the altar to which Ps 2 refers it is tempting at first to see an allusion to Antiochus Epiphanes' act in setting up on the altar the 'abomination of desolation' (1 Mac 1^{54}). To this period, then, some scholars have assigned the Psalms. But the whole of the more specific allusions taken together, and most of them even taken separately, are far better satisfied by the circumstances of the middle of the 1st cent. B.C.—a period of bitter feud between the Pharisees and the Sadducees, and of the invasion of Judah by the Romans under Pompey. It is to this period, therefore, that most recent scholars refer the Psalms. The (alien) nations ($2^{2.\ 6.\ 20.\ 24}$ $7^{3.\ 6}$ 8^{36}) who attack Jerusalem, and by whom the Jewish captives are led away, and against whom the writer prays for deliverance, are the Romans. Their commander, 'who is from the end of the earth, who smiteth mightily' (8^{16}), who is met by the Jewish princes and at first invited by them to Jerusalem, but ultimately has to capture the fortresses and the walls of Jerusalem by force (8^{18-21}), by bringing battering-rams to play upon them (2^{1}), who allows his soldiers profanely to trample upon the altar (2^{2}), who carries his captives to the West (17^{14}), and whose end was a dishonoured death 'on the mountains of Egypt' ($2^{30.\ 31}$) is Pompey. For he, as a Roman, came from the West, and thither he led back to grace his triumph in Rome the Jewish prince Aristobulus; he availed himself of the quarrels between the Jewish princes Hyrcanus and Aristobulus and their supporters to secure the Roman power in Judah; he was at first approached and welcomed by both these princes, but in the end he was resolutely resisted by Aristobulus in Jerusalem, so that he was compelled to bring up battering-rams from Tyre wherewith to break down the fortified wall of Jerusalem; he shocked Jewish feeling by intruding into the Holy of Holies, and fifteen years after he had captured Jerusalem and profaned the Temple, he was slain beside Mons Cassius near Pelusium, his body being at first left unburied on the Egyptian shore, and then hastily and unceremoniously burned.

A considerable similarity of tone and temper and the possibility of satisfying all the specific allusions, more or less completely, by what is known independently of the condition of the Jews between about 80 and 40 B.C. and of the circumstances of Pompey's treatment of them, and of his death, favour the commonly accepted view that these Psalms (possibly with the exception of Ps 18) were written in Palestine (and probably indeed in Jerusalem) within a single generation, and not improbably by a single writer; absolute proof, however, of single authorship is not forthcoming, and some of the more colourless of the Psalms *might* then belong to another age. The second Psalm, which refers to the death of the foreign invader, must have been written after, but probably soon after, Pompey's death in 48 B.C.; the rest of the Psalms (except 18) were probably written rather earlier, most of them soon after Pompey's capture of Jerusalem in 63 B.C., but one or two (4 and 12) perhaps earlier still, before the Jews in general had suffered at Pompey's hands and the party of the 'sinners' had received that severer treatment which Pompey measured out to Aristobulus and his party.

4. Main ideas.—(1) *Pharisees and Sadducees.*—The chief interest of these Psalms is that they reveal the temper and ideals of those two parties which in the period of the formation of the NT played so conspicuous a part in Jewish life: the author is a Pharisee, and the opponents whom he denounces are Sadducees. The Psalms indeed run back two or three generations before the separation of the Christian Church from the Jewish religion, but we can trace in them much that was still characteristic of the two parties later.

The Sadducees are to the writer 'the unrighteous' (ἄδικοι), 'sinners' (ἁμαρτωλοί), 'transgressors' (παράνομοι), 'the profane' (βέβηλοι), the 'men-pleasers' (ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι). The use of these terms and the charges brought against the Sadducees of insolence, self-reliance, disregard of God, and gross sensual sins may largely represent the generalizations, exaggerations, or inventions of a political or religious opponent. But in charging them with profanation of the sanctuary and its sacrifices he implies that somewhat intimate association of the priesthood with the Sadducees which is conspicuous later. So again in charging them with setting up a non-Davidic monarchy ($17^{7.8}$), *i.e.* with recognizing the royal dignity which the Hasmonæans had claimed since Aristobulus I. (104 B.C.), he implies a readiness in that party to acquiesce in an existing polity, even though it was inconsistent with the Messianic promises, which seems natural enough in the ancestors of the Sadducees of the 1st cent. A.D.

Over against these 'sinners' the writer sees in his own party, *i.e.* the Pharisees, 'the righteous' (δίκαιοι), 'the pious' (ὅσιοι, representing the Hebrew *ḥasīdim*), 'those that fear the Lord' ([οἱ] φοβούμενοι τὸν κύριον), 'the guileless' (ἄκακοι); occasionally too this party appears as 'the poor' (πτωχοί, πένητες). They were devoted to the Law (14^{1}), troubled about sins done in ignorance yet convinced that the punishment of the righteous for sins done in ignorance was something very unlike that which awaited the 'sinners' ($13^{4.5}$). As a matter of fact, though 'righteous' and 'sinners' alike must have suffered greatly from the necessary results of Pompey's attack on and capture of Jerusalem, it was the party of the Sadducees, the adherents of Aristobulus, who with his children were taken captive, that suffered most. But in their view of a future life these Pharisees of the 1st cent. B.C. already found further ground for differentiating the lot of the sinners and the righteous. 'They that fear the Lord shall rise to life eternal, and their life shall be in the light of the Lord, and shall come to an end no more' (3^{16}). When the wicked depart into 'Sheol and darkness and destruction,' the righteous will obtain mercy and 'the pious of the Lord shall inherit life in gladness' ($14^{6.7}$; cf. also 13^{9-11} $14^{2.3}$ 15^{15} 16^{1-5}). On the other hand, the end of the wicked, if not actual annihilation, is but the miserable life of Sheol indefinitely prolonged: whereas the righteous 'rise to life eternal,' the sinner 'falls and rises no more' and his destruction is for ever (3^{13-15}; cf. 9^{9} 12^{7} 13^{10} 14^{6} 15^{11}). With this hope the righteous pray that they may, and the writer claims that they already do, accept with patience the present passing chastisement of God.

(2) *Free-will.*—In their view of man's free-will the author of the Psalms and his party are at one with the Pharisees of the 1st cent. A.D. as described by Josephus (*Ant.* II. viii. 14): *i.e.* like the Sadducees they assert man's freedom, but at the same time they differ from the Sadducees by asserting and indeed emphasizing the Divine knowledge and control of human action: 'Man and his portion lie before Thee in the balance: he cannot add to, so as to enlarge, what has been prescribed by Thee' (5^{6}). 'Our works are subject to our own choice and power to do right or wrong in the work of our hands.'

(3) *The Messianic hope.*—Lastly, we may note the very important light cast by Pss 17 and 18 on the Messianic hope as cherished in this circle. The Messiah is to be, unlike the actual king whom the sinners had presumptuously set up ($17^{7.8}$), a descendant of David (v.^{23}). He will enjoy the old title of the Hebrew kings—the anointed of Jahweh (or the Lord); for the phrase 'Christ (the) Lord' (cf. Lk 2^{11}) which occurs in the MSS at 17^{36} is probably, even if it be the original Greek reading, nothing but a mistranslation (as in La 4^{20}) of the ordinary Hebrew genitival phrase 'the anointed of the Lord.' This Messiah is also called 'the king of Israel' (17^{47}) and 'the son of David' (v.^{23}). He will appear at a time determined by God (18^{6}), being raised up, or brought forward again (though the idea of a pre-existing Messiah detected by some in this phrase is very doubtful) by God Himself. He will purge Jerusalem alike from heathen enemies who profane it, and from native unrighteous rulers. He will then restore the true kingdom to Israel—a kingdom righteous, holy, glorious, world-wide—and rule as the vicegerent of God, who Himself remains over and above this human ruler, the king of Israel, 'for ever and ever' (17^{51}).

LITERATURE.—(1) GREEK TEXT.—**O. von Gebhardt**, *Die Psalmen Salomo's* (*TU* xiii. 2 [1895]); **H. B. Swete**, *The Old Testament in Greek*, 1894–96, iii. 765–787 (text of MS R with the variants of H and three MSS dependent on H).

(2) SYRIAC TEXT.—**J. Rendel Harris**, *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon*, 1909 (^{2}1911, where the variants of a Cambridge University MS discovered by Barnes [Harris, p. 46] and containing part of Ps 16 are given); **F. C. Burkitt**, in *JThSt* xiii. [1911–12] 372–385 (a description of a British Museum MS containing in immediate continuation of the Odes of Solomon and with continuous enumeration *Pss.-Sol.* i. 1–iii. 5 and x. 4–xviii. 5).

(3) COMMENTARIES, etc.—**H. E. Ryle** and **M. R. James**, *Psalms of the Pharisees*, 1891 (the Greek text here printed is antiquated; but on account of the fullness and excellence of the introduction and commentary this work remains of the first importance); **J. Wellhausen**, *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer*, 1874 (contains a German translation); **J. Viteau**, *Les Psaumes de Salomon*, 1911 (text, translation, and full introduction and commentary); **G. B. Gray**, 'The Psalms of Solomon' (brief introduction and notes to an English translation arranged in parallel lines in Charles's *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, 1913, ii. 625–652). For a full bibliography, see **Viteau**, *op. cit.* pp. 240–251.

G. BUCHANAN GRAY.

PTOLEMAIS (Πτολεμαΐς).—Ptolemais is the ancient Canaanite town of Acco (mentioned in Jg 1^{31} and in the corrected text of Jos 19^{30}), still known in Arab. as *'Akka*. Standing on the rocky promontory which forms the northern boundary of the sandy Bay of Acre, protected by the sea on the W., S., and S.E., and strongly fortified on the landward side, it came to be regarded as the key of Palestine, and its chequered history is chiefly a record of sieges, of which it has probably had to endure more in ancient and modern times than any other Syrian town. Between it and the hills of Galilee lies the fertile Plain of Acre, six miles in width, watered by the Nahr Namein, the ancient Belus, a river famous for the manufacture—Pliny (*HN* xxxvi. 65. 26) says the invention—of glass at its mouth, as well as for the murex shells from which purple dye was extracted by the Phœnicians.

The town rose to considerable importance under the Macedonian kings of Egypt, who converted it into a Greek city, and its new name—given probably by Ptolemy Soter, and retained when the rival kings of Syria gained the mastery—continued to be used till the end of the Roman period, after which the old native name was revived. The city played a prominent part in the Maccabæan wars. There Simon routed the Syrian Greeks (1 Mac 5^{15}), and there Jonathan was treacherously captured by Trypho (12^{45-48}). Ptolemais had an era dating from a visit of Julius Cæsar in 47 B.C. Augustus was entertained in it by Herod the Great (Jos. *Ant.* XV. vi. 7), and Claudius established it as a *colonia* (Pliny, *HN* v. 17). The Romans used it as a base of operations in the Jewish war, at the outbreak of which its inhabitants proved their loyalty to Rome by massacring 2,000 Jews resident in the city and putting others in bonds (Jos. *BJ* II. xviii. 5).

Ptolemais is mentioned only once in the NT. St. Paul touched it in sailing from Tyre to Cæsarea (Ac 21^{7}). Its distance from Tyre is 25 miles. The Apostle saluted the Christians whom he found in the town, and remained a day in their company. The founder of the Church is not known. Philip the Evangelist, who laboured in Cæsarea, has been suggested.

Under the name of Accon (St. Jean d'Acre of the Knights of St. John), the town was the scene of many conflicts in the time of the Crusaders, who made it their chief port in Palestine. Its capture by the Saracens brought the kingdom of the Franks to an end. The destruction of the city 'produced terror all over Europe; for, with its fall in 1291, the power of the Christian nations of the West lost its last hold upon the East' (C. Ritter, *The Comparative Geography of Palestine and the Sinaitic Peninsula*, 1866, iv. 361). Reconstructed in the 18th cent., besieged in vain by Napoleon (1799), captured by Ibrahim Pasha (1831), and bombarded by the fleets of Britain, Austria, and Turkey (1840), it still has some commercial importance, though the recent growth of Haifa has told heavily against it.

LITERATURE.—A. P. Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, new ed., 1877, p. 265 f.; G. A. Smith, *HGHL*^{4}, 1897; W. M. Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, 1864, p. 308; C. Baedeker, *Palestine and Syria*^{4}, 1906; E. Schürer, *HJP* II. [1885] i. 90 f.

JAMES STRAHAN.

PUBLIUS (Πόπλιος).—Publius was the leading man of Malta at the time of St. Paul's shipwreck there, when he hospitably entertained the shipwrecked party (Ac 28^{7}). His father, who was sick of fever and dysentery, was healed by the Apostle (v.^{8}). The epithet ὁ πρῶτος, 'the chief man,' seems to have been an official title peculiar to Malta (cf. Ramsay, *St. Paul*, 1895, p. 343). The form 'Poplios' may be either the Greek popular equivalent for the Roman *prænomen* Publius or the Greek rendering of the *nomen* Popilius. Ecclesiastical tradition makes him the first bishop of Malta.

W. F. BOYD.

PUDENS (Πούδης).—Pudens was a Christian of Rome who along with Eubulus, Claudia, and Linus sends greetings to Timothy (2 Ti 4^{21}). He was thus on intimate terms with the apostle Paul at the time of his last Roman imprisonment. Nothing certain is known regarding him. He is supposed by many to have been the husband of the Claudia of the same verse and has been identified with the Pudens of Martial's *Epigrams*, whose wife also bore the name Claudia (*Epigr.* iv. 13, xi. 54). For a full account of various identifications and literature, see art. CLAUDIA.

W. F. BOYD.

PUNISHMENT.—The word 'punishment' is employed to translate κόλασις (1 Jn 4^{18} RV) and τιμωρία (He 10^{29}). The corresponding verbs κολάζω and τιμωρέω, translated 'punish,' are used indiscriminately (Ac 4^{21}, 2 P 2^{9}; cf. Ac 22^{5} 26^{11}); so that the classical distinction, exemplified in Plato and Aristotle, between τιμωρία, which regarded the retributive suffering, and κόλασις, which regarded the correction of the offender, can hardly be pressed in the case of NT usage (for the distinction, see R. C. Trench, *Synonyms of the NT*^{8}, London, 1876). Other words translated 'punishment' are δίκη (2 Th 1^{9} RV), ἐκδίκησις (1 P 2^{14}, 'vengeance' in RV), and ἐπιτιμία (2 Co 2^{6}).

The term 'punishment' (Lat. *pœna*) may be defined as pain or suffering inflicted in expiation of a crime or offence by an authority to which the offender is subject. The authority inflicting it may be human or Divine. The human authority may be civil or ecclesiastical. Human authority to inflict punishment is ultimately derived from a Divine source.

1. Punishment inflicted by human authority.—Under this head may be mentioned (*a*) *that inflicted by civil authority.* Roman magistrates, under the supremacy of the Emperor, in so far as they administered just laws, are regarded as executors of the Divine wrath or vengeance against evil-doers, and submission to their jurisdiction is made imperative on members of the Apostolic Church (1 P 2^{14}; cf. Ro 13^{1-5}).

(*b*) *That inflicted by ecclesiastical authority.* (α) In the Jewish Church, the supreme Sanhedrin at Jerusalem and local Sanhedrins claimed and exercised the right to punish persons adjudged guilty of contumacy, schism (αἵρεσις), or seducing the people. On the basis of such charges it was sought to make the apostles and others who adhered to their doctrine and fellowship amenable to punishment (Ac 4^{21} 22^{25} 26^{11}). (β) In the exercise of discipline, the members of a Christian church, acting as a judicial body, were vested with the power to inflict censure, or the severer punishment of exclusion from the fellowship of the Church, on every brother who walked disorderly (1 Co 5^{3-5}, 1 Th 5^{14}, 2 Th 3^{6}). In carrying out the sentence of exclusion, the name and authority of Christ, as King and Head of the Church, were solemnly invoked. While the extreme penalty of exclusion was called punishment (ἐπιτιμία, 2 Co 2^{6}; ἐκδίκησις, 7^{11}), the object of its infliction was the ultimate restoration of the offender to Church privileges (2 Co $2^{6f.}$; cf. 10^{8} 13^{10}).

2. Divine punishment.—In passages in which the term occurs it is conceived as eschatological. (*a*) It is *associated with the Intermediate State.* (α) According to representations derived from apocalyptic literature, the fallen angels are depicted as undergoing punishment in Tartarus while awaiting the Final Judgment (2 P 2^{9}; cf. 2^{4}, Jude ^{6}, 1 P 3^{19}). (β) The inhabitants of the Cities of the Plain have been continually subjected to punishment since the period when it was first inflicted upon them in the time of Lot (Jude ^{7} RV).

(*b*) Punishment is *associated with the Parousia.* (α) At the Second Advent the heathen and unbelieving Jews who have persecuted or ill-used members of the Church are to receive the due reward of their deeds. The punishment meted out to them is more particularly defined as 'eternal destruction from the face of the Lord and from the glory of his might' (2 Th 1^{9} RV). (β) Apostates from the Christian faith, being guilty of wilful sin, for which no further sacrifice is provided, are liable under the New Covenant to far severer punishment at Christ's Return than that which overtook offenders under the Old Covenant (He $10^{29f.}$; cf. v.^{37}).

The primary purpose of punishment, human or Divine, is to vindicate the law, and uphold the moral order of the world, which, in the absence of such sanction, would fail to command the respect of the law-breaker. Punishment may also be imposed with a view to reform the offender or to deter others from the commission of like offences by making an example of him. It must be maintained, however, that even should punishment fail to exercise a corrective or deterrent effect, its infliction as righteous retribution would still be justified (see W. N. Clarke, *An Outline of Christian Theology*, Edinburgh, 1898, pp. 253–255, and R. Mackintosh, *Christianity and Sin*, London, 1913, p. 215). Punishment is the natural correlate and consequence of guilt. It presupposes that the wrong-doer is responsible for the acts which have exposed him to it, and justly merits its infliction. Divine punishment is the reaction of God's holy nature against sin. It is the outward manifestation of the Divine wrath against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men. As the manifestation of God's just resentment, it is mainly, though not exclusively (in opposition to Ritschl, see A. E. Garvie, *The Ritschlian Theology*^{2}, Edinburgh, 1902, pp. 307–310), eschatological. Punishment by itself, *i.e.* apart from disclosures of Divine grace, leading to 'the apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ' (*Shorter Catechism*, A. 87), has no redemptive or remedial effects upon the character, and cannot produce repentance (Ro 2^4 4^{15}, 2 Co 7^{10}). Doubtless it is for this reason that the future punishment of the impenitent is never regarded as tending to the purification of the sufferers. Whatever possibilities the eternal future may have in store, the NT draws a veil over the fate of those who have failed to improve the opportunity afforded by the dispensation under which men are now living.

LITERATURE.—For theories of punishment, in addition to works referred to in art. see F. H. Bradley, *Ethical Studies*, London, 1876, ch. i.; J. Seth, *A Study of Ethical Principles*^{10}, do., 1908, pp. 320–323; Borden P. Bowne, *Principles of Ethics*, New York, 1892, ch. x.; G. F. Barbour, *A Philosophical Study of Christian Ethics*, Edinburgh and London, 1911, pp. 285–291, 409 f.

W. S. MONTGOMERY.

PURIFICATION (*ἁγνισμός*, Ac 21^{26}; *καθαρισμός*, He 1^3, 2 P 1^9).—Purification is an old-world idea and ideal. It arose out of the mystery of God and the misery of man. The signification of *ἁγνισμός* is that we must approach God carefully, of *καθαρισμός* that we are unable to do so without the help of some mediator who cleanses. Men instinctively felt that those mysterious presences which surround man were dangerous forces, and that both in approaching and leaving them a wise ritual of restrictions was necessary. Outside the Bible these restrictions are called 'tabus.' Aaron, for instance, washed both before and after the act of atonement (Lv $16^{4.\ 23-24}$; W. R. Smith, *RS*^{2}, 1894, p. 152 ff., and additional note B). Man's misery had taught him the need of being made fit, and so there lurked at the heart of tabu the idea of an act of moral cleansing. It was to be such as both to annul man's guilt and to appease God. Thus after child-birth, bringing with it the mystery of Divine forces, the mother kept days of purification. Whenever man sighted the Unseen Powers—when with the dead, *e.g.*, or in war—he was under tabu. The Nazirite vow (Nu 6, Ac 21^{26}) was a continuous tabu, an active hourly recognition of the Unseen. St. Paul was Jew enough to respond to these forms, and Christian enough to extract value out of them (Ac 18^{18})—to make them 'days of separation' (Nu 6^4, He 7^{26}) in the religious life.

The Jewish sacrificial system is the specially Divine one among the primitive systems of sacrifice and tabu. It puts into dogmatic form the vague God-ward instincts of the primeval heart. One instinct was the community of blood between the god, man, and the animal world, so that, if the blood of a human or an animal victim was shed, it was an offering of their common life, and, if the flesh was eaten, they became one in a mysterious sacrament (W. R. Smith, *op. cit.* p. 312 ff.; J. G. Frazer, *GB*^{2} [1900] ii. 318). So the sin-offering was eaten (Lv 6^{26}), embodying man's guilty feelings towards God and God's appeased feelings towards man. The final act of this mystery is when 'God made Jesus Christ to be sin,' a sin-offering, a setting forth of man's guilt and God's purification. He made 'purification of sins' (He 1^3). How?

There are three answers. (*a*) *Psychological.*—He fulfils the vague cravings for a guilt-offering from the beginning. That which we cannot put into words, but which has written itself in history, in language, in religion, in instinctive humanity, He is and does. (*b*) *Ethical.*—An exhibition on a great scale of an act of justice purges a people. Aristotle made this one of the uses of tragedy, to purify the passions by pity and terror (cf. S. A. Brooke, *Life and Letters of F. W. Robertson*, new ed., 1868, Letters 86, 87). Christ's death was such an exhibition. (*c*) *Spiritual* ('cleansing their hearts by faith').—Personal identification with His suffering cleanses (J. R. Seeley, *Ecce Homo*^{11}, 1873, p. 7; Ro 6^{4-7}; Sanday-Headlam, *ICC*, 'Romans'^{5}, 1902, p. 162). It is the absence of such identification which in 2 P 1^9 is deplored.

LITERATURE.—B. F. Westcott, *Hebrews*, 1889, pp. 283, 293, *The Epistles of St. John*, 1883, p. 34; A. Edersheim, *The Temple: its Ministry and Service*, 1874, ch. 18; J. Scott Lidgett, *The Spiritual Principle of the Atonement*, 1897; J. M'Leod Campbell, *The Nature of the Atonement*^{6}, 1895.

SHERWIN SMITH.

PURITY.—See HOLINESS.

PURPLE.—See COLOURS.

PUTEOLI (*Ποτίολοι*, now Pozzuoli).—The town of Puteoli lay on the northern shore of the Bay of Naples (Sinus Cumanus), and on the eastern side of the lovely Sinus Baianus, which was a bay within a bay. Originally a Greek settlement, it retained the name of Dicæarchia till the Romans established a colony there, when the Latin element swamped the Greek. Eastward the town was separated from Neapolis by a headland (Posilipo) which Augustus pierced with a tunnel, while westward it joined hands with Baiæ, the gay resort of fashionable Rome. By the short Via Campania (or Consularis) it was connected with the Via Appia at Capua, which was 125 miles from Rome. Puteoli was not only the usual landing-place of travellers for Rome—such as St. Paul (Ac 28^{13}), Josephus (*Vit.* 3), and the prisoner Ignatius (*Martyr.* 5)—but the haven for the merchant-ships of Syria and Egypt in the east, of Carthage and Spain in the west. It was 'the Liverpool of Italy' (Conybeare-Howson, *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, new ed., 1877, ii. 433). Seneca (*Ep.* 77) gives a life-like picture of the Puteolan crowd gathering on the pier in spring to watch the fleet of Alexandrian corn-ships heaving in sight, easily distinguished 'in magna turba navium' because they alone were allowed to enter the bay carrying their top-sails. The mercantile supremacy of Puteoli is explained by Strabo (*c.* A.D. 20): Ostia 'has no port, owing to the accumulation of alluvial deposit brought down by the Tiber, . . . vessels therefore bring to anchor farther out, but not without danger' (v. iii. 5). All this was changed by the construction at Ostia of the Portus Augusti, begun in the reign of Claudius and finished in that of Nero, close to the time (A.D. 59 or 60) of St. Paul's arrival in Italy. The Apostle's ship, however, sailed for the old port, so that he and his companions had to make the usual overland journey. In Puteoli they 'found brethren' of whom they had no previous knowledge (as the absence of the article proves), and 'were cheered among them (παρεκλήθημεν παρ' αὐτοῖς), remaining seven days' (Ac 28^{14}). This reading is preferred by W. M. Ramsay (*St. Paul the Traveller*, 1895, p. 212) and F. Blass (*Acta Apostolorum*, 1895, p. 287) to 'were entreated by them' (ἐπ' αὐτοῖς), which would convey the idea that St. Paul, though a prisoner, was able to make his own arrangements; whereas the truth probably was that when Julius decided that a halt must be made for a week, the Apostle used the measure of liberty given him, and passed the time in happy fellowship with the little Christian Church. There had been a colony of Jews in Puteoli before the time of Christ (Jos. *Ant.* XVII. xii. 1, *BJ* II. vii. 1), so that the soil had been partly prepared for the seed of the gospel; and as ships plied between Puteoli and every port in Syria and Egypt, it was nothing wonderful that St. Paul found Christianity already planted in that great commercial city. Other Eastern cults took root there sooner than in Rome, as a temple of Serapis, frequented in the 2nd cent. B.C., proved. The modern town (population, 17,000) retains many relics of ancient greatness—amphitheatre, baths, circus, villas. Its cathedral is built into a temple of Augustus.

LITERATURE.—Strabo, v. iv. 7; C. Dubois, *Pouzzoles antique*, 1908; C. Baedeker, *Southern Italy and Sicily*^{12}, 1896.

JAMES STRAHAN.

PYLON.—See GATE.

PYRRHUS (Πύρρος, a Greek name).—In ℵ ABDE and several ancient versions Sopater of Berœa, who accompanied St. Paul on at least part of his return journey from Greece to Palestine, is described in Ac 20^4 as 'the son of Pyrrhus' (Σώπατρος Πύρρου). In the TR Πύρρου is omitted in accordance with later MSS and versions. Hence the omission in the English AV and the addition in the RV. Nothing further is known of Pyrrhus or of Sopater (*q.v.*), unless the latter, as is possible, is identical with Sosipater of Ro 16^{21}, who is one of three men who send salutations from Corinth as 'kinsmen' of St. Paul, *i.e.* fellow-Jews. If we consider this identification likely, we shall suppose father and son to have been Hellenistic Jews, and perhaps both to have been among the 'many' converts made at Berœa during the Apostle's visit there (Ac 17^{10-14}). The mention of Pyrrhus at all may indicate that he had become well known as a Christian. On the other hand, some commentators consider that his name has been inserted purposely to distinguish Sopater from Sosipater. This is the only instance of a patronymic of the usual Greek fashion in the NT. It may point to a family of some social position.

T. B. ALLWORTHY.

PYTHON.—The primitive Aryans worshipped a deity named, from ἀπέλλα, 'the fold,' Ἀπέλλων or Ἀπόλλων, 'he of the fold,' the special god of the cattle-pen, the patron deity of cattle-rearing. He was also called Λύκιος, 'he who frightens away the wolf.' As Φοῖβος, the sun-god, was the deity who opened the ἀπέλλαι ('cattle-pens') in the morning and drove out the herds, the one god became identified with the other. Apollo dwelt in caves.* Certain tribes of Aryan Hellenes who invaded and conquered what is now called Greece brought with them their cave-dwelling deity. One of these tribes settled in a narrow vale shut in between Mount Parnassus and Mount Cirphis. The place, afterwards called Delphi, was then named Πυθώ or Πύθων. In Πύθων was a cavern which emitted vapour of a more or less mephitic character. To the autochthons this was clear evidence of the presence of a chthonian spirit, most probably nameless, whom they worshipped. The cults of the two cave-dwellers inevitably amalgamated, and Apollo took the place of the nameless chthonian spirit and was called Πύθιος.* The name Πύθων is in some way connected with πύθειν, 'to rot.' Such a cave in primitive times was certain to have been a resort of serpents, and an ætiological myth arose to the effect that the cavern, which had been possessed by Themis, had been guarded by an immense serpent called Πύθων who was the offspring of Gaia, produced from mud after the flood of Deucalion. Four days after his birth Apollo, the child of Zeus and Leto, killed the serpent, from whom he took the name, its carcass being allowed to rot where it was killed.†

Cattle-rearing being the chief employment of the earlier Aryans and Apollo being the protector of the fold, we can understand how helpfulness became one of his characteristics. This developed along two lines. (1) He suggested means by which calamities might be avoided. This led (2) to the conception of a power of prediction. In this way Apollo became the prophet of Zeus. Plato calls him 'the interpreter of religion to all mankind.'‡ His oracle made Delphi particularly famous,§ he became the most typical representative Hellenic deity, and his oracle at Delphi the most powerful influence in guiding and moulding the growth of Hellenism.‖ At Delphi his cult and oracle-giving became recognized and organized institutions. The oracle in historic times was of the ecstatic, enthusiastic, or epileptic kind. The chief agent was the Πυθία (the fem. of Πύθιος). When an oracle was asked, she, after preparation, drank the water of the sacred stream, chewed the leaves of the sacred laurel, mounted a tripod above the cavern from which the mephitic vapour arose, and then began to speak. Near her were the ὅσιοι, five priests who listened and interpreted her sayings.¶ Thus the Πυθία, a virtuous woman, became a mere tool in the hands of the Holy Ones, whose power has been aptly compared to that of the prophet Samuel.** Apollo had the power of communicating this gift of oracle-giving to others besides the Πυθία.†† Persons who were ventriloquists, in the original sense of that term, would naturally be supposed to have had it conferred on them. Hence Πύθων meant equally the divine being and the person whom it possessed. These ἐγγαστρίμυθοι were apparently very common throughout the countries where Greek influence predominated. They were called Eurykleidai, Sternomanteis, and Pythones.

Such diviners belonged to the lowest grade of the profession and were evidently for the most part ventriloquists.‡‡ One such is brought before us in Ac 16^{16-18}, in the Greek city of Philippi, during a visit paid to it by Paul and Silas. She was not a priestess of the Pythian Apollo, or in other words an accredited agent of the Delphic Oracle, as has been supposed,§§ but a female slave, probably a ventriloquist, afflicted with lunacy of a mild chronic type,* whose peculiarity was, according to the ideas of the time, looked upon as caused by her being possessed with a Pythonic spirit.† She was accordingly consulted by those who desired to have the future revealed to them, a business which produced a considerable revenue. She was not a slave mantic owned and exploited by a syndicate, as has often been stated,‡ for οἱ κύριοι does not mean 'masters' but rather, as A. Souter has pointed out, the girl's master and mistress.* These dealt with her cries as the ὅσιοι did with the deliverances of the Delphic priestess, framing out of them answers to those who consulted the girl.

---

* *ERE* ii. 36.

* *ERE* iv. 797.

† Apollodorus (*c.* 140 B.C.) I. iv. 1; Smith's *DGRB*, artt. 'Apollo' and 'Python'; *ERE* i. 609^a; *Hymn to Apollo*.

‡ Quoted by J. E. Carpenter, *Comparative Religion*, London, 1913, p. 183.

§ Smith's *DGRG*, art. 'Delphi,' *DGRA*, art. 'Oraculum.'

‖ *HDB* v. 143.

¶ *Ib.* p. 146; cf. the accounts of the Plutonium at Hierapolis by different travellers summarized by J. B. Lightfoot in *Colossians and Philemon*^{3}, London, 1879, p. 12.

** W. R. Halliday, *Greek Divination*, London, 1913, p. 64; L. R. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States*, 5 vols., Oxford, 1896–1909, iv. 185–193.

†† Smith's *DGRB*, art. 'Apollo,' p. 231; Homer, *Il.* i. 72; *Hymn to Mercury*, iii. 471.

‡‡ Halliday, *op. cit.* p. 244.

§§ J. Neil, *Pictured Palestine*, London, 1891, p. 38.

For the Patristic view see Hermas, *Mand.* 11.

P. A. GORDON CLARK.

---

* W. M. Alexander, *Demonic Possession*, Edinburgh, 1902, pp. 36, 161.

† The reading πνεῦμα Πύθωνα is supported by ℵ A B C* D*, while the reading of the TR Πύθωνος is only that of C³ D² E H L P.

‡ *E.g.* G. V. Lechler, *Commentary on Acts*, Edinburgh, 1872, p. 306; W. J. Conybeare-J. S. Howson, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, London, 1877, i. 353; F. W. Farrar, *Life and Work of St. Paul*, do., 1897, p. 278; W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, do., 1895, p. 216.

* *Exp*, 8th ser., viii. [1914] 95.

Q

QUARTUS (Κούαρτος, a common Latin name).—Quartus is a Christian whose greeting is sent in Ro 16^{23} from Corinth with that of Erastus, 'the treasurer of the city.' He was probably a member of the church there, and was associated with St. Paul at the time of writing. He was almost certainly a convert from heathenism, not from Judaism, and in this respect was unlike the three men whose salutations are sent in $v.^{21}$ and who are distinguished from Tertius, Erastus, and Quartus, as 'kinsmen' of the Apostle. The name Quartus itself might of course have been borne by a Jew (cf. Lucius, $v.^{21}$). It has been conjectured that Tertius and Quartus were brothers, but there is no ground for thinking so. If we suppose Rome to have been the destination of these Corinthian salutations, Quartus may have been a Roman with friends in the church in the city. It is, however, easier to believe that members of the Church at Corinth had friends in Ephesus, to which city some scholars think that the greetings were directed. We should remember, at the same time, that in the Apostolic Church personal acquaintance was not necessary to create Christian sympathy. Quartus is described simply as 'the brother' (ὁ ἀδελφός). Elsewhere in the Pauline Epistles, Apollos (1 Co 16^{12}), Epaphroditus (Ph 2^{25}), Onesimus (Col 4^{9}), Sosthenes (1 Co 1^{1}), Timothy (2 Co 1^{1}, etc.), Titus (2 Co 2^{13}), Tychicus (Eph 6^{21}, Col 4^{7}) are similarly described (cf. also 2 Co 8^{18} 12^{18}), while two Christian women, Phœbe and Apphia, are alluded to as 'our sister' (Ro 16^{1}, Philem ^{2}). One of the earliest titles used by Christians of themselves was 'the brethren.' 'The brethren,' forming with Asyncritus and four others a household or district church, are saluted in Ro 16^{14}. The term was perhaps taken over from Judaism. It is frequently found in Acts addressed to Jews by Jews ($2^{29.37}$, etc.), and Saul before his baptism was called 'brother Saul' by a Christian, Ananias (9^{17}). It was also in use among the heathen to designate members of the same religious community (see G. A. Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, 1901, p. 87 f., and the authorities there quoted). St. Paul over and over again addresses the readers or hearers of his Epistles as 'brethren,' *i.e.* simply 'fellow-Christians,' members of the one great spiritual family of which God is Father and Jesus Christ the Elder Brother, 'the firstborn among many brethren' (Ro 8^{29}). In one passage at least (1 Th 5^{14}) it is possible that the leaders of the church are addressed as 'brethren' (see G. Milligan, *Thessalonians*, 1908, *ad loc.*), and indeed we may say that in the Apostolic Church the terms 'brother' or 'sister' and 'minister' (διάκονος) were practically synonymous. To be a member of the community was to be a 'servant' of the community according to one's gift. We cannot doubt that Quartus was an active worker.

T. B. ALLWORTHY.

QUATERNION (τετράδιον, from τετράς, 'the number four'; Vulg. *quaternio*, whence the English word).—St. Peter, arrested by King Herod Agrippa, was handed over to four quaternions of soldiers (Ac 12^{4}), probably at the fortress Antonia. A quaternion was a guard consisting of four men, two of whom would be chained to the prisoner in the cell, while the other two kept watch outside (cf. Philo, *in Flaccum*, 13; Polyb. VI. xxxiii. 7). The second two were apparently the 'first ward' (φυλακή), which had to be passed before the iron gate was reached (Ac 12^{10}). Four quaternions were required, as the night was divided in Roman fashion into four watches of three hours each.

JAMES STRAHAN.

QUEEN (βασίλισσα).—The only person bearing this title that meets us in the apostolic writings is Candace, queen of the Ethiopians (Ac 8^{27}). This people appear frequently to have had female sovereigns, and the name Candace seems to have been handed on from one to another, as we meet with several queens of this name in their early history. The only other passage in which the title occurs is Rev 18^{7}, where Babylon is represented as sitting as a queen, priding herself upon her power and immunity from sorrow (cf. Is 47^{7}).

G. WAUCHOPE STEWART.

QUICKSANDS.—See SYRTIS.

QUOTATIONS.—A wide variety has been found to exist in the literary allusions of the four Gospels. The same freedom pervades the rest of the NT. Characteristic differences are, no doubt, to be met with in different groups of apostolic writings; but the field of quotation, direct and indirect, extends throughout from exact reproduction of the original texts to the merest suggestion or reminiscence, often hardly to be traced. The present article seeks to cover the more obvious reminiscences, as well as explicit citations, in the NT books under review.

1. Acts of the Apostles.—The direct quotations in Acts are confined to speeches of the apostles and the story of the Ethiopian eunuch ($8^{26ff.}$). They are invariably drawn from the LXX, even when that Version departs considerably from the Hebrew (as in $7^{42f.}$ $15^{16f.}$), and normally introduced by formulæ like 'It is written (in the book of Psalms),' 'This is that which hath been spoken by the prophets,' 'For David saith concerning him,' etc. A number of the citations are exact, viz. 2^{25-28} = Ps 16^{8-11}, omitting the last clause (identity being secured by reading ἡ καρδία μου with ℵAD, etc.); $2^{34f.}$=Ps 110^{1}; $4^{25f.}$=Ps $2^{1f.}$; $8^{32f.}$=Is $53^{7f.}$ (with addition of *αὐτόν*, as in ℵA, etc.); 23^{5}= Ex 22^{28} (in Lucian's recension); $28^{26f.}$=Is $6^{9f.}$ (apart from a slight difference in the opening formula). Under the same category is virtually to be placed the long citation from Jl 2^{28-32} woven into Peter's speech at Pentecost (2^{17-21}), the only changes from the LXX (ℵA) being a substitution of the eschatological phrase *ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις* (from Is 2^{2}, Mic 4^{1}) for the simple *μετὰ ταῦτα* of the original, the insertion of the solemn formula of Divine utterance *λέγει ὁ θεός*, and the transposition of the clauses relating to the young men and the old. In close dependence on the historical narratives from Genesis to Kings stands Stephen's long survey of the Divine leading and mission of Israel ($7^{1ff.}$), many of the verses being abbreviated, but sufficiently exact, citations of biblical texts (cf. esp. vv.$^{3. 6f. 26-28. 30-34. 40}$ with Gn 12^{1} $15^{13f.}$, Ex $2^{13f.}$ $3^{2ff.}$ 32^{1}). More deliberate alterations are evident in 1^{20}, where the general denunciation of wicked men in Ps 69^{25} (amplified by a further reference to Ps 109^{8}) is directly pointed against Judas; 2^{30}, an indirect citation of Ps 132^{11}; $3^{22f.}$ (abbreviated in 7^{37}), a conflate of Dt 18^{15-19} and Lv 23^{29}; 3^{25}, a free blending of the promises addressed to the fathers in Gn 12^{3} 18^{18}, etc.; 4^{11}, a loose citation of the verses (Ps $118^{22f.}$) which are fully reproduced and applied to Christ in Mt 21^{42} and parallel texts; $7^{42f.}$, where the famous words of Am 5^{25-29} are quoted with considerable changes, the most remarkable being the substitution of 'Babylon' for 'Damascus' (due either to accident, or, more probably, to a desire to bring the prophecy into line with later events); $7^{49f.}$, where the prophet's great contrast between the heavens of the Most High God and even the noblest temple built by man (Is $66^{1f.}$) is reproduced with considerable freedom; 13^{22}, a noteworthy conflate of Ps 89^{20}, 2 S 23^{1} (or Ps 72^{20}), 1 S 13^{14}, and Is 44^{28}; other verses from St. Paul's speech at Antioch, esp. $13^{33. 34. 35. 41. 47}$, which are abbreviated citations of Ps 2^{7}, Is 55^{3}, Ps 16^{10}, Hab 1^{5}, and Is 49^{6} respectively; $15^{16f.}$, a free rendering of Am 9^{11}, introduced by a phrase from Jer 12^{15}; and $26^{17f.}$, an application to St. Paul himself of the prophetic passage Is 42^{7-16}.

In addition to direct citations, however, there are many reminiscences of Scriptural phraseology scattered through Acts. The following may be presented as most suggestive of the original texts: 2^{24} (cf. Ps $18^{4f.}$ 116^{3}, Job $39^{2f.}$); 2^{39} (cf. Is 57^{19}, Jl 2^{32}, etc.); 2^{40} (cf. Dt 32^{5}); 4^{24} 14^{15} 17^{24} (cf. Gn 1^{1}, Ex 20^{11}, etc.); 4^{34} (cf. Dt 15^{4}); 5^{4} (cf. Jos 24^{27}, etc.); 8^{2} (cf. Gn 50^{10}); 8^{21} (cf. Dt 12^{12}, Ps 78^{37}); 10^{36} (cf. Ps 107^{20}, Is 52^{7}, etc.); 17^{27} (cf. Is 55^{6}, etc.); 17^{29} (cf. Is $40^{18f.}$ 46^{5}); 17^{31} (cf. Ps 9^{8}, etc.).

Outside of the OT, no texts are ever cited as Scripture. Other sources are, however, clearly before the mind of the writer. Thus 7^{21} suggests Wis 11^{14} 18^{5}; 17^{29}, Wis 13^{10}; and 17^{30}, Wis 11^{23} 12^{2}. The phraseology of 3^{14} (cf. 7^{52} 22^{14}) 4^{12} 10^{4} 17^{31} recalls *Enoch*, xxxviii. 2, xlviii. 7, xcix. 3, and xli. 9 respectively. In St. Stephen's speech ($7^{36. 38f.}$) R. H. Charles finds distinct evidence of dependence on the *Assumption of Moses* (iii. 11–13). There is here also (7^{16}) betrayed an acquaintance with extra-canonical Jewish tradition regarding the burial of Joseph's brethren, as it was afterwards committed to writing in the *Book of Jubilees* (xlvi. 9 f.). Finally, St. Paul's great speech at Athens brings classical poetry into the service of Christ. The final clause of 17^{28}, *Τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν* ('for we are also his offspring') has long been recognized as an exact quotation from Aratus' *Phænomena*, line 5 (cf. the similar phrase, *ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ γένος ἐσμέν*, from Cleanthes' *Hymn to Jove*, line 4). But Rendel Harris has recently traced the immediately preceding words ('for in him we live and move and have our being') to the *Minos* of the Cretan poet, Epimenides, from which also Tit 1^{12} is drawn, the text being restored as follows:

τύμβον ἐτεκτήναντο σέθεν, κύδιστε, μέγιστε,
Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί.
Ἀλλὰ σύ γ' οὐ θνήσκεις, ἕστηκας γὰρ ζοὸς αἰεί,
ἐν γὰρ σοὶ ζῶμεν καὶ κινύμεθ' ἠδὲ καὶ ἐσμέν

(cf. *Exp*, 8th ser., iv. [1912] 348 ff.).

2. The Pauline Epistles.—These are peculiarly rich in allusions. Every important doctrinal argument is buttressed by an appeal to Scripture; and even moral counsels are, as a rule, referred to some basal principle of the OT. The Apostle's ordinary language is likewise steeped in OT phraseology. Here too the LXX is the great storehouse of literary reference. 'More than half of the direct quotations of the OT in the Epistles of St. Paul are taken from the LXX without material change' (H. B. Swete, *Introduction to the OT in Greek*, Cambridge, 1900, p. 400). In the remaining cases he allows himself considerable freedom, sometimes quoting from memory, or otherwise altering the text for the purpose immediately in view, though occasionally there is evidence of direct translation from the Hebrew.

(*a*) The *Epistle to the Romans* is a veritable mine of quotations. Exact reproductions of the LXX are found as follows: 3^{4b}=Ps 51^{4b}; 4^{3} (cf. v.$^{5ff.}$) =Gn 15^{6}; $4^{7f.}$=Ps $32^{1f.}$; 4^{17} (*πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν τέθεικά σε*) is excerpted from Gn 17^{5}; 4^{18} (*οὕτως ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου*) from Gn 15^{5}; 7^{7} (*οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις*) from the Decalogue (Ex 20^{17}); 8^{36}=Ps 44^{22}; 9^{7} (*ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεταί σοι σπέρμα*) comes from Gn 21^{12}; 9^{12} (*ὁ μείζων δουλεύσει τῷ ἐλάσσονι*) from Gn 25^{23}; 9^{15}=Ex 33^{19}; 9^{29}=Is 1^{9}; 10^{13}=Jl 2^{32}; 10^{16}=Is 53^{1a}; 10^{18}=Ps 19^{4}; 12^{20}=Pr $25^{21f.}$ (omitting the last words); 13^{9} (*ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν*) comes from Lv 19^{18}; 15^{3}=Ps 69^{9}; 15^{9}=Ps 18^{49}; 15^{10} (*εὐφράνθητε, ἔθνη, μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ*) from Dt 32^{43}; and 15^{11} (acc. to certain MSS)=Ps 117^{1}. The quotation from Hab 2^{4} introduced in 1^{17} is identical with the LXX save for the omission of *μού* (ct. Heb. בֶּאֱמוּנָתוֹ, 'through his faith'); 2^{6} likewise differs from Pr 24^{12} only in the pronouns. The long citation, 3^{10-18}, opens with a phrase from Ec 7^{20}; the rest is almost an exact reproduction of the LXX text of Ps 14^{1-3}, though this is really a conflate of various OT passages (Ps 5^{9} 140^{3} 10^{7}, Is $59^{7f.}$, and Ps 36^{1}) interwoven with the original. 3^{20} is clearly introduced as a quotation (from Ps 143^{2}), but differs considerably from both the Hebrew and the LXX; 9^{9} is a free, abbreviated reference to Gn $18^{10. 14}$, and 9^{13} a citation from Mal $1^{2f.}$, with a trifling transposition of the opening words. 9^{17} (from Ex 9^{16}) shows a distinct approach to the original Hebrew. On the other hand, $9^{25f. 27f. 32f.}$ are free reproductions of the thought of Hos 1^{10} 2^{23}, Is $10^{22f.}$ 28^{16} (blended with 8^{14}) respectively, in the last instance so free as to yield a sense quite contrary to the original. The final clause of 9^{33} is repeated in 10^{11} with the addition of *πᾶς*; while 10^{5} is a direct application of Lv 18^{5} to 'the righteousness that is of the law.' The long passage on the nearness and saving power of the Word of God (10^{6-9}) is another free compound of Dt 9^{4} 30^{11-14}, etc. 10^{15} (from Is 52^{7}) gives further evidence of direct use of the Hebrew; 10^{19} differs from the LXX text of Dt 32^{21} only in the substitution of the personal pronoun 'you' for 'them,' and $10^{20f.}$ from Is $65^{1f.}$ in a slight transposition of words. $11^{3f.}$ (from 1 K $19^{10ff.}$) has been altered and transposed under Hebrew influence. 11^{8} is a free blend of ideas from Is 29^{10}, Dt 29^{4}, etc. (with traces of Hebrew influence); $11^{26f.}$ is also a complex from Is $59^{20f.}$ (in the main) and Ps 14^{7}, Is 27^{9}, etc. $11^{9f.}$, again, is a close, though abbreviated, citation of Ps $69^{22f.}$, and $11^{34f.}$ is but slightly altered from

Is $40^{13f.}$ (in the fuller reading of ℵA, etc.). 12^{19} (from Dt 32^{35}) shows the same approach to the original Hebrew as the Targum of Onkelos. 14^{11} is a somewhat free rendering of Is 45^{23}, with introductory phrase from Is 49^{18}, or a similar context; 15^{12} is an abbreviated reference to Is 11^{10} (cf. Is 42^{4}); and 15^{21} is the exact equivalent of Is 52^{15}, except for the transposition of *ὄψονται*.

(*b*) A number of these citations are repeated in *other Epistles of St. Paul*. Thus the fundamental assertion of justification by faith (Ro 1^{17} = Hab 2^{4}) reappears in Gal 3^{11}, and the texts Ro 3^{20} (from Ps 143^{2}) in Gal 2^{16}; Ro 4^{3} (= Gn 15^{6}) in Gal 3^{6}; Ro 10^{5} (from Lv 18^{5}) in Gal 3^{12}; Ro 13^{9b} (from Lv 19^{18}) in Gal 5^{14}; and Ro 11^{34} (from Is 40^{13}) in 1 Co 2^{16} (a different close being here adopted).

Fresh quotations from the OT are found as follows: Gal 4^{27} = Is 54^{1}; 4^{30} = Gn 21^{10} (with the significant change of *τῆς ἐλευθέρας* instead of *Ἰσαάκ*); 3^{8}, a blend of the promises in Gn 12^{3} 18^{18}, etc.; 3^{10}, from Dt 27^{26}, with phrase inwoven from Dt 9^{11}; 3^{13}, an abbreviated, and slightly altered, citation from Dt 21^{23}; 3^{16}, a direct application to Christ of the promise to Abraham and his 'seed' (Gn 12^{7} 13^{15} 17^{8}, etc.).

The closing phrase of 1 Co 6^{16} comes directly from Gn 2^{24} (the whole verse being reproduced in Eph 5^{31}); 9^{9} (in reading of ℵAD, etc.) = Dt 25^{4} (repeated in 1 Ti 5^{18} with transposition of words); 10^{7} = Ex 32^{6}; 10^{26}, a phrase from Ps 24^{1}; 15^{32} = Is 22^{13}; $1^{19f.}$ comes from Is 29^{14}, with alteration of verb; 1^{31} (repeated in 2 Co 10^{17}) is a free reproduction of Jer 9^{23}, and 2^{9} a very free rendering, perhaps through independent Jewish channels (cf. below), of the ideas in Is 64^{4}, with suggestions from Is 65^{16} or Jer 3^{16}; 3^{19} is from Job 5^{13}, under direct influence of the Hebrew; 3^{20}, from Ps 94^{11}, with 'of the wise' substituted for 'of men' (to make the application more apt); 10^{20} (*δαιμονίοις καὶ οὐ θεῷ θύουσιν*) from Dt 32^{17}, with a change in the order of words; 14^{21}, a very free citation, supported by *λέγει Κύριος*, of Is $28^{11f.}$; 14^{34} $15^{3.\,4.\,15.\,45.\,47}$, free allusions to Gn 3^{16}, Is 53^{12}, Hos 6^{2}, and Gn 2^{7}, all adduced as 'written' or Scriptural authorities; 15^{27} (cf. Eph 1^{22}, Ph 3^{21}), from Ps 8^{6} with direct reference to the Hebrew; $15^{54f.}$, a free conflate of Is 25^{8} and Hos 13^{14}.

2 Co 4^{13} (*ἐπίστευσα διὸ ἐλάλησα*) exactly = Ps 116^{10}; 6^{2} = Is 49^{8}; 9^{9} = Ps 112^{9}; 13^{1} (cf. 1 Ti 5^{19}) = Dt 19^{15} (Luc.); 4^{6}, a free blend of Gn $1^{2f.}$, Is $9^{1f.}$, etc.; 6^{16}, a loose conflate of Ezk 37^{27} and Lv $26^{11f.}$; 6^{17}, abbreviated from Is 52^{11} and Ezk 20^{34}; 6^{18}, a compound of Jer 31^{9}, Is 43^{6}, 2 S 7^{8}, etc.; 8^{15}, from Ex 16^{18}, with direct approach to the Hebrew; 9^{7}, a free reproduction of Pr 22^{9} (cf. Ex 25^{2}).

Eph 4^{8} is from Ps 68^{18}, with the *ἔλαβες* boldly altered to *ἔδωκεν*, to make it more applicable to the Giver of good; 4^{25}, from Zec 8^{16} with the אֶת more accurately rendered by *μετὰ τοῦ*; 4^{26}, an excerpt from Ps 4^{4}; 5^{14}, a very free reproduction of Is $60^{1.\,19f.}$ (cf. below); 5^{18}, from Pr 23^{31} (with *οἴνῳ* for *ἐν οἴνοις*); $6^{2f.}$, from the Decalogue (Ex 20^{12}), the motive being somewhat altered, and a new clause added to emphasize the element of 'promise.'

Ph 1^{19} is a literal extract from Job 13^{16}; and the two 'seals' of 2 Ti 2^{19} are free citations of Nu 16^{5} and Is 26^{13} respectively. Direct quotations from the OT are not found in Colossians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, Titus, or Philemon.

Among the more striking reminiscences may be noted Ro 1^{23} (cf. Dt $4^{15\text{-}18}$, Ps 106^{20}); 2^{5} (cf. Ps 110^{5}, Zeph 1^{18}); 3^{4a} (cf. Ps 116^{11}); $3^{29f.}$ (cf. Mal 2^{10}); 4^{11} (cf. Gn 17^{11}); $4^{13.\,16}$ (cf. Gn 12^{7} 13^{15}, etc.); 4^{19} (cf. Gn 17^{17}, etc.); 4^{25} $5^{19.\,32}$ (cf. Is 53^{12}); 5^{5} (cf. Ps $22^{4f.}$ 25^{20}); $7^{8.\,11}$ (cf. Gn $2^{16f.}$ $3^{1ff.}$); 8^{27} (cf. Heb. text of Ps 7^{9}); $8^{33f.}$ (cf. Is $50^{8f.}$); $9^{20f.}$ (cf. Is 29^{16} 45^{9}); $11^{1f.}$ (cf. Ps 94^{14}); $11^{16ff.}$ (cf. Jer 11^{16}); 11^{25} 12^{16} (cf. Is 5^{21}, Pr 3^{7}); 12^{14} (cf. Ps 109^{28}); 12^{17} (cf. Pr 3^{4}).

1 Co 1^{2} (cf. Jl 2^{32}); 1^{20} (cf. Is $19^{11f.}$ 33^{18}); 3^{11} (cf. Is 28^{16}); 5^{7} (cf. Ex 12^{15}); 6^{2} (cf. Dn $7^{18ff.}$); 6^{17} (cf. 2 K 18^{6}); 8^{6} (cf. Dt $4^{35.\,39}$, Mal 2^{10}, etc.); 9^{7} (cf. Dt 20^{6}, Pr 27^{18}, etc.); 9^{13} (cf. Dt $18^{1ff.}$, Nu $18^{8ff.}$); $10^{1ff.}$, from Ex $13^{2ff.}$ (combined with tradition); 10^{22} (cf. Dt 32^{21}); 11^{7} (cf. Gn $1^{26f.}$); 14^{25} (cf. Is 45^{14}, Zec 8^{23}); 15^{31} (cf. Ps 44^{22}).

2 Co $3^{3.\,7}$ (cf. Ex 31^{18}, Jer 31^{33}, Ezk 11^{19}, etc.); $3^{7ff.}$ (cf. Ex $34^{29ff.}$); 4^{11} (cf. Ps 44^{22}); 5^{10} (cf. Ec 12^{14}); 5^{17} (cf. Is $43^{18f.}$); 6^{9} (cf. Ps $118^{17f.}$); 6^{11} (cf. Ps 119^{32}); 7^{6} (cf. Is 49^{13}); 8^{21} (cf. Pr 3^{4}); 9^{10} (cf. Is 55^{10}, Hos 10^{12}); 11^{3} (cf. Gn 3^{4}).

Gal 1^{4} (cf. Is 53^{12}); $1^{15f.}$ (cf. Jer 1^{5}); 3^{17} (cf. Ex $12^{40f.}$); 3^{20} (cf. Mal 2^{10}); 6^{16} (cf. Ps 125^{5}, etc.).

Eph 1^{20} (cf. Ps 110^{1}); 1^{22} (cf. Ps 8^{6}); $2^{13ff.}$ (cf. Is 57^{19}); 2^{19} (cf. Lv 25^{23}); 2^{20} (cf. Is 28^{16}); 4^{6} (cf. Dt 6^{4}); $4^{9f.}$ (cf. Dt $30^{12ff.}$); 5^{2} (cf. Gn 8^{21}, Ex 29^{18}, etc.); $5^{22ff.}$ (cf. Gn 3^{16}); 6^{14} (cf. Is 11^{5} 59^{17}, etc.); 6^{15} (cf. Is 52^{7}); 6^{17} (cf. Is 49^{2} 51^{16} 59^{17}).

Ph $2^{10f.}$ (cf. Is 45^{23}); 2^{15} (cf. Dt 32^{5}); 2^{16} (cf. Is 49^{4} 65^{23}); 3^{3} (cf. Jer $9^{23f.}$); 3^{21} (cf. Ps 8^{6}); 4^{3} (cf. Ps 69^{28}, etc.).

Col 2^{3} (cf. Is 45^{3}); 2^{22} (cf. Is 29^{13}); 3^{1} (cf. Ps 110^{1}); 3^{10} (cf. Gn 1^{27}); 3^{18} (cf. Gn 3^{16}).

1 Th 2^{4} (cf. Jer 11^{20}); 2^{16} (cf. Gn 15^{16}, Dt 8^{23}); 4^{8} (cf. Ezk 11^{19} $36^{26f.}$, Ps 51^{11}); 5^{8} (cf. Is 59^{17}); 5^{22} (Job $1^{1.\,8}$).

2 Th 1^{8} (cf. Ex 3^{2}, Is 66^{15}); $1^{9f.}$ (cf. Is $2^{10ff.}$, Ps 89^{8}); 1^{12} (cf. Is 24^{15} 49^{3} 66^{5}); 2^{4} (cf. Dn 11^{36}, etc.); 2^{8} (cf. Is 11^{4}); 2^{13} (cf. Dt 33^{12}).

1 Ti 1^{17} (cf. Dt 4^{35}, etc.); 2^{6} (cf. Is $53^{4ff.}$); $2^{11f.}$ (cf. Gn 3^{16}); 2^{14} (cf. Gn $3^{6ff.}$); 6^{1} (cf. Is 52^{5}); 6^{15} (cf. Dt 10^{17}, Ps 136^{3}, Dn 2^{47}, etc.).

2 Ti 4^{14} (cf. Ps 28^{4} 62^{12}); 4^{17} (cf. Dn 6^{20}).

Tit 2^{5} (cf. Gn 3^{16}); 2^{14} (cf. Ex 19^{5}, Is $53^{4ff.}$, Ezk 37^{23}, etc.).

The Pauline Epistles also show the influence of apocryphal books. A clear instance is found in Ro 12^{15}, compared with Sir 7^{34} (*μὴ ὑστέρει ἀπὸ κλαιόντων, καὶ μετὰ πενθούντων πένθησον*); cf., further, Ro 2^{11} (Sir $32^{15f.}$) 16^{27} (Sir 1^{8}), 1 Co 6^{12} (Sir 37^{28}), 6^{13} (Sir 36^{23}) $7^{13.\,36}$ (Sir $42^{9f.}$), Col 2^{3} (Sir 1^{25}), 1 Th 4^{6} (Sir 5^{3}). Between Romans and the Wisdom of Solomon there are several close parallels betraying St. Paul's intimate acquaintance with the latter; cf., especially, Ro $1^{18ff.}$ (Wis $13^{1ff.}$ $14^{8f.}$), 8^{18} (Wis $3^{4ff.}$), $9^{19f.}$ (Wis 12^{12}), 9^{21} (Wis 15^{7}), 9^{31} (Wis 2^{11}), 11^{32} (Wis 11^{23}), 13^{10} (Wis 6^{18}). Of the other Epistles, cf. 1 Co 11^{7} (Wis 2^{23}) $15^{45.\,47}$ (Wis 15^{11}), 2 Co $5^{1ff.}$ (Wis 9^{15}), Eph 1^{18}, Col 1^{12} (Wis 5^{5}), Eph 2^{12} (Wis 3^{18}), $6^{11ff.}$ (Wis $5^{17ff.}$), 1 Th 1^{10} (Wis 16^{8}). To a common use of Wisdom are no doubt to be traced the frequent resemblances between the Epistles and Philo. A considerable list of parallels with the *Book of Enoch* has been drawn up by Charles, the most obvious being Ro 8^{38}, Eph 1^{21}, Col 1^{16} (*En.* lxi. 10), Ro 9^{5}, 2 Co 11^{31} (*En.* lxxvii. 1), Ph 2^{10} (*En.* xlviii. 5), Col 2^{8} (*En.* xlvi. 3), 2 Th 1^{7} (*En.* lxi. 10), 1 Ti 1^{15} (*En.* xciv. 1). The very free citation, 1 Co 2^{9}, is referred by Origen and other Church Fathers to the *Apocalypse of Elijah*, and is actually found in the Latin version (ii. 34); this may well have been the direct source, its ultimate dependence on the OT explaining the formula *κάθως γέγραπται* (cf. 1 Clem. xxxiv. 8, where the text recurs in almost the same form, though in a different context). Eph 5^{14} is likewise traced by Epiphanius to the *Apocalypse of Elijah*, though other Fathers give different sources (Isaiah, or an apocryphal work of Jeremiah); it may, however, be but a loose rendering of Is $60^{1.\,19f.}$ (cf. above). Further acquaintance with Jewish tradition—probably derived from the actual *Book of Jannes and Jambres* mentioned by Origen (on Mt 27^{9})—is presupposed in the reference to the withstanding of Moses (2 Ti 3^{8}). Various phrases recall the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*: *e.g.* Ro 1^{32} (*Asher*, vi. 2) 12^{21} (*Benj.* iv. 3), 2 Co 7^{10} (*Gad*, v. 7), 1 Th 2^{16}

(Levi, vi. 11). There are also two direct citations of classical texts: 1 Co 15^{33} ('evil communications corrupt good manners') from Menander's *Thais*—ultimately perhaps from a lost play of Euripides (cf. Socrates, *HE* iii. 16)—and the verse from the 'prophet' of the Cretans (Tit 1^{12}), an excerpt from the *Minos* of Epimenides already alluded to (cf. Ac 17^{28}). Both were apparently common tags, *Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται* being introduced as a familiar quotation in Callimachus, *ad Jovem*, line 8. The Apostle may thus have received them from floating tradition, instead of direct acquaintance with the texts. The analogies with stoical writings and the mystery-religions, at all events, show the influence of the *Zeitgeist* rather than first-hand study of the literature (cf. H. A. A. Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions*, 1913).

The Apostle reveals in his letters a varied knowledge of Christian tradition and even words and deeds of Jesus, afterwards embodied in the Gospels. Thus in 1 Co 7^{10} (on divorce) he contrasts his own advice with definite instructions of our Lord, which may be compared with Mt 5^{32} 19^{9} and parallel passages. His counsel to remain unmarried because of the coming distress (1 Co $7^{25ff.}$) recalls Mt 24^{19}, etc. The Christian principle of living by the gospel (1 Co 9^{14}) is directly referred to the Master's ordinance (cf. Mt 10^{10}, Lk 10^{7}). The words of institution at the Lord's Supper (1 Co $11^{23ff.}$) are in close harmony with Mt $26^{26ff.}$ and parallel passages, and belong undoubtedly to common tradition. Other reminiscences of the Gospels (or their sources) are found in 1 Co 11^{19} (cf. Mt 10^{34}, etc.); 1 Co 13^{2} (cf. Mt 17^{20}, etc.); 2 Co 1^{17} (cf. Mt 5^{37}); Gal 5^{14} (cf. Mt $22^{39f.}$, etc.); 1 Th $2^{15f.}$ (cf. Mt $23^{31f.}$); 1 Th 4^{8} (cf. Lk 10^{16}); 1 Th $4^{16f.}$ (cf. Mt $24^{30f.}$); 1 Th $5^{1ff.}$ (cf. Mt $24^{36ff.}$).

3. The Epistle to the Hebrews.—This Epistle equals Romans in its dependence on the OT. It is, indeed, 'in great part a catena of quotations' (Swete, p. 402). A considerable number are either wholly or virtually exact: 1^{5a} (5^{5})=Ps 2^{7}; 1^{5b}=2 S 7^{14}; 1^{6b}=Dt 32^{43} (in Lucian's recension); 1^{8b}=LXX addition to Ps $45^{6f.}$ (with one or two changes, absent from certain MSS); 1^{10-12}=Ps 102^{25-27} (with slight textual differences); 1^{13}=Ps 110^{1}; 2^{6-8} (with addition in ℵAD, etc.)=Ps 8^{4-6}; 2^{13b}=Is 8^{18}; 3^{7-11} (individual verses repeated in 3^{15} $4^{3.\,5.\,7}$)=Ps 95^{7-11} (with slight textual differences, not found in several MSS); 4^{4} (cf. 4^{10})=Gn 2^{2} (Luc.); 5^{6} (cf. 7^{17} and, with variations, 5^{10} 6^{20} $7^{11.\,21}$)=Ps 110^{4}; 10^{30b}=Dt 32^{35}; 13^{6}=Ps 118^{6}. Of the remaining citations, 1^{7}=Ps 104^{4}, with *πυρὸς φλόγα* for *πῦρ φλέγον* (A: *πυρὸς φλέγα*)=Heb. אֵשׁ לֹהֵט; 2^{12}=Ps 22^{22}, with *ἀπαγγελῶ* for *διηγήσομαι* (Heb. אֲסַפְּרָה); 2^{13a}=Is 8^{17}, with transposition of words; $6^{13f.}$, from Gn $22^{16f.}$, exact, but abbreviated; 7^{1-10}, a historical survey depending, often literally, on Gn $14^{17ff.}$; 8^{5}=Ex 25^{40}, with *δειχθέντα* for *δεδειγμένον*; 8^{8-12} (abbreviated, and somewhat altered, in $10^{16f.}$), from Jer 31^{31-34}, with certain alterations pointing the prophecy directly to Christ; 9^{20} (cf. 10^{29} 13^{20}), from Ex 24^{8}, with changes, in part suggested by the words of institution (cf. Mt $26^{26ff.}$, etc.); 10^{5-7} (repeated with changes in v.$^{8f.}$), from Ps 40^{6-8}, with accidental and other alterations; 10^{30a}, from Dt 32^{35}, in the same form as in Ro 12^{19}; 10^{37}, from Hab $2^{3f.}$, the principle of justification repeated as in Ro 1^{17} (the two instances thus pointing to some common original, either in tradition, or in a written collection of Messianic prophecies), and a *ὁ* inserted before *ἐρχόμενος* to give the text a still clearer Messianic reference; $11^{4ff.}$, the roll-call of heroes, drawn from the historical books from Gen. onwards, often with close dependence on the texts (cf. vv.$^{5.\,18.\,21}$ with Gn 5^{24} 21^{12} and 47^{31} respectively); $12^{5f.}$ (detailed application in vv.$^{7-11}$), from Ps $3^{11f.}$, with verbal changes due probably to textual transmission; 12^{20}, a free reproduction of Ex 19^{13}, probably from memory; 12^{21}, from Dt 9^{19}, with addition of *καὶ ἔντρομος*; 12^{26}, from Hag 2^{6}, verbally altered to emphasize the argument; 12^{29}, from Dt 4^{24}, with *γάρ* added in harmony with Heb. כִּי; 13^{5}, from Dt $31^{6.\,8}$, changed into the form of a direct quotation by the use of the first person; 13^{20}, a complex of phrases from Is 63^{11} and Jer 32^{40}, etc.

Among reminiscences of OT texts may be given 1^{3} (cf. Ps 110^{1}); $3^{2.\,5}$ (cf. Nu 12^{7}); 3^{17} (cf. Nu $14^{29.\,32f.}$); 6^{8} (cf. Gn $3^{17f.}$); 6^{19} 10^{20} (cf. Ex 26^{33}, Lv 16^{2}); 8^{1} $10^{12f.}$ 12^{2} (cf. Ps 110^{1}); 8^{2} (cf. Nu 24^{6}); $9^{2ff.}$ (cf. Ex $26^{1ff.}$); 9^{28} (cf. Is 53^{12}); 10^{27} (cf. Is 26^{11}); 10^{28} (cf. Dt 17^{6}); 12^{12} (cf. Is 35^{3}, Sir 25^{23}); 12^{13} (cf. Pr 4^{26}); 12^{15} (cf. Dt 29^{18}); 12^{16} (cf. Gn 25^{33}); 12^{17} (cf. Gn 27^{38}); $12^{18ff.}$ (cf. Ex $19^{16ff.}$); 13^{2} (cf. Gn 18^{3} $19^{1ff.}$); 13^{11} (cf. Lv 16^{27}); 13^{15} (cf. Ps $50^{14.\,23}$, Hos 14^{3}).

In 1^{3} we have another clear mark of the influence of Wis. ($7^{25f.}$). The description of the martyrdoms in $11^{35f.}$ probably derives certain elements from 1 Mac 9^{26}, 2 Mac $6^{10ff.}$ $7^{1ff.}$, etc., as well as the tradition of Isaiah's death by sawing (*Ascension of Isaiah*, v. 11–14). A few passages recall the *Book of Enoch*, *e.g.* 4^{13} (*En.* ix. 5); 11^{10} (*En.* xc. 29). A suggestion of the 'words of institution' has been found in 9^{20}, while the reference to the Master's 'strong crying and tears' (5^{7}) recalls the scene in Gethsemane (cf. Mt $26^{36ff.}$), though known to the writer only from tradition. In Hebrews there is no trace of classical literature.

4. The Catholic Epistles.—(*a*) *James.*—The practical character of James necessitates less reliance on OT authority. Of direct quotations in his Epistle there are but six, $2^{8.\,23}$ and 4^{6} being virtually exact reproductions of the LXX text of Lv 19^{18}, Gn 15^{6}, and Pr 3^{34} respectively, 2^{11} an original version of the Decalogue (Ex $20^{13.\,15}$), 5^{20} a rendering of Pr 10^{12} with direct dependence on the Hebrew (though here possibly introduced from an intermediate source), and 4^{5} a reference to some unknown passage definitely recognized as 'Scripture.' In addition there are various reminiscences of OT and apocryphal books: *e.g.* $1^{9f.}$ (cf. Jer 9^{23}); $1^{10f.}$ (cf. Is $40^{6f.}$); 1^{19} (cf. Pr 14^{29} 17^{27}, Ec 7^{9}); 2^{21} (cf. Gn 22^{9}); 2^{25} (cf. Jos $2^{1ff.}$ 6^{17}); 5^{3} (cf. Ps 21^{9}); 5^{4} (cf. Is 5^{9}, Ps 18^{6}, etc.); 5^{7} (cf. Dt 11^{14}); 5^{11} (cf. Ps 103^{8} 111^{4}, etc.); $5^{17f.}$ (cf. 1 K $17^{1ff.}$ $18^{1ff.}$); 1^{5} (cf. Sir 20^{15}); 1^{13} (cf. Sir $15^{11f.}$); 1^{19} (cf. Sir 5^{11}); 5^{1-6} (cf. *En.* xciv. 8–11). The remarkable feature about the Epistle, however, is the number of correspondences with sayings of Jesus, especially those included in the Sermon on the Mount, *e.g.* $1^{2f.}$ (cf. Mt 5^{3-12}); 1^{5-8} (cf. Mt 6^{6-15}); $1^{10f.}$ (cf. Mt 6^{19-21}); $1^{22f.}$ (cf. Mt $7^{21ff.}$); $1^{26f.}$ (cf. Mt 6^{1-7}); $3^{11f.}$ (cf. Mt 7^{16-20}); 4^{3} (cf. Mt 7^{7}); 5^{12} (cf. Mt 5^{33-37}). The mind of the Apostle was evidently saturated with Jesus' thoughts and words; and they came to him unbidden in a form resembling their original. The relation of the Epistle to other parts of the NT belongs rather to the region of literary criticism.

(*b*) Of the other Catholic Epistles, *1 Peter* offers a number of quotations from the OT, some of them exact equivalents of the LXX, as 1^{16}=Lv $11^{44f.}$; 2^{7}=Ps 118^{22}; 3^{10-12}=Ps 34^{12-16a} (with simple change from imperative to jussive); $3^{14f.}$=Is $8^{12f.}$ (with *Χριστὸν* instead of *Κύριον*); 4^{18}=Pr 11^{31} (a passage where the LXX differs widely from the original); 5^{5}=Pr 3^{34}; while others show distinct evidence of the Hebrew, *e.g.* $1^{24f.}$ (from Is 40^{6-8}), 2^{6} (from Is 28^{16}), 2^{8} (from Is 8^{14}), 4^{8} (from Pr 10^{12}); 2^{10} is a free reproduction of the thought of Hos 2^{23}; 2^{9} a loose conflate of Ex $19^{5f.}$, Is $43^{20f.}$; and 2^{22} of Is 53^{9}, Zeph 3^{13}. Reminiscences of OT texts may be traced in 1^{18} (cf. Is 52^{3}), 2^{3} (cf. Ps 34^{8}), $2^{4f.}$ (cf. Ps 118^{22}), 2^{17} (cf. Pr 24^{21}), 3^{6} (cf. Pr 3^{25}), 4^{14b} (cf. Is 11^{2}), 5^{7} (cf. Ps 55^{22}); while a direct allusion to the *Book of Enoch* (x. 4–6, 12 f.) is found in $3^{19f.}$.

The author is further acquainted, not merely with Synoptic tradition, and parts at least of Acts, but also with the Epistles to the Romans and Ephesians (on details, and the bearing of the facts, cf. the standard NT Introductions and Commentaries, or the art. on ‘Peter, First Epistle of’ in *HDB*).

(*c*) In contrast, *2 Peter* and *Jude* show little trace of the influence either of the OT Scriptures or of Christian tradition and literature. The only explicit citation of the OT is in 2 P 2^{22}, where the saying from Pr 26^{11} (‘the dog returning to his own vomit again’), directly translated from the Hebrew, is referred to as ‘the true proverb.’ There are, however, a few suggestions of OT texts, *e.g.* 2 P $2^{4ff.}$ (cf. Gn $6^{1ff.}$); $2^{15f.}$ (cf. Nu $22^{5ff.}$); 3^{6} (cf. Gn $7^{21ff.}$); 3^{8} (Ps 90^{4}); 3^{9} (Is 46^{13}); 3^{13} (cf. Is 65^{17} 66^{22}); Jude ^{9} (ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος), from Zec 3^{2}. But the most remarkable fact about these Epistles is their dependence on apocryphal writings. 1 Pet. had already alluded to the legend of the fallen angels as narrated in *En.* x. 4–6, 12 f. The same context is drawn from, in still more detail, by 2 P $2^{4f.}$ and Jude ^{6}. An actual quotation from *En.* (i. 9) is given in Jude $^{14f.}$, and introduced as a prophecy of ‘Enoch, the seventh from Adam.’ According to the united testimony of the Church Fathers, the reference to the contest of Michael for the body of Moses (Jude ^{9}) comes from the *Assumption of Moses*; while v.^{16} is composed of fragments from v. 5, vii. 7, 9 (Latin text) of the *Testament of Moses.* The language of Jude $^{6.\,7.\,18}$ likewise recalls the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (*Napht.* iii. 4, *Asher*, vii. 1). The parallels in 2 Pet. are doubtless derived from Jude.

(*d*) The only OT allusion in the *Epistles of John* is found in 1 Jn 3^{12} (cf. Gn 4^{8}). There are naturally, however, many reminiscences of the Fourth Gospel. For these compare Commentaries, etc.

5. **Revelation.**—In Revelation there are no formal citations, but the whole work is saturated with OT allusions. These are drawn from almost the entire range of the OT Canon, though Psalms, Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel contribute by far the largest number. The *Book of Enoch*, and probably other apocalyptic works, add to the writer's treasury of symbols. Here too the LXX supplies the basis; but the writer seems occasionally to have used Theodotion or some other Greek version, and often to have gone direct to the Hebrew. In the present article only a few representative allusions can be offered; for the rest such sources as Westcott and Hort's Greek text and Swete's *Apocalypse*^{2}, p. cxxxix ff., must be referred to.

The coming of the Messiah with the clouds (1^{7}) is clearly based on Dn 7^{13}, and the rest of the verse on Zec $12^{10\text{-}14}$. The actual description ($1^{13ff.}$) closely follows Dn $7^{9ff.}$ $10^{5ff.}$. Various expressions in the Letters to the Churches recall OT phraseology, *e.g.* 2^{7} (Gn 2^{9}) 2^{17} (Is 62^{6}) $2^{26f.}$ (Ps $2^{8f.}$) 3^{7} (Is 22^{22}) 3^{14} (Pr 8^{22}) 3^{19} (Pr 3^{12}) 3^{20} (Ca 5^{2}). The vision of the King on the throne ($4^{2ff.}$) rests on Is $6^{1ff.}$, Ezk $1^{26ff.}$ (cf. *En.* xiv. 18 ff.); that of the sealed book ($5^{1ff.}$) on Ezk $2^{9f.}$ (cf. *En.* lxxxix. 70 f., xc. 20). The number of the worshipping angels (5^{11}) follows Dn 7^{10} (cf. *En.* xiv. 22). The vision of the horses ($6^{2ff.}$) is based on Zec $1^{8ff.}$, and the earthquake (6^{12}) on Jl 2^{10}; the hiding in the rocks ($6^{15f.}$) on Is $2^{10ff.}$, and the ‘day of wrath’ (6^{17}) on Jl 2^{11} 3^{4}, etc. The picture of the final blessedness of the saints ($7^{15\text{-}17}$) recalls Is 49^{10}, *En.* xlviii. 1. The fall of the star (8^{10} 9^{1}) is based on Is 14^{12} (cf. *En.* lxxxvi. 1), and the plague of locusts ($9^{3ff.}$) on Jl $1^{6ff.}$. The allusion to the worship of demons and idols (9^{20}) recalls Dt 32^{17}, Dn $5^{4.\,23}$, the sealing of the vision (10^{4}) Dn $12^{4.\,9}$, and the eating of the book ($10^{8ff.}$) Ezk $2^{8f.}$ $3^{1ff.}$. The measuring of the new temple ($11^{1ff.}$) is based on Ezk $40^{3ff.}$, the olive trees and candlesticks (11^{4}) on Zec $4^{2ff.}$, the raising of the dead martyrs (11^{11}) on Ezk $37^{5ff.}$, and the Messiah's eternal reign (11^{15}) on Ps $2^{2f.}$. The description of the dragon ($12^{3f.}$) is suggested by Dn $7^{7ff.}$, and that of the Beast with the horns ($13^{1ff.}$) by Dn $7^{3\text{-}7}$. The peal for the fall of Babylon (14^{8} 18^{2}) comes from Is 21^{9} (combined with Dn 4^{27}). The vision of the sickle ($14^{15ff.}$) follows Jl 3^{13}, the ‘Song of Moses’ recalls Ex $15^{1f.}$ and the description of the ‘fear’ (15^{4}) Jer 10^{7}. The account of the last plagues ($16^{1ff.}$) is based on that of the plagues of Egypt (Ex $7^{17ff.}$), and the language used to describe the terror of the earthquake (16^{18}) recalls Dn 12^{1}. The actual description of Babylon and her downfall ($18^{4ff.}$) follows various prophetic passages (Is $47^{7\text{-}9}$ 52^{11}, Jer $50^{8ff.}$, etc.). The treading of the winepress ($19^{13ff.}$) recalls Is $63^{1\text{-}3}$, and the mention of Gog and Magog (20^{8}) Ezk $38^{1ff.}$, the judgment scene ($20^{11ff.}$) Dn $7^{9f.}$, *En.* xlvii. 3, and the yielding up of the dead (20^{13}) *En.* li. 1. The picture of the New Jerusalem ($21^{10ff.}$) contains features from Ezk $40^{1ff.}$, Is $52^{1ff.}$ $60^{1ff.}$, To 13^{16}, etc., while the passing of the curse and the dawn of everlasting day for the righteous ($22^{3ff.}$) is clearly reminiscent of Zec $14^{7ff.}$.

LITERATURE.—D. McC. Turpie, *The Old Testament in the New*, 1868; C. H. Toy, *Quotations in the New Testament*, 1884; F. Johnson, *The Quotations of the New Testament from the Old*, 1897; W. Dittmar, *Vet. Test. in Novo*, pt. ii., 1903 (a very useful compendium, the texts being quoted in full, both in Gr. and Heb.); E. Hühn, *Die alttest. Citate und Reminiscenzen im Neuen Testament*, 1900 (very full); F. H. Woods, art. ‘Quotations’ in *HDB* iv. 184 ff. Cf. also Westcott and Hort, *The New Testament in Greek*, ii. [1882] Appendix; H. B. Swete, *Introd. to NT in Greek*, 1900, p. 381 ff., *Apocalypse*^{2}, 1907, p. cxxxix ff.; Sanday-Headlam, *ICC*, ‘Romans’^{5}, 1902, p. 51 f.; B. F. Westcott, *Hebrews*, 1889, p. 67 ff.; J. B. Mayor, *James*^{3}, 1910, p. lxix ff., *Jude and 2 Peter*, 1907, p. cliii ff.; R. H. Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 1893 (^{2}1912), p. 41 ff., *Assumption of Moses*, 1897, p. lxii ff., *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 1908, p. lxxviii ff., *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, 1913, i. 199, 294 f., 525 ff., ii. 180 f., 292, 412 f.

A. R. GORDON.

R

RACE.—See GAMES.

RAHAB (Ῥαάβ).—Rahab, the harlot (πόρνη) of Jericho, is the heroine of the romantic story told in Jos 2. At the risk of her life she sheltered two Hebrew spies and cunningly contrived their escape, receiving as her reward her own safety and that of her whole house. She is accorded a place in a great roll of the faithful (He 11^{31}), and her case is cited by James (2^{25}) in support of his thesis that one is not ‘saved’ by faith alone but by faith and works (cf. F. Weber, *Jüd. Theol.*, ed. F. Delitzsch and G. Schnedermann, Leipzig, 1897, p. 332). These high estimates of her are doubtless based on an edifying speech (Jos $2^{9\text{-}13}$), in which she acknowledges that Jahweh has given her land to Israel, and that He is God in heaven above and on earth beneath.

The Jewish Rabbis and Christian Fathers alike took much interest in her story. Some of them softened the statement that she was a harlot, Josephus (*Ant.* V. i. 2), followed by Chrysostom, suggesting that she was merely an innkeeper;

others, confessing her evil behaviour, represented her as seeking forgiveness from the God of Israel and pleading the merit of her good works (*Mechilta*, 64*b*). The allegorizing of her scarlet thread was begun by St. Clement of Rome, who calls her 'the hospitable Rahab.'

> 'Through faith and hospitality Rahab the harlot was saved. . . . And they [the spies] proceeded further to give her a sign, that she should hang from her house scarlet, making it manifest beforehand that through the blood of the Lord there should be redemption to all who believe and hope upon God. Behold, beloved, how there was not only faith, but prophecy in the woman' (*Ep. ad Cor.* i. 12).

JAMES STRAHAN.

RAILING.—See EVIL-SPEAKING.

RAINBOW (*ἶρις*).—The rainbow which the writer of the Revelation saw around the throne of God was 'like an emerald to look upon' (Rev 4^{3}). Flinders Petrie (*HDB* iv. 620) argues from this passage that *σμάραγδος* was not an emerald but a rock-crystal, as only a colourless stone can show a rainbow of prismatic colours. But while the glory encircling the throne was like a rainbow in shape, it may well have been conceived, not as prismatic, but as having the soft green colour of an emerald. Any nimbus round another body, as the halo of the moon or a candle, was called an *ἶρις* (Arist. *Meteor.* III. iv. 9). What the prophet depicts is a startling contrast: the very throne from which proceed lightnings and thunders (Rev 4^{5}) is yet arched with emerald. In other words, mercy tempers justice: 'Deus in judiciis semper fœderis sui meminit' (Grotius, quoted by H. Alford, *Greek Testament*^{5}, Cambridge, 1875, p. 596). Noah's rainbow and its traditional (mythological) explanation (Gn 9$^{12-17}$) were doubtless in the background of the Seer's mind. When the dread storm, in which the lightnings were Jahweh's arrows and the thunder His voice, was passing, His bow appeared in the clouds as a sign that His anger was appeased. 'The brilliant spectacle of the upturned bow against the dark background of the retreating storm naturally appeals to man as a token of peace and good-will from the god who has placed it there' (J. Skinner, *ICC*, 'Genesis,' Edinburgh, 1910, p. 172). The Jewish Rabbis would have agreed with the English poet who apostrophizes the rainbow:

> 'I ask not proud Philosophy
> To teach me what thou art'
> (T. Campbell, *To the Rainbow*, 3 f.).

They discouraged (*Ḥagiga*, 16*a*) the study of a mysterious phenomenon which was to them a sacrament or covenant of Divine grace.

JAMES STRAHAN.

RANSOM.—'Ransom' is the rendering in AV and RV of a word (*ἀντίλυτρον*) rare in apostolic literature, and possibly coined by St. Paul for use in 1 Ti 2^{6}, 'Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all.' It appears to be a strengthened form of *λύτρον* (cf. *EGT*, '1 Tim.,' 1910, p. 105), the word attributed to Jesus, and rendered 'ransom' in Mt 20^{28}, Mk 10^{45}, 'to give his life a ransom for many.' The strong substitutionary force of *ἀντί* in the compound word may be reduced by the *ὑπέρ* ('on behalf of') which immediately follows in 1 Ti 2^{6}. 'Ransom' is not elsewhere used in the NT.

In each place it is the figure chosen to indicate the redemptive significance of the death of Christ which had become familiar in the Apostolic Church, and had apparently become specialized by the time the Pastoral Epistles were written. Access to its meaning in the apostolic times may be sought in (*a*) the fairly frequent uses in the NT of cognate or derivative forms of *λύτρον* for expressing the saving processes or issues of Christ's death for men; *e.g.* *ἐλυτρώθητε* (1 P 1^{18}), *λύτρωσις* (He 9^{12}), *ἀπολύτρωσις* (Ro 3^{24}, Eph 1^{7}, Col 1^{14}); as so used its reference is clear; it offers an illustrative form of the great apostolic unity of thought which directly relates the death of Christ to the reconciliation of God and men; (*b*) the occasion and context of the term as used by the Synoptics (Mk 10^{45}, Mt 20^{28}); here the redemption for which the Son of Man gave His life a ransom is closely connected in the context with the liberation of the disciples of Jesus from the thraldom of worldly and ambitious self-seeking, and their entrance into the liberty of self-imparting service in the Kingdom of God which it was the mission of Jesus to establish by His death (so Beyschlag, *NT Theol.* i. 153; Stevens, *Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, p. 47 f.); but this view is not fully adequate to the expiatory value attributed to Christ's death by Christ and His apostles (Mt 26^{28}, 1 Co 11^{25} 15^{3}); (*c*) the attempt to find, with most expositors, a closer definition of the term by isolating it from its context and treating it as a word study; it is the representative in the LXX of certain much-used Hebrew words. Several of these are there rendered by a common use of *λύτρον*. Which of them corresponds most closely to the NT usage is a matter of discussion. One of them, כִּפֶּר, is said to have the root idea of 'covering,' or of 'wiping away,' though it is almost entirely used in an accommodated moral sense of 'making propitiation' (cf. Driver in *HDB* iv. 128, G. F. Moore in *EBi* iv. 4220). The leaning here is, therefore, towards sacrificial implications. The alternative words are פָּדָה and גָּאַל with the primary significance of 'liberating,' which lean towards the social or legal notion of redemption, illustrated possibly by the obligation to redeem laid upon the *goel* or kinsman (cf. Lv 25^{51}; see T. V. Tymms, *Christian Idea of Atonement*, London, 1904, p. 240 ff.). The majority of expositors favour the former derivation, though Wendt and others criticize its linguistic basis. The idea of ransom is thus obtained from the idea of 'covering' or 'clearing the face' of an offended person by means of a gift, especially by a gift which is the satisfaction for the life of a man paid either to God or man (cf. Ex 21^{30} 30^{12}, Nu 21^{30}, Job 33^{24}, Is 12^{3}, Ps 49^{7}, Pr 6^{35}, Am 5^{12}; cf. also Cremer, *Bibl.-Theol. Lex. of NT Greek*^{3}, p. 408; B. Weiss, *Bibl. Theol.* i. 101). Support for the second line of derivation with the primary idea of a ransom price paid is found in the rendering of פָּדָה in Is 35^{10}, Ps 69^{18}, Hos 13^{14}, Is 51^{11}, Jer 31^{11}; and in the rendering of גָּאַל in Is 51^{10}, Jer 31^{11}. (*d*) Dissatisfied with a reference of the NT passages to the LXX, and assuming that Jesus spoke not Greek, but Aramaic, G. Hollmann has sought by elaborate investigation to discover the Aramaic term of which *λύτρον* is the equivalent; he thinks that this inquiry results more favourably for the idea of 'liberating' than of 'covering' in the Hebrew original (*Die Bedeutung des Todes Jesu*, Tübingen, 1901, p. 98 ff.). One advantage of the precarious method of thus going behind the Greek term has been a fruitful suggestion by Ritschl that Ps 49$^{7f.}$ and Job 33^{23} (cf. Mk 8^{37}), where both פָּדָה and גָּאַל occur, may furnish the best interpretation of *λύτρον* in the mind of Christ (cf. *Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*^{4}, ii. 69 ff.; Denney, *Death of Christ*, p. 43 f.).

Whichever line of derivation may be followed, the resultant idea from the Hebrew terms, of which *λύτρον* is the representative in the LXX, is that the word indicates the means or cost by which a redemption is achieved. Consequently the apostolic interpretation will lie within that circle of ideas which carry the implication that life in the higher sense may be lost, and that man has no means of buying it back. To meet such a situation Christ laid down His life as a price or means of redemption by which the forfeited possession was restored. The further implication we should gather from the consensus of the teaching of Jesus and His apostles is that this ransom was not His death alone, but His life also—Himself indeed, in that perfect unity of which the life lived, laid down, and taken again are integral parts. It is not stated to whom the ransom price was paid. This has been the subject of wide conjecture. It does not seem essential to the apostolic use of the metaphor to state it. Nor is it stated precisely from what the ransom delivered; it was a saving advantage for men. A closer definition when sought will best be supplied from the analogy of faith as it deals with the issues of the death of Christ and from the more definite use of analogous terms in the apostolic teaching (see ATONEMENT and REDEMPTION).

LITERATURE.—For a discussion of λύτρον and its cognates see B. F. Westcott, *Hebrews*, London, 1889, pp. 295 f., 229 ff.; W. Beyschlag, *NT Theol.*, Halle, 1891–92, i. 149, Eng. tr., Edinburgh, 1895, i. 152; J. Denney, *Death of Christ*, London, 1902, p. 38 f.; A. Ritschl, *Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*^{4}, Bonn, 1895–1902, iii. 68–88, Eng. tr., *Justification and Reconciliation*, Edinburgh, 1900; G. B. Stevens, *Theology of the NT*, do., 1899, p. 126 ff., *Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, do., 1905, p. 45 ff.; H. H. Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, Eng. tr., do., 1892, ii. 226 ff.; B. Weiss, *Biblical Theology of NT*, Eng. tr., do., 1882–83, i. 101; H. Cremer, *Bibl.-Theol. Lex. of NT Greek*, do., 1880, p. 408.

FREDERIC PLATT.

RAPTURE, ECSTASY.—The English word 'rapture' is derived from Lat. *raptus*, the act of seizing and carrying away, hence transport of mind or ecstasy (ἔκστασις). In classic Greek ἔκστασις means frenzy; in the NT it rarely expresses this high degree of emotion, but may include distraction of mind, caused by wonder and astonishment, or exceptional joy and rapture. In Ps 16^{11} (LXX) the latter condition seems to be implied. Amongst the results of the healing of the paralytic by Christ, St. Luke tells us that 'amazement (ἔκστασις) took hold on all' (Lk 5^{26}), whilst St. Mark, in describing the effects of the Resurrection upon the minds of the women, as they fled from the tomb, states that 'trembling and astonishment (ἔκστασις) had come upon them' (16^{8}). In Mt 12^{23}, Mk 2^{12} 6^{51} the verb ἐξίσταμαι is used, also in reference to the effects upon the multitude of the bestowal of the 'gift of tongues' (Ac $2^{7.12}$), and further of the preaching of St. Paul in the synagogues immediately after his conversion (9^{21}). The stronger sense of the word, translated in English as 'trance,' is found in the description of St. Peter's vision of the vessel full of unclean beasts (10^{10} 11^{5}). Whilst engaged in prayer in the Temple at Jerusalem, St. Paul fell into an ἔκστασις, in which he was warned by the Lord to escape from the city (22^{17-21}). These references to the word do not by any means exhaust the instances of undoubted rapture or ecstasy found in the OT or the NT. When the prophets felt that the hand of the Lord was upon them, there would doubtless have been the exaltation of spirit and the entrance upon the higher transcendent experiences, accompanied more or less by a cataleptic condition of the body. Whatever the gift of tongues implied in the early Church, it certainly included the power of rapt and ecstatic utterance, sometimes incoherent and requiring interpretation (1 Co 14). St. Paul claimed to possess this gift, but he placed it on a lower level than the work of instruction that tended to edification. As an instance of the second stage of trance in which the spirit is believed to make excursions into other states and come into contact with other beings in the spirit world, we may instance St. Paul's rapture on being caught up into Paradise and hearing unutterable words. St. John in his apocalyptic vision of the Lord of Churches was in the Spirit, and he saw the Living One in all His glory, when he 'fell at his feet as one dead' (Rev 1^{17}).

In all mystical experiences and in all great religious revivals such outbursts of rapture are especially noticeable. The bodily powers are held in abeyance, and it seems as though the soul were actively engaged in cognizing spiritual objects, as St. Teresa experienced when 'she simply felt Christ close by her.' F. von Hügel deals with this subject fully, and indicates the manner in which these experiences may be tested by the moral and spiritual value of their results. W. James, who works out the psycho-physical accompaniments of these states, dwells upon the authoritative value they have for the experients themselves, and shows that they tend to break down the exclusive authority of the non-mystical or rational consciousness. They are as real as their results are real, and their value is to be judged by their effects in a higher order of morals and of life.

LITERATURE.—W. James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, 1902; F. von Hügel, *The Mystical Element of Religion as studied in Saint Catherine of Genoa and her Friends*, 1908; Evelyn Underhill, *Mysticism*, 1911.

J. G. JAMES.

READING (ἀνάγνωσις).—In apostolic literature the mention of reading occurs almost invariably in connexion with the OT Scriptures. A few references are made to those writings which later formed part of the NT. The subject resolves itself into the three questions as to what was the usage of the early Church in regard to (1) the public reading of the OT; (2) the private reading of Scripture; (3) the place assigned to Christian writings.

1. The public reading of the OT, both Law (Ac 15^{21}, 2 Co $3^{14f.}$) and Prophets (Lk 4^{17}, Ac $13^{15.27}$), was regularly observed by the Jews in their synagogue service. It is only natural to suppose that the custom was followed by both Gentile and Jewish Christians in their worship, especially in their meetings for edification. The lack of direct reference to it as a practice, noticed by most writers on the history of the period, is perhaps the best proof that Scripture was so used. For there are certain considerations, in the nature of indirect proof, which, as McGiffert says, 'make it practically certain that the Scriptures were diligently read and expounded in their meetings' (*A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, Edinburgh, 1897, p. 533). The OT was treated with great reverence by Christians, being spoken of as 'the holy scriptures' (Ro 1^{2}), 'the sacred writings' (2 Ti 3^{15}), or absolutely as 'the scripture' (Ac 1^{16}, Gal 3^{8}, 1 P 2^{6}) or 'the scriptures' (Ac 18^{24}, 1 Co 15^{4}). Truths are quoted and duties frequently enforced by the formula, 'it is written' (Ac 7^{42}, Ro 1^{17}, 1 Co 9^{9}, He 10^{17}, 1 P 1^{16}, and many others). The OT was regarded by Christians as inspired by God; to it men did well to take heed (2 P 1^{21}); and it was able to make men 'wise unto salvation' as well as 'furnished completely unto every good work' (2 Ti $3^{16f.}$). The Scriptures were freely quoted, and allusions were made to them in a way that presupposes that even Gentiles had frequently heard them read.

The procedure of St. Paul in his missionary work enables us to see the transition from the Jewish usage to the Christian. In Thessalonica he went into the synagogue, as was his custom, and 'reasoned with them from the scriptures, opening and alleging that it behoved the Christ to suffer, and to rise again from the dead' (Ac $17^{2f.}$). In Berœa the Jews 'examined the scriptures daily, whether these things were so' (v.^{11}). The Corinthian believers are reminded by St. Paul of his preaching, wherein he had proved that Christ died for our sins and was raised 'according to the scriptures' (1 Co $15^{3f.}$). This question as to the Messiahship of Jesus makes it practically certain that the early Christians read the Scriptures in their meetings. To prove that the events in the life of Jesus, His death, and resurrection were in harmony with the OT prophecies, involved frequent reading of the passages concerned (Ac $2^{25ff.}$ $4^{25f.}$ $15^{16f.}$, Ro 15^{12}). St. Paul's injunction to Timothy to 'give heed to reading' (*τῇ ἀναγνώσει*, 1 Ti 4^{13}) almost certainly refers to the public reading of Scripture, as it is connected in the immediate context with 'exhortation' and 'teaching.' Weizsäcker makes an ingenious suggestion that the part of the heavenly rites described in the Apocalypse in which a book was opened and read (Rev $5^{1ff.}$) was typical of what took place ordinarily in the Divine service on earth (*The Apostolic Age*, Eng. tr., London, 1894–95, ii. 277). That the Scriptures were read in the Christian assemblies from the earliest times is evident from the testimony of Clement of Rome: 'Ye know the Holy Scriptures, and know them well, and ye have deep insight into the oracles of God' (*Ep. to the Corinthians*, ch. 53), and the statement of Justin Martyr that in his day this was so (*Apol.* i. 67).

2. The question as to **the private reading of Scripture** in the early Church is of special importance because of the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church in the matter. No prohibition against Bible reading can be found in the NT; nor, on the contrary, is it urged as a duty. But that the Scriptures were actually read in private by the Christians of the 1st cent. cannot be doubted. The Jews did so before the time of Christ (1 Mac $1^{56ff.}$). The Gentile proselytes had their own copies of portions, at least, of the OT, which they read diligently. This gave the Christian missionary an opportunity for delivering his message. For example, Philip found the Ethiopian eunuch reading Isaiah, and 'beginning from this scripture he preached unto him Jesus' (Ac 8^{35}). Among Jewish Christians the practice would not be discontinued, as they had special reason, in wishing to prove the Messiahship of Jesus, for making a careful study of the Prophets. Harnack, who has investigated the subject in his *Bible Reading in the Early Church* (Eng. tr., London, 1912), says the Jewish usage of reading the OT 'simply and easily passed over from the Jewish to the Gentile Christians, for the Holy Scriptures in the Greek translation were fully accessible to, and were read by, the Jews of the Dispersion. Moreover, we know that among the Gentile Christians the order of public worship and private and family discipline in matters of religion and morality took form in accordance with the Jewish (Jewish Christian) models' (p. 32).

The only restriction experienced was that imposed by the bulky *form* of Scripture. It existed in separate rolls of parchment or papyrus (see F. G. Kenyon, *Textual Criticism of the NT*², London, 1912, ch. ii.), and a complete copy of the OT would be possessed by but few people. Still, the existence of collections of extracts, the widespread use of papyrus, and the diffusion of a popular literature like the apocalyptic, make it a probable conjecture that the sacred writings in part, if not in whole, were possessed and studied by many private persons. Harnack argues that, as the knowledge of Scripture brought to light by the apologists of the 2nd cent. and the controversies of the great Gnostic movement could not have been derived solely from what was heard in public worship, we may conclude that the sacred writings were in private hands also in the period before Irenæus, and that from the first the Christians were in the habit of reading the OT.

3. **The reading of Christian writings.**—It is obvious that the apostolic Epistles were read in the meetings of the church to which they were addressed. St. Paul either directs explicitly that this be done (1 Th 5^{27}, Col 4^{16}), or presupposes it (1 Co 5^{9}, 2 Co 1^{13} $10^{9ff.}$). Other writings were thus read to assemblies of Christians. Of the Book of Revelation, for example, the writer says, 'Blessed is he that readeth and they that hear the words of the prophecy, and keep the things which are written therein' (1^{3}; cf. $22^{16.18}$). Letters were exchanged between churches (Col 4^{16}) or one congregation addressed another, *e.g.* the Church in Rome sent an epistle to Corinth (Clement, *Epistle to the Corinthians*, 47). In the 2nd cent. and later the *Shepherd of Hermas* and Epistles like those of Barnabas, Ignatius, and Polycarp were read in churches.

It is more difficult to determine whether during the 1st cent. narratives from the life of Jesus and collections of His sayings were so read. That there were such writings is evident from the early existence of Mark and Q, the common source of much of the First and Third Gospels, and from the use of such records in Christian teaching (Lk 1^{4}). As eye-witnesses of Jesus died out, the oral or written tradition of His life would be highly prized by the early Christians, and the parenthetical remark, 'Let him that readeth understand' (Mk 13^{14}, Mt 24^{15}), points to the reading, publicly or privately, of such records. It must not be supposed, however, that even the apostolic writings, though widely read for didactic purposes, were regarded at first as 'Scripture.' The Sayings of Jesus were quoted as of supreme authority (Ac 20^{35}, 1 Co 7^{10} 9^{14}, 1 Th 4^{15}) in matters of belief and practice, but the written record of these and the separate apostolic writings were not looked upon as 'Scripture' till the 2nd century. But even then the writings which now form the NT did not displace the OT, though they found a place in the public reading of Scripture. Justin, describing the practice of his day (*c.* 155), says, 'There are meetings of all of us who live in cities or the country, and the memoirs of the apostles and the writings of the prophets are read as long as time allows' (*Apol.* i. 67).

LITERATURE.—In addition to works quoted above, see artt. 'Anagnostes,' by D. Butler, and 'Lectionary,' by F. H. Scrivener, in W. Smith-S. Cheetham's *DCA*, London, 1875–80; also artt. by W. F. Adeney, on 'Worship (in NT)' in *HDB*, and 'Reader' in *DCG*.

M. SCOTT FLETCHER.

REBECCA (Ῥεβέκκα).—Rebecca, the wife of Isaac, received a Divine oracle before the birth of her twin sons, Esau and Jacob, foretelling her that she would be the mother of two nations or peoples, of whom the elder would serve the younger (Ro 9^{10-12}, from Gn 25^{24-26}). St. Paul uses this tradition as illustrating a mysterious principle which he observed in the operation of Divine grace. Even within the family of Abraham, to whom the promises were given, God more than once made choice, rejecting Ishmael and accepting Isaac, loving Jacob and hating Esau (Ro $9^{7.13}$). In the OT those preferences were regarded as purely arbitrary, Jahweh having the right to do as He pleased with any mother's sons; but the Apostle discerns in His sovereign decrees a gracious design which embraces all mankind—'the purpose of God working by means of election' (*ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις*). See JACOB and ESAU.

JAMES STRAHAN.

RECOMPENSE.—See REWARD.

RECONCILIATION (*καταλλαγή*).—'Reconciliation' is the elect word in the apostolic literature to denote the changed relations issuing in the restoration, brought about by means of the Person and work of Jesus Christ, of the fellowship between God and man, which sin had interrupted. The Greek term is based upon the idea of exchange, especially the exchange of equivalent values; this passes, through the ideas of exchange of sympathy, mutual understanding and reciprocal confidence, into the notion of reconciliation, and thus becomes a term expressive of personal relations, with the implication that a previous hostility of mind or heart is now put away. Whilst the English 'reconciliation' (and its German equivalent *Versöhnung*) implies a mutual putting away of hostility, the Greek term is frequently used where only one person ceases to be angry with another and receives him into favour (see Grimm-Thayer^2, Edinburgh, 1890, p. 333). In the apostolic writings it is used both where the enmity is one-sided and where it is mutual; in the former case the context must show on which side the active enmity exists; the word in and of itself cannot declare on which side the adjustment is required or whether the hostility is mutual. 'Reconciliation' is the redemptive term specially acceptable to the modern mind, which seeks to interpret the Atonement in terms of personality; because it states the apostolic thought on the redemptive relations of God and man in personal and therefore in ethical terms, and not in terms of law or of sacrifice. The practical value of the term, and the immediacy of its application to living experience, make a similar appeal; for in the apostolic teaching it is directly and organically connected with 'the ministry of reconciliation' and 'the word of reconciliation' (2 Co $5^{18f.}$) which constituted the essence of the apostolic preaching. Moreover, it presents 'at-one-ment' as the result of atonement; it brings the mystery of a past 'propitiation' into the light of present and abiding personal relations Godward and manward; for it declares a restored communion to be a permanent attitude of God to man, and at the same time a progressively realized experience in man himself; 'God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ, and gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation,' is also 'in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses, and having committed unto us the word of reconciliation' (2 Co $5^{18f.}$).

Unlike 'propitiation,' 'reconciliation' is a term without direct ancestry in OT usage, and in the NT it is a redemptive term peculiar to the writings of St. Paul. The Pauline usage is found in Ro $5^{10f.}$ 11^{15}, 2 Co $5^{14ff.}$, Eph 2^{16}, Col $1^{20f.}$ (cf. also 1 Co 7^{11} and Jer 31^{39} [LXX], 2 Mac 1^5 7^{33} 8^{29}, Mt 5^{24}). In Ro $5^{10f.}$ the context distinctly shows that the reconciliation spoken of is that of God to man; it is something received by man as an accomplished fact; and, although the act of man in 'receiving' the reconciliation by obedient faith is implicitly recognized as perfecting the Divine purpose by his becoming himself reconciled to God, the clear Pauline contention is that there is a reconciliation on the part of God that is not only antecedent to any reception of it on the part of man, but is independent of any change of feeling on the part of man brought about by the Divine redemption; it is not an alteration in his relation to God accomplished by man. God is regarded as having established anew a relation of peace by putting away His hostility towards man in his sin (cf. Ro 11^{15}, Eph 1^6). 'While we were enemies we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son' (Ro 5^{10}); 'enemies' (ἐχθροί), whilst it is a term used both actively, denoting hostility towards God, and passively, denoting hostility from God, almost certainly includes the latter in this place as it obviously does in 11^{28}, where it is correlated with 'beloved' (ἀγαπητοί), which is certainly passive—'beloved of God'; the verb 'were reconciled' (κατηλλάγημεν, 5^{10}) is a real passive; men are primarily the objects, not the subjects, of the reconciliation. Otherwise the force of St. Paul's great argument that God's 'own love towards us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us' (v.^{8}) was sufficiently strong to account for this changed attitude would be of little value. He can exalt the love only by pointing to what God has done, not to what we have done; our laying aside our hostility, though ultimately required to make the reconciliation complete, is wisely and intentionally ignored here; it has no place in the demonstration of the transcendent and undeserved love of God in providing the means of reconciliation and in establishing with men a relation of peace. Both in this passage and in 11^{15}, Col $1^{20f.}$, Eph 2^{16} this distinctively Pauline sense prevails—and it is the most direct indication we have of the general apostolic thought—that reconciliation is a work complete on God's side before man's share in it begins, a work wrought by God in Christ and made available for the world, which men are besought to 'receive' in order that it may become effective in them individually. That this is the Pauline teaching is acknowledged by the great body of NT exegetes, although some distinguished scholars seriously question it (*e.g.* A. Ritschl, *Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*, ii. 230 ff.; J. B. Lightfoot, *Colossians*^{3}, London, 1879, p. 159; B. F. Westcott, *Epistles of St. John*^{3}, do., 1892, p. 85; cf. also Askwith in *Cambr. Theol. Essays*, p. 206). Some others, who personally disagree with St. Paul, frankly acknowledge that the hostility overcome by the reconciliation is regarded by him as mutual, and 'hence any reconciliation which is accomplished between God and man must be two-sided. Not only must man renounce his hostility to God, but God must change His attitude toward man—must relinquish His wrath and resentment' (Stevens, *Christian Doctrine of Salvation* p. 59). Cremer thus states the case in favour of the same position: 'As this view is grammatically as possible as the other; as, further, there are no lexical difficulties in its way; and as, finally, it is indicated by the context of both passages (Ro 5^{11} and 11^{15})—no solid objection can be raised against it; whereas the other quits the biblical circle of thought, and has merely a hortatory character, but no force as evidence, such as is required, especially in Ro 5' (*Bibl.-Theol. Lex.*^{3}, p. 92). A reasoned theological defence of the same situation is given in *HDB* iv. 205 ff. (cf. also Sanday-Headlam, *ICC*, 'Romans'^{5}, p. 129 f.; J. Denney, *EGT*, 'Romans,' 1900, p. 625 f.; B. Weiss, *Biblical Theology of the NT*, Eng. tr., 1882–83, i. 428 ff.).

The reluctance to accept the Pauline view that reconciliation must deal with hostility on God's side as well as on man's arises mainly from two causes. (*a*) There is an exaggerated anthropomorphic interpretation of the significance of God's anger against sin; it is set in opposition to His love, as if these were mutually exclusive, or it is made the expression of the purely judicial demand for punishment. This is not the apostolic view; for in it there is no conflict between the Divine wrath and the Divine love, nor do they dwell apart; they are expressions of the one perfect Personality whose name and nature is love. All the processes of redemption are traced in the Pauline discussion to God's own love for sinful men. His anger is real; it is not simply official as the hostility of a law-giver in presence of a law-breaker; it is personal, but not a fitful personal resentment: it is the hot displeasure of a fatherly love in presence of all that disturbs the filial relations of His children with Himself, and destroys His ideal for their peace; it is love's crowning sign, not its contradiction. His anger is the indication that His love discriminates; for righteousness and love are moral differences which would be lost in a love of God which was incapable of moral indignation and hostility to wrong. (*b*) There is the unethical conception of the Divine immutability, which leads to confusion of thought; as a true Personality God can and does change His feelings and attitudes; these must change to correspond with His moral activity towards the changing character and conduct of men; whilst behind the varying attitudes involved in a change from hostility to complacence, such as reconciliation supposes, lie the unchangeable character and the changeless moral purpose which give unity and consistency to all God does (cf. I. A. Dorner's 'Divine Immutability' in *A System of Christian Doctrine*, Eng. tr., Edinburgh, 1880–82, i. 244, iv. 80; W. Adams Brown, *Christian Theology in Outline*, do., 1907, p. 117 f.).

In 2 Co 5^{14-21}, the *locus classicus* for the apostolic doctrine of reconciliation, St. Paul is supremely concerned with its practical results in the ethical and spiritual history of mankind and in the personal experience of the individual. These results are profoundly assured in the self-identification of God in Christ with mankind, whilst their blessedness is individually realized by the response of a reciprocal self-identification with God in Christ on the part of man; in this response the reconciliation is perfected. To achieve this end God in Christ has given a 'word of reconciliation' and inspires the tender persuasions of a 'ministry of reconciliation,' which are to us men the mystic wonder of the whole redemptive process: for they reveal a love of God which humbles itself to beseech sinful men, 'as though God were intreating by us: we beseech you on behalf of Christ, be ye reconciled to God' (v.^{20}). But in this work of reconciliation the initiative is taken by God; and its cost in sacrificial self-giving is borne by Him. We never read that God has been reconciled; God Himself does the work of reconciliation in and through Christ, 'God was in Christ reconciling the world (even a world) unto himself' (v.^{19}). The self-identification of God with men is made in Christ—it is truly God's self-identification; the humanity of Christ is the humanity of Deity, which is made manifest in time. In His death particularly Christ identified Himself with men; He 'died on behalf of all (ὑπὲρ πάντων), therefore all died' (v.^{14}). The death on behalf of all involved the death of all; because through His self-identification with all Christ was the Representative of all. As it was the death of all men which was died by Him, His self-identification with men, being real in the flesh as in the spirit, involved a true but mysterious fellowship in the deepest mystery of their experience in the flesh—their sin. 'Him who knew no sin he [God] made to be sin on our behalf' (v.^{21}). His death on behalf of all was a death unto sin once for all, that in the flesh He might destroy sin in the flesh. Such a death on their behalf was virtually the death of mankind with whom He was self-identified. The further significance of His death on behalf of all is 'that we might become the righteousness of God in him' (v.^{21}). 'Because we thus judge . . . he died for all, that they which live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto him who for their sakes died and rose again' (v.^{15}). The issue of this self-identification of God in Christ with man is that 'he is a new creature, the old things are passed away; behold, they are become new' (v.^{17}). In this new creation of humanity with its new identities with God in Christ is found the reconciliation to which 'the love of Christ constraineth us' (v.^{14}). But the justification as well as the source of all this is God—God Himself, not Christ apart from God; not man by his penitence or by the response of his submission to God. 'All things are of God who reconciled us to himself through Christ, and gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation' (v.^{18}). The heart of the apostles' teaching, their gospel of reconciliation, is 'all things are of God.' Reconciliation is a Divinely accomplished fact, done once for all. In the Apostolic Church it was believed that this reconciliation was the issue of that which God had done in the setting forth of Christ Jesus to be a 'propitiation' (Ro 3^{25}). Such a propitiation is the Divinely appointed sanction and constraint of the apostles' doctrine (λόγος) of reconciliation—'To wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses' (2 Co 5^{19}); see, further, PROPITIATION. But whatever may be the God-ward side of reconciliation, they proclaimed on its manward side, with beseeching urgency, a ministry of reconciliation. Their doctrine gave no countenance to the idea that man is secure in the Divine favour through something accomplished for him apart from the obedience of his own faith, by which the reconciliation is personally 'received.' The wistful word of their beseeching, 'Be ye reconciled to God' (v.^{20}), is at one with the lingering pathos of their admonition, 'and working together with him we intreat also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain' (6^{1}). A man's whole attitude towards sin must be changed, otherwise the incidence of this yearning admonition must rest upon him.

A careful examination of the apostolic documents available leaves an irresistible conviction that the Apostolic Church held the view that 'reconciliation' was a change from mutual hostility, resulting from the sinfulness of mankind, to mutual friendship between God and man; that this change was God's own work accomplished in Christ through His life and death; but that it was also a process, carried on by God in Christ, requiring for its completion the receiving of it as a grace and the consequent participation in it as a Divine operation by men individually. Whether this view accords with the teaching of Jesus recorded in the Synoptics, and whether it is an interpretation of the experience of salvation binding permanently upon the faith of the Church are questions beyond the scope of this article.

LITERATURE.—H. Cremer, *Bibl.-Theol. Lexicon of NT Greek*^{3}, Edinburgh, 1880, p. 91 ff.; Sanday-Headlam, *ICC*, 'Romans'^{5}, do., 1902, p. 129 f.; E. H. Askwith, 'Sin, and the Need of Atonement,' in *Cambridge Theological Essays*, London, 1905, p. 175; W. F. Lofthouse, *Ethics and Atonement*, do., 1906, pp. 82–179; F. R. M. Hitchcock, *The Atonement and Modern Thought*, do., 1911, pp. 255–283; J. Scott Lidgett, *The Spiritual Principle of the Atonement*, do., 1897, pp. 219–306; J. Denney, *The Death of Christ*, do., 1902, p. 139 ff.; G. B. Stevens, *Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, Edinburgh, 1905, p. 59 ff.; *ExpT* iv. [1892–93] 335 f., v. [1893–94] 532 ff.; W. H. Moberly, 'The Atonement,' in *Foundations*, London, 1912, p. 265 ff.; A. Ritschl, *Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*^{4}, Bonn, 1895–1902, iii., Eng. tr., *Justification and Reconciliation*, Edinburgh, 1900; D. W. Simon, *Reconciliation by Incarnation*, do., 1898; W. L. Walker, *The Gospel of Reconciliation*, do., 1909; R. C. Moberly, *Atonement and Personality*, London, 1901; S. A. MacDowall, *Evolution and the Need of Atonement*, Cambridge, 1912; art. 'Reconciliation' in *HDB* and *DCG*.

FREDERIC PLATT.

RED.—See COLOURS.

REDEMPTION.—Among the figures employed by the apostolical writers to set forth the nature of the transaction by which our Lord has saved His people, none is more illuminating than that which we are accustomed to speak of as 'redemption.' The terms 'redeem,' 'redemption,' 'redeemer' are a gift of the Latin Bible to our theological language. They fail in complete exactness as renderings of the terms which they are used to translate in the apostolical writings, in so far as there still clings to them the notion, intrinsic in their form, that the buying which they denote is distinctively a 'buying back.' The English word 'ransom,' etymologically a doublet of 'redeem,' has more completely lost its etymological implication of specifically 'buying back,' taking on in its stead rather that of 'buying out.' The series 'ransom,' 'ransoming,' 'Ransomer' might on this account serve better as equivalents of the Greek words currently employed by the apostolical writers to convey this idea. These are : [*λύτρον*, Mt 20^{28}, Mk 10^{45}] ; *ἀντίλυτρον*, 1 Ti 2^{6} ; *λυτροῦσθαι*, Lk 24^{21}, Tit 2^{14}, 1 P 1^{18} ; *λύτρωσις*, Lk 1^{68} 2^{38}, He 9^{12} ; *ἀπολύτρωσις*, Lk 21^{28}, Ro 3^{24} 8^{23}, 1 Co 1^{30}, Eph $1^{7.\ 14}$ 4^{30}, Col 1^{14}, He 9^{15} 11^{35} ; [*λυτρωτής*, Ac 7^{35}]. No words provided by the Greek language could convey more distinctly the idea which we commonly express by the term 'ransoming.' Their current employment by the writers of the NT to describe the action of our Lord in setting His people free is proof enough of itself that this action was thought of by them not broadly as 'deliverance,' but as a deliverance in the distinct mode of 'ransoming.' If 'deliverance' alone, without implication of the mode of accomplishing it, had been what was intended to be expressed, the simple forms *λύειν*, *λύσις*, *λυτήρ* or some of their strengthened prepositional compounds lay at hand. These were in common use in the sense of 'delivering,' and indeed some of them (like *λύεσθαι* and *ἀπολύεσθαι*) had even acquired the special sense of 'ransoming.' Instead of them, however, the NT writers elected to employ forms which embody in their very structure an open assertion that the mode of deliverance spoken of is by 'ransom.' To say *λύτρον* is to say 'ransom' ; and to say *λυτροῦσθαι*, *λύτρωσις* is to say *λύτρον* ; while *ἀπολύτρωσις* is but a stronger way of saying *λύτρωσις*.

Of course, even words like these, in the very form of which the modal implication is entrenched, and which owe, in fact, their existence to the need of words emphasizing the mode unambiguously, may come to be used so loosely that this implication retires into the background or even entirely out of sight. In our common English usage the words 'redeem,' 'redemption,' 'redeemer' retain no sure intimation of their etymological denotation of 'buying back,' but suggest ordinarily only a 'buying out.' They are sometimes used so loosely as to convey no implication even of purchase. That *λυτροῦσθαι*, *λύτρωσις*, *ἀπολύτρωσις* have suffered in their NT usage such a decay of their essential significance cannot be assumed, however, without clear proof. In point of fact, the actual accompaniments of their usage forbid such an assumption. In a number of instances of their occurrence the intimation of a price paid is prominent in the context ; in other words, the deliverance spoken of is definitely intimated as a ransoming. In the remaining instances this intimation becomes no doubt rather an assumption, grounded in their form and their usage elsewhere ; but that is no reason for neglecting it. The apparently varying usage of the terms depends merely on an oscillation of emphasis between the two elements of thought combined in them. Sometimes the emphasis is thrown on the mode in which the deliverance asserted is wrought—namely, by ransoming. Sometimes, on the other hand, it is shifted to the issue of the ransoming which is affirmed—namely, in deliverance. In the former case the stress falls so strongly on the idea of ransoming that the mind tends to rest exclusively on the act of purchasing or the price paid. In the latter it rests so strongly on the idea of deliverance that we are tempted to forget that an act of ransoming is assumed as its procuring cause. In neither case, however, is either element of thought really suppressed entirely. Christ's ransoming of His people is of course always thought of as issuing in their deliverance. His deliverance of His people is equally thought of always as accomplished by a ransoming.

We may be surprised to observe that the epithet 'Redeemer' ('Ransomer,' *λυτρωτής*) is never applied to our Lord in the NT. Even the broader designation, 'Deliverer,' is applied to Him only once, and that in a quotation from the OT (*ὁ ῥυόμενος*, Ro 11^{26}, from Is 59^{20} ; cf. 1 Th 1^{10}). In fact, we do not meet with 'Redeemer' (*λυτρωτής*) as a designation of our Lord in extant Christian literature, until the middle of the 2nd cent. (Justin, *Dial.* xxx. 3 ; cf. lxxxiii. 3), and it does not seem to become common until three centuries later. Nevertheless, Justin himself tells us that it was in ordinary use in the Christian community when he wrote. 'For we call Him Helper and Redeemer,' he says, with an allusion to Ps 19^{14}. And it seems that in the only instance of the appearance of the term in the NT—Ac 7^{35}, where it is used of Moses—its employment as a designation of our Lord is already presupposed. For it is applied to Moses here only as the type of Christ, and with a very distinct reference to the antitype in the choice of the word. The Israelites had demanded of Moses, 'Who made thee a ruler and a judge ?' Stephen, driving home his lesson, declares that him who was thus rejected as 'ruler and judge' God has sent 'both as ruler and as redeemer.' The 'both . . . and' is to be noted as well as the change of term. 'Redeemer' is introduced with great emphasis ; attention is called markedly to it as a significant point in the argument. 'Observe,' says H. A. W. Meyer, 'the climax introduced by *λυτρωτήν* in relation to the preceding *δικαστήν*. It is introduced because the obstinacy of the people against Moses is type of the antagonism to Christ and His work (v.^{51}) ; consequently, Moses in his work of deliverance is a type of Christ, who has effected the *λύτρωσις* of the people in the highest sense (Lk 1^{68} 2^{38}, He 9^{12}, Tit 2^{14})' (*Commentary on the NT*, 'Acts,' vol. i. [1877] p. 204 f.). We must look upon the absence of instances of the application of the epithet 'Redeemer' to Christ in early Christian writers, therefore, as merely a literary phenomenon. Christians were from the first accustomed to speak of their Lord as 'Redeemer.' The usage undoubtedly was not so rich and full in the earlier ages of the Church as it has since become. The intense concreteness of the term probably accounts in part for this. But it was already in use to express the apostolic conception of the function of our Lord as Saviour.

The basis of this apostolic conception is laid in our Lord's own declaration, 'For verily the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many' (Mk 10^{45}, Mt 20^{28}), a declaration elucidated and enforced in those others, preserved by John, in which He speaks of laying down His life for the sheep (Jn 10^{11}), or His friends (15^{13}), or of giving His flesh for the life of the world (6^{51}). In this great declaration our Lord is commending a life of service to His disciples by His own signal example. He adduces His example after a fashion which runs on precisely the lines repeated by Paul in Ph $2^{5\text{ff.}}$. He calls Himself by the lofty name of the Son of Man, and, by thus throwing the exaltation of His Person into contrast with the lowliness of the work He was performing, He enhances the value of His example to a life of service. He describes His whole mission in the world as service, and He adverts to His ransoming death as the culminating act of the service which He came into the world to render. He, the heavenly man of Daniel's vision (Dn 7^{13}), came into the world for no other purpose than to perform a service for men which involved the giving of His life as a ransom for them. Thus He makes His ransoming death the final cause of His whole manifestation in the world. The terms He employs to describe His death as a ransom are as simple and precise as possible. He speaks of 'giving his life,' emphasizing the voluntariness of the act. He speaks of giving His life as a 'ransom,' using the most exact word the Greek language affords (*λύτρον*) to express the price paid to secure the release of prisoners, the manumission of slaves (see A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, p. 322 ff., with some of the necessary correctives in T. Zahn, *Der Brief an die Römer*, 1910, p. 180, note 51 from the middle), or the purchase of immunity for faults committed against Deity (see F. Steinleitner, *Die Beicht im Zusammenhange mit der sakralen Rechtspflege in der Antike*, p. 37 f.). He speaks of giving His life as a ransom 'for,' or rather 'in the place of,' 'instead of,' 'many,' the preposition (ἀντί) employed emphasizing the idea of exchange, or, we may say shortly, of substitution. In this declaration, then, our Lord Himself sets forth in language as precise as possible His work of service for man as culminating in the vicarious payment by His voluntary death of a ransom price for them. This is what He came to do; and in this, therefore, is summed up briefly the nature of His work for men.

It would be strange if so remarkable a declaration had produced no echoes in the teaching of our Lord's followers. A very distinct echo of it sounds in 1 Ti 2^6, where it is declared of the man Christ Jesus, the only Mediator between God and men, that 'he gave himself a ransom for all.' The term employed for 'ransom' here is a strengthened form (ἀντίλυτρον), in which the idea of exchange, already intrinsic to the simple form (λύτρον), is made still more explicit. This idea having thus been thrown into prominence in the term itself, the way was opened to add an intimation of those with whom the exchange is made by means of a preposition which indicates them as beneficiaries of it (ὑπέρ). The voluntariness of the ransoming transaction on our Lord's part is intimated when it is said that He 'gave himself' a ransom for all, a phrase the full reference of which on Paul's lips may be gathered from Gal 1^4: 'who gave himself for our sins' (cf. Gal 2^{20}, Eph $5^{2.\ 25}$). Every element of thought contained in Mk 10^{45}, Mt 20^{28}, in a word, is repeated here; and what is there represented by our Lord as the substance of His mission, is here declared by Paul to be the sum of the gospel committed to him to preach. It is the 'testimony in its own times, whereunto I was appointed a preacher and an apostle' (1 Ti 2^7).

It is only an elaboration of the central idea of this declaration when Paul (Tit 2^{14}), stirred to the depths of his being by the remembrance of all that he owes to 'our great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ,' for 'the epiphany of whose glory' he is looking forward as his most 'blessed hope,' celebrates in burning words the great transaction to which he attributes it all: 'who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a people for his own possession, zealous of good works.' The fundamental fact thrown up to observation here too is that Jesus Christ 'gave himself for us.' The assertion is the same as that of 1 Ti 2^6, and the meaning is the same: our Lord voluntarily gave Himself as a ransom for our benefit. This statement dominates the whole passage, and doubtless has determined the choice of the verb 'ransom' in the first clause of the telic sentence which follows. But it is the effects of this ransoming which are particularly developed. Paul's mind is intent in this context on conduct. He would have his converts live worthily of the grace of God which has come to them, their eyes set upon the recompense of the reward. If Christ gave Himself for our sins, it was that we might sin no more. That is expressed in Gal 1^4 thus: 'That he might deliver us out of this present evil world.' It is expressed here thus: 'That he might ransom us from all iniquity and purify for himself a people for his own possession, zealous of good works.' The two statements have fundamentally the same content, expressed, however, in the one case negatively, and in the other positively. Christ ransomed us by the gift of Himself, that we might no longer belong to the world but to Him. To belong to Christ is to be holy; and therefore those who are His, while still in the world must live soberly, righteously, and godly, expecting His coming, that their deliverance out of this evil world may be completed. The verbs used in the two statements are, however, different. In the one case, the verb employed (ἐξαιρεῖσθαι, Gal 1^4) declares the effect wrought exclusively, with no intimation of the mode of action by which it is attained: the purpose of Christ's giving Himself for our sins is our rescue, deliverance, out of the present evil world. In the other case, the verb employed (λυτροῦσθαι, Tit 2^{14}) has a distinct modal connotation: Christ's purpose in giving Himself for us is to ransom us from every iniquity, and thus to purify for Himself a people of His own, zealous of good works. The concept of ransom intrinsic in Christ's giving Himself for us is here expressly carried over to the ultimate effects, our deliverance from all iniquity, and our purification for Christ, 'so that,' as B. Weiss puts it, 'His giving Himself up for our liberation from guilt is conceived as the ransom-price, apart from which these things could not result' (*Die Briefe Pauli an Timotheus und Titus*^{5}, 1885, p. 384 n.). This is only to say, in our current modes of speech, that the ransom paid by Christ, when He gave Himself for us, purchases for us not only relief from the guilt but also release from the power of sin.

How little such a reference to the revolution wrought in the life of Christians empties the term 'to ransom' of its implication of purchase may be learned from 1 P $1^{18f.}$. Peter is here as completely engrossed with conduct as Paul is in Tit 2^{14}. He too is exhorting his readers to a life, during their sojourn here expecting the revelation of the Lord, consonant with their high dignity as a people of God's own possession. And he too seeks to gain force for his exhortation by reminding them of what they owe to Christ their Ransomer. The thing asserted to be secured by this ransoming is, with Peter as with Paul, an ethical deliverance. 'Knowing,' says he, 'that ye were redeemed . . . from your vain manner of life handed down from your fathers' (1 P 1^{18}). The thought is closely similar to that of Gal 1^4: 'That he might deliver us out of this present evil world.' If we should be tempted to suppose that, therefore, the term 'ransomed,' as here used, has lost its implication of purchase, and become the exact equivalent of the 'deliver' of Gal 1^4, Peter at once undeceives us by emphasizing precisely the idea of purchasing. The peculiarity of the passage consists just in the fullness with which it dwells on the price paid for our deliverance. Paul contented himself in Tit 2^{14} with saying merely that Christ 'gave himself for us.' Peter tells us that this means that He poured out His blood for us. 'Ransomed' here, although used exactly as in Tit 2^{14}, cannot possibly mean simply 'delivered.' It means distinctively, 'delivered by means of the payment of a price.'

What the price was which Christ paid to ransom us 'from our vain manner of life, handed down from our fathers,' Peter develops with great fullness, both negatively and positively. Negatively, he tells us, it was no corruptible thing, no silver or gold. His mind is running on the usual commodities employed in the ordinary ransomings familiar to everyday life; and we perceive that he intends to represent the ransoming of which Christians are the object as similar in kind to them. It differed from them only in the incomparable greatness of the price paid; and this carries with it the greatness of the evil from which it delivers us and the greatness of the good which it secures for us.

The price paid, Peter tells us positively, is the blood of Christ. This blood he characterizes in a two-fold manner. On the one hand, he speaks of it, enhancing its value, as precious. It is at great cost that we have been ransomed. On the other hand, intimating the source of its efficacy, he compares it with the blood 'of a lamb without blemish and without spot' (1 P 1^{19}). The sacrificial allusion here is manifest, whether we think (with Hermann Gunkel), through the medium of Is 53, of the ordinary offerings (cf. Lv 23^{12}), or (with F. J. A. Hort) particularly of the Paschal lamb (cf. Ex 12^{5}). The main point to observe is that Peter feels no incongruity in blending the ideas of ransom and sacrifice. The blood which Christ shed as a sacrifice is the blood by which we are ransomed. The two modes of representation express a single fact.

Peter does not inform his readers of these things as something new to them. He presents them as matters which are of common knowledge: 'knowing, as you do, that,' etc. 'It is an appeal to an elementary Christian belief' (F. J. A. Hort, *The First Epistle of St. Peter I. 1–II. 17*, p. 75). Of course, then, there are other allusions to them, more or less full, scattered through the NT. There is, for instance, a similar conjunction of the notions of sacrifice and ransom in He 9^{12}. There we are told that Christ, in contrast with the priests of the old dispensation, 'a high priest of the good things to come, . . . not by means of the blood of goats and calves, but by means of his own blood, entered in once for all into the holy place having obtained eternal ransoming.' There are not two acts intimated here: by the one shedding of His blood, Christ both entered once for all into the holy place and obtained an eternal ransoming. The correspondence of the 'once for all' in the one clause and the 'eternal' in the other should not be overlooked; it is a binding link assimilating the two assertions to one another. Christ, unlike the Levitical priests with their repeated entrances, entered the holy place 'once for all,' because the ransoming He was obtaining through His blood was not like theirs, temporary in its effect, but 'eternal,' that is to say, of never-failing absoluteness (cf. 'eternal Spirit,' v.^{14}, 'eternal inheritance,' v.^{15}). The effect of the sacrificial shedding of Christ's blood is here expressed in terms of ransoming.

Precisely how this author conceived this ransoming is made plain by a phrase which he employs three verses further on: 'a death having taken place for the ransoming of the transgressions.' He is still contrasting the effective work of Christ with the merely representative work of the Old Covenant. A promise had been given of an eternal inheritance. But men had not received the heritage which had thus been promised. Their sins stood in the way, and there was no sacrifice which took away sin. Christ had now brought such a sacrifice. In His case a death had taken place 'for the ransoming of the transgressions' which they had committed. 'Ransoming' here conveys a meaning which might have been conveyed by 'expiation.' The term used is not the simple form λύτρωσις, but the strengthened form ἀπολύτρωσις; and the construction is inexact—it is not the transgressions but the transgressors that are ransomed. But the meaning is plain. 'The genitive expresses in a wide sense the object on which the redemption is exercised ("redemption in the matter of the transgressions," "transgression—redemption")' (B. F. Westcott, *Hebrews*, p. 264). It was because men had sinned that they required to be ransomed; sin had brought them into a condition from which they could be delivered only by a ransom. And the ransom required was a death. The matter is put quite generally: 'a death having taken place for ransoming the transgressions.' This death was, in point of fact, Christ's death; and it was because it was Christ's death that it was adequate to its end (v.^{14}). But the fundamental point in our present passage is that Christ could ransom men from their sins, that is to say, from the consequences of their sins, including, of course, that consciousness of sin which bites into the conscience (v.^{14}), only by dying. By sacrificing Himself He put away sin (v.^{26}); He was offered to bear the sins of many (v.^{28}). The images of sacrifice and of ransoming are inextricably interwoven, but it easily emerges that Christ is thought of, in giving Himself to death, as giving Himself as a ransom-price to deliver men from the guilt and penalties of sin.

This representation meets us again, very tersely put, in Eph 1^{7}, of which Col 1^{14} is a slightly less completely expressed repetition. The ransoming (ἀπολύτρωσις) which is in Christ, described with more particularity in Ephesians again as having been procured 'through his blood,' is in both passages alike identified immediately with 'the remission of our trespasses' (Eph.), or 'of our sins' (Col.). 'The studied precision,' as J. B. Lightfoot phrases it in his note on Col 1^{14}, with which the ransoming is thus defined to be just 'remission of sins,' is the more noteworthy because it is apparently directly contrasted as such with the wider 'deliverance' (ἐρύσατο) from the power of darkness and removal into the Kingdom of the Son of God's love, for which it supplies the ground. It is because Christ has at the cost of His blood, that is, by dying for us, purchased for us remission of sins (which is our ransoming), that we have deliverance from the tyranny of darkness and are transferred under His own rule. We thus reach a very close determination of the exact point at which the ransoming act of Christ operates, and of the exact evil from which it immediately relieves us. It relieves us of the guilt and the penal consequences of our sins; and only through that relief does it secure to us other blessings. It is, at its very centre, just 'the remission of our sins' that we have in Christ when we have in Him our ransoming.

The great passage in which the nature of our ransoming is unfolded for us, however, is Ro 3^{24}. There, nearly all the scattered intimations of its essential nature found here and there in other passages are gathered together in one comprehensive statement. The fundamental declarations of this very pregnant passage are, that men, being sinners, can be justified only gratuitously, by an act of pure grace on God's part; that God, however, can so act towards them in His grace, only because there is a ransoming (ἀπολύτρωσις) available for them in Christ Jesus; and that this ransoming was procured by the death of Christ as an expiatory sacrifice, enabling God righteously to forgive sins. The ransoming found—perhaps we may even say stored—in Christ Jesus is here represented as the result of His sacrificial death; this sacrificial death is made the ground of God's forgiveness of sins; and this forgiveness of sins is identified with the justification which God gratuitously grants believing sinners. The blending of the ideas of ransoming and expiation is complete; the 'blood of Christ,' in working the one, works also the other. The ascription to God of the whole process of justification, including apparently the ransoming act itself, which is usually (but not always) ascribed to Christ, but which is thus traced back through Christ to God, whose will in this too Christ does, is apparently due to the emphasis with which, throughout the passage, the entirety of salvation, in all its elements, is attributed to God's free grace. This emphasis on the gratuitousness of the whole saving process is the most noticeable feature of the passage. It has been strangely contended (*e.g.* by T. Zahn) that it is inconsistent with the conception of a ransom, strictly taken. There is, however, not even an antinomy here: the gratuitousness of justification *quoad homines* cannot possibly exclude the grounding of that act in the blood of Christ, as a ransom paid for men from without. What the passage teaches is, that all men have sinned and have failed to attain the glory God has in mind for them; all are in this matter in like case; those whom God justifies—namely, all believers—are, then, justified freely, by God's grace alone. But it does not teach that God acts thus, in His free grace, justifying sinners gratuitously so far as they are concerned, arbitrarily and with no adequate ground for His action. On the contrary, it asserts a ground for His justifying act; and the ground which it asserts is the ransoming that is in Christ Jesus. It says, indeed, not 'on the ground of the ransoming that is in Christ Jesus' (διὰ τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν), but 'through the instrumentality of the ransoming that is in Christ Jesus' (διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως). But this is only a formal difference. What Paul says is, that the ransoming that is in Christ Jesus is the means by which men, being sinners, are brought by God into a justification which they cannot secure for themselves. If the ransoming that is in Christ Jesus is the means by which alone they can be justified, that is only another way of saying that God, who gratuitously justifies them in His grace, proceeds in this act in view of nothing in them, but solely in view of the ransoming that is in Christ Jesus. How this ransoming comes to be in Christ Jesus is, then, immediately explained: God has set Him forth as an expiatory sacrifice through faith in His blood, for the manifestation of His righteousness in the forgiveness of sins. Christ, then, has been offered as an expiatory sacrifice; this enables God to forgive sins righteously; those thus forgiven are justified gratuitously; and this justification has taken place in view of, and that is as much as to say by means of, the ransoming which has resulted from the shedding of the blood of Christ. The ransoming provided by Christ is, in a word, the means by which God is rendered gracious; and in this His grace, thus secured for us, He gratuitously justifies us, although we, as sinners, have no claim upon this justification.

The fundamental idea underlying the representation of salvation as a ransoming is its costliness. In some of the passages which have been adduced this idea is thrown very prominently forward. This is the case with Ro 3^{24}, and, indeed, with all the passages in which Christ is said to have given 'Himself,' or 'His blood,' as a ransom for His people; and it is elaborated in much detail in such passages as He 9^{12} and 1 P $1^{18f.}$. But the emphasis often falls no less on the value of the acquisition obtained, and that both on its negative and on its positive sides. Naturally it is the eschatological aspects of this acquisition on which ordinarily most stress is laid. These eschatological aspects of our ransoming are brought very decidedly into the foreground, for example, in Tit 2^{14}, 1 P 1^{18}, and not less so in He 9^{12}, Eph 1^{7}, Col 1^{14}. When the mind is thus occupied with the eschatological results of the ransoming, it is apt to be relatively less engaged with the nature of the ransoming act itself, and we may be tempted to read the term 'ransoming' as if its whole implication were absorbed in the simple idea of 'deliverance.' This is, of course, not really the case. The term 'ransoming' is employed instead of one by which nothing more than 'deliverance' would be expressed, precisely because the writer is conscious that the deliverance of which he is speaking has been secured only at a cost, and instinctively employs a term which intimates this fact. It was thus a true feeling which led James Morison (*A Critical Exposition of the Third Chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, 1866, p. 254) to insist that by the terms in question is expressed not mere deliverance, but 'deliverance which is effected in a legitimate way, and in consistency with the rights and claims of all parties concerned.' We must, however, go a step further and recognize that the deliverance intimated by these terms is thought of distinctively as resting on a purchase, as, in a word, the issue of a ransoming. This is, at all events, the state of the case with the NT instances.

When we read, for example, in Ro 8^{23}, that we, in this life, are groaning within ourselves, waiting for our adoption, and then this adoption is defined as 'the ransoming (ἀπολύτρωσις) of our body,' the word 'ransoming' cannot be taken out of hand as merely 'deliverance,' and much less can it be supposed to intimate that a special ransom shall be paid at the last day for the deliverance of the body. What is meant is that the deliverance of our bodies—by which is intended just our resurrection, connected in this context with the repristination of the physical universe, an object as yet of hope only—shall be experienced in due season, not as something disconnected with the salvation we are enjoying here and now in its first-fruits, but as its consummation; that is to say, as one of the results of the ransom paid by Christ in His blood on the Cross, from which flow all the blessings which, as believers, we receive. It is because Paul's mind is fixed upon this fundamental ransom-paying that he uses here a term which imports a ransoming and not one of mere deliverance.

Similarly, when we read in the closing words (Eph 1^{14}) of that splendid hymn of praise which opens the Epistle to the Ephesians, that believers, having received the promised Spirit, defined specifically as 'the earnest of the inheritance,' have been 'sealed unto the ransoming of the acquired possession, to the praise of God's glory,' every element in the wording of the statement itself, and of the context as well, cries out against seeing in the term 'ransoming' anything else but a reminder that this deliverance is an issue of the ransom-paying of Christ in His blood. This ransom-paying had just (Eph 1^{7}) been defined as made by Christ in His blood, and as consisting in the remission of our trespasses. As it is impossible to suppose that the term is used in two radically different senses in the same sentence, so it is impossible to imagine that those who are delivered are described expressly as God's 'acquired possession,' and their deliverance is made dependent upon their reception of the Spirit, described specifically as 'the earnest of their inheritance,' without a very precise intention of connecting this deliverance with the ransom-paying out of which it flows as its consummation. And, this being true, it is quite clear that 'the day of ransoming' of Eph 4^{30} does not mean the day on which the ransom shall be paid, nor merely the day of a deliverance wrought somehow or other not intimated, but distinctly the day on which there shall be actually experienced the ultimate results of the ransom-paying which Christ has made 'through his blood' (1^{7}), that is, at His death on the Cross, assured to believers, because they are sealed thereto by the Holy Spirit of God, received now as the earnest of their inheritance.

There seems no reason to doubt that the same conception underlies the language of our Lord (Lk 21^{28}) when He encourages His followers to see in the signs of the coming of the Son of Man, fearful to others, the indications of their approaching 'ransoming' (ἀπολύτρωσις): 'But when these things begin to come to pass, look up, and lift up your heads; because your ransoming draweth nigh.' He does not point them to the time when the ransom which He came into the world to pay (Mk 10^{45}, Mt 20^{28}) is at length to be paid for them; neither does He promise them some other deliverance, different from that and disconnected with it, which they might expect some time in the undefined but distant future. He says '*your* ransoming,' intimating that it was already theirs in sure expectation; He speaks of it as 'drawing nigh,' recognizing that it was eagerly looked for. He is, of course, pointing to the complete realization of the ransoming of which He speaks in the actual deliverance which shall be experienced. But when He speaks of this deliverance as a 'ransoming' He is equally, of course, referring it as its result to a ransom-paying which secures it; and can we doubt that what was in His mind was His own promise that He would give His life a ransom in the place of many?

This declaration of our Lord's (Lk 21^{28}) may lead us to the two or three passages (all, like it, occurring in Luke's Gospel, 1^{68} 2^{38} 24^{21}) which differ from the other instances in which the terms denoting 'ransoming' are employed in the NT, in that they do not have the great basal assertion of our Lord (Mk 10^{45}, Mt 20^{28}) behind them, but give expression to hopes nourished on the promises of the Old Covenant. We read of Zacharias, on the birth of his prophetic son, praising the God of Israel, because 'he hath visited and wrought ransoming (λύτρωσις) for his people' (Lk 1^{68}); and of Anna, the prophetess, on seeing the infant Jesus in the Temple, giving 'thanks unto God, and speaking of him to all them that were looking for the ransoming (λύτρωσις) of Jerusalem' (2^{38}); and of the two disciples, sorrowing over Jesus' death, sadly telling their unknown Companion, as they journeyed together to Emmaus: 'We hoped that it was he that should ransom (λυτροῦσθαι) Israel' (24^{21}). Obviously these passages stand somewhat apart from those which embody the apostolic conception of the nature of the saving work of Christ. They represent rather the anticipations of the faithful in Israel with respect to the salvation promised to God's people. Their interest to us is due to the use in them of the same terminology to express Israel's hope which afterwards was employed by the apostles when they described Christ's work as at its root a ransom-paying. As we can hardly ascribe to these aspirations of saints taught by the OT revelation so clearly cut and definitely conceived a conviction that the Divine deliverance for which they were waiting was to be specifically a ransoming, as we have ascribed to the apostolic writers with respect to the deliverance wrought by Christ, the question easily arises whether we have not overpressed the apostles' language, and whether it would not be better to interpret their declarations from the vaguer, if we should not rather say the looser or at least the broader, use of the same terms in these earlier passages which represent a usage going back into the OT.

Such has been the method of many expositors (the typical instance is commonly taken from H. Oltramare on Ro 3^{24}; cf. the corrective in Sanday-Headlam on the same passage). Following it, they have felt entitled or bound to empty the language of the apostles, which literally expresses the idea of ransoming, when speaking of the work of Christ, more or less completely of all such implication, and to read it as conveying merely the broad idea of delivering. This method of dealing with the apostolic usage is, however, quite misleading. The language of the apostles is altogether too definite to permit such a process of evacuation to be carried successfully through with respect to it. Their teaching as to the nature of our Lord's work as an act of ransoming is not conveyed exclusively by the implication of the ransoming terms which they prevailingly employ in speaking of it; they use other terms also, of similar meaning, side by side with them (cf. Ac 20^{28}, 1 Co 6^{20} 7^{23}, Gal 3^{13}, 2 P 2^{1}, Rev 5^{9} 14$^{3.4}$); and they often expound their meaning in the sense of ransoming in great detail. It must not be permitted to drop out of sight that something happened between the prophetic promises of the Old Covenant reflected in the anticipations of the early days of the gospel, and the dogmatic expositions of the nature of the work of Christ by the apostles, which was revolutionary precisely with respect to the conceptions held by God's people of the nature of His great intervention for their deliverance. We cannot interpret the apostles' exposition of the meaning of the death of Christ and the manner in which it produces its effect—which was to them the most tremendous of experienced facts—wholly within the limits of the anticipations of even the most devout of Israelites who, at the best, only dimly perceived the necessity of a suffering Messiah (Lk 20$^{25\text{f.}}$). We must expect a precision in defining the mode of God's deliverance of His people to enter in after the experience of it as a fact, which could not exist before; and that the more, because a model which necessarily dominated all their teaching had been given His followers by our Lord Himself (Mk 10^{45}, Mt 20^{28}) for interpreting the nature of His work and the meaning of His death. F. J. A. Hort is certainly right in saying, when speaking of 1 P 1^{19}: 'The starting point of this and all similar language in the Epistles is our Lord's saying in Mt 20^{28} ∥ Mk 10^{45}' (cf. also B. F. Westcott, *Ephesians*, 1906, p. 140, and even, though more cautiously, A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, p. 331). Moreover, the primary assumption of this method of determining the apostolic usage of these terms is not unquestionable—to wit, that, in their earlier use, running back into the OT, the implication of purchase has dropped wholly out of sight, and only the broad sense of delivering has been retained. It is at least noticeable that the OT persistently employs terms with the implication of purchase, when speaking whether of the great typical deliverances from Egypt and the Captivity or of the greater deliverance typified by them which Jahweh was yet to bring to His people. This is no more a phenomenon of the LXX than of the underlying Hebrew; and it does not appear that it is due to a complete decay of feeling for the implication of purchase intrinsic in these terms. No doubt they are sometimes used when we see nothing further necessary for the sense than simple deliverance, and sometimes in parallelisms together with terms of simple deliverance. They are also used, however, when the implication of purchase is express. And we are not encouraged to think that they had ceased to bear their intrinsic meaning to the writers of the OT, even when applied to the greater matters of destiny, whether of the individual or of the nation, by such a passage, say, as Ps 49$^{7-8}$: 'None of them can by any means redeem (פדה, λυτροῦσθαι) his brother, nor give to God a ransom (כֹּפֶר, ἐξίλασμα) for him: (for the redemption [פִּדְיוֹן, τὴν τιμὴν τῆς λυτρώσεως] of their life is costly . . .)'; or by such a passage as, say, Is 43$^{1\text{ff.}}$: 'Fear not, for I have redeemed thee (גְּאַלְתִּיךָ, ἐλυτρωσάμην); . . . I have given Egypt as thy ransom (כָּפְרְךָ, ἄλλαγμα), Ethiopia and Seba for thee. . . . I have loved thee; therefore will I give men for thee, and peoples for thy life.' The truth seems to be that the language of ransoming and redemption is employed in the OT to describe the deliverances which Israel had experienced or was yet to experience at the Divine hands, not because this language had lost to the writers of the OT its precise import, but in order to intimate that these deliverances were not, and were not to be, without cost. Even the later Jews were not without some sense of this, and looked about for the purchase-price. ‘With two bloods,’ says the Midrash on Ex 12^{22}, ‘were the Israelites delivered from Egypt, with the blood of the paschal lamb and with the blood of circumcision’ (A. Wünsche, *Bibliotheca Rabbinica*, ii. [1890] 135, as cited by F. J. A. Hort on 1 P 1^{19}, p. 79^{b}). There is no compelling reason, then, why we should not recognize an implication of purchase, however undefined, even in Lk 1^{68} 2^{38} 24^{21}.

If there be any instance in the NT of the use of a derivative of *λύτρον*, from which this implication is wholly absent, it will most probably be found in He 11^{35}, where, in the bead-roll of the heroes of faith, we are told of some who were beaten to death, ‘not accepting the ransoming (*ἀπολύτρωσις*), that they might obtain a better resurrection.’ There is nothing in the context to intimate that the deliverance from their martyrdom which they refused was to be purchased by a ransom. But is anything further needed to carry this intimation than the employment of this particular word, in which the idea of a ransom is included? Is it not possible that the writer has selected this particular word (it is not employed in the account from which he is drawing) precisely in order to intimate that Eleazar and ‘the seven brethren with their mother’—if he is really alluding to their cases (2 Mac 6, 7)—felt apostasy too great a price to pay for their deliverance? They did not refuse a bare deliverance; they refused a deliverance on a condition, a deliverance which had to be paid for at a price which they rated as too high. The term employed is, at all events, perfectly adapted to express this fact; and the words of this stem, when used elsewhere in this Epistle, retain the implication of purchase ($9^{11.\,15}$).

There is another passage in which we are practically dependent on the implications of the form itself, without the aid of contextual indications, to determine its meaning. This is 1 Co 1^{30}, where the Apostle, in enumerating the contents of that wisdom which Christ has brought to His followers, orders the several elements, which he mentions, thus: ‘that is to say, righteousness and sanctification, and also ransoming.’ It is a little surprising to find the ‘ransoming’ (*ἀπολύτρωσις*) placed after the righteousness and sanctification, of which it is the condition. We may, therefore, be tempted to give it some looser sense in which it may appear to be conceived as following upon them, if not chronologically, at least logically. There seems to be no justification, however, for departing from the proper meaning of a word which is not only clear in its natural meaning, but is closely defined in other passages in Paul’s writings in accordance with this natural meaning. We may think, with Lightfoot and T. C. Edwards, of the eschatological usage of the word, and understand it ‘of redemption consummated in our deliverance from all sin and misery’; and suppose it to be mentioned last because referring to the final deliverance, and, therefore, ‘almost equivalent to *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*’ (Lightfoot, *ad loc.*; cf. also Edwards, *ad loc.*). Or we may think with H. A. W. Meyer and C. F. G. Heinrici of its ordinary use as the proper term to designate the act by which Christ purchased His people to Himself by the outpouring of His blood, and suppose it to be mentioned last in the enumeration of the blessings received from Christ, with the emphasis of climax, because it supplies the basis of those further acts of salvation (justification and the gift of the Spirit), by means of which righteousness and holiness are conveyed to believers. The one thing which we cannot easily suppose is that Paul has departed in this one instance from his uniform usage of a word which holds the rank of a technical term in his writings. A. Deissmann cries out: ‘This rare word occurs seven times in St. Paul!’ (*op. cit.* p. 331, n. 2). The reason obviously is that Paul had something to say which he needed this word to say. Are we to suppose that he might just as well have used the common words, current in everyday speech, for what he had to say?

How little strange the idea of salvation as a thing purchased is to this particular Epistle may be observed from the declaration twice repeated: ‘Ye were bought with a price’ (6^{20} 7^{23}), which Paul uses as an incitement to Christian effort. The addition to the assertion of the verb that we have been ‘bought,’ of the words, ‘with a price,’ serves to give great emphasis to the exclusion of all notion that salvation was acquired for us without the payment of an equivalent, and thus to make very prominent the essential idea of exchange which underlies the conception of ransoming. What the price was which was paid for our purchasing is not mentioned in these passages: it was too well understood to require explicit statement. It is similarly taken for granted in the like allusion in 2 P 2^{1}, where the false teachers who were vexing the Church are condemned as even ‘denying the Master (*δεσπότης*) that bought them.’ There is no question that they were bought: this pungent fact is rather treated as the fundamental thing in the consciousness of all Christians, and is therefore employed as a whip to their consciences to scourge them to right conduct towards their Master. In all these instances the stress falls on the ownership over us acquired by Christ by His purchase of us. They therefore naturally suggest the remarkable words of Paul, when, in bidding farewell to the Ephesian elders, he exhorts them ‘to feed the church of God, which he acquired by means of his own blood’ (Ac 20^{28}). Although, however, not the specific ‘purchased’ but the broader ‘acquired’ is employed here, the emphasis is shifted from the mere fact of acquisition and consequent ownership to the costliness of the acquisition, and therefore the price paid for it is not only explicitly mentioned but strongly stressed. God has acquired His Church by means of *His own* blood, a paradoxical statement which presented no difficulties to Paul and his readers, but rather was freighted with the liveliest gratitude. Whence ‘the church of God’ was thus acquired ‘by means of his own blood,’ we learn from the new songs of the Apocalypse. It was ‘purchased out of the earth,’ ‘from among men’ ($14^{3.\,4}$), or, more explicitly, ‘of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation’ (5^{9}). And here we are reminded again of the great price which was paid for it, and of the great deliverance which was obtained for it at this great cost. The purchase-price was nothing less than ‘the blood of the Lamb,’ and they that are purchased are ‘loosed (*λύειν*, the primitive of *λυτροῦσθαι*) from their sins in his blood’ (1^{5}), and made unto God ‘a kingdom and priests’ (1^{5} 5^{10}) who shall ‘reign upon the earth’ (5^{10}). All the virtues gather to them—‘they are without blemish’ (14^{5}). That nothing should be lacking to the presentation of the whole idea of ransoming outside the term itself, we find Paul employing the exact synonym, ‘to buy out’ (*ἐξαγοράζειν*), to express the common idea. ‘God sent forth his Son,’ he tells us, ‘born of a woman, born under the law, that he might buy out them under law, that we might receive the adoption of sons’ (Gal $4^{4f.}$); ‘Christ bought us out from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us’ (Gal 3^{13}). Paul’s whole doctrine of the ransoming Christ has been compressed into these two sentences. We were under the dominion of law, and have been bought out from it, that we may become rather sons of God and receive the Spirit. We were under the curse of the broken law and had incurred its penalty—the wrath of God and all that the wrath of God means: Christ has bought us out from under this curse. He has done this by becoming Himself a curse for us; that is, by taking the wrath of God upon Himself and enduring the penalty of the broken law in our stead. As a consequence, the blessing of Abraham has come to us, and we have received the promised Spirit.

We have called this Paul's doctrine of the ransoming Christ, and that designation of it is just. The derivatives of λύτρον occur nowhere except in Paul's own letters and other writings closely affiliated with them (Luke, 1 Peter, Hebrews). The technical term by way of eminence for the expression of this doctrine, ἀπολύτρωσις, occurs seven times in Paul and but three times elsewhere (Hebrews, twice; Luke, once). From another point of view, however, it deserves to be called a generally apostolic doctrine. It is rooted in distinct teachings of our Lord Himself. It is found clearly enunciated in the whole series of Paul's letters, from Galatians to Titus. It has a place also in the Epistle to the Hebrews, both Epistles of Peter, and the Book of Revelation. Its outlines are so sharply etched in by a touch here and a touch there, as allusion to it is added to allusion, that they cannot be obscured. It is not a doctrine merely of 'moral reform' or even of 'moral revolution,' although it includes in it an effective provision for moral regeneration. It is not a doctrine of 'deliverance from the world,' although again it counts deliverance from the world among its most valued effects. It is not merely a doctrine of deliverance from sin, conceived as a power, although it provides for deliverance from the power of sin. It is most particularly not a doctrine of deliverance from the powers of evil under whose dreadful dominion 'this world' labours, although it is a doctrine of deliverance from bondage to Satan. It is specifically a doctrine of deliverance from the guilt and penalties of sin, with all that flows from this deliverance to the uttermost consequences. The function of Christ in it cannot be reduced to that of a teacher or of an example. It is presented rather as that of a substitute. He gives Himself, His life, His blood, and He gives it as a ransom-price to buy man out from the penalties he has incurred by sin, and thus to purchase for him newness of life. Parallel and intertwined with the doctrine of Christ our Sacrifice, this doctrine of Christ our Ransom is made thus a vehicle of that 'blood theology' which is the very heart of the entire teaching of the apostles, and which has given to Christianity its whole vitality in the world.

LITERATURE.—James Orr, artt. 'Ransom' and 'Redemption' in *DCG*, *Christian View of God and the World*, 1893, p. 333 ff.; the Biblical Theologies of the NT: among the older ones H. J. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Theologie*, 1896–97, and A. Titius, *Die neutest. Lehre von der Seligkeit*, 1895–1900; among the later ones, Paul Feine, *Theologie des NT*, 1910, p. 439 f., has a brief but instructive note, and H. Weinel, *Bibl. Theol. des NT*^{2}, 1913, pp. 291 and 546, may be profitably consulted. The commentaries of H. Oltramare (1872), J. Morison (1866), Sanday-Headlam (^{5}1902), T. Zahn (1910) on Ro 3^{24}, have extended notes; B. F. Westcott, *Hebrews*, 1889, p. 297 f., has a detached note of importance; F. J. A. Hort, *1 Peter I. 1–II. 17*, 1898, p. 76 ff., has a very valuable note; A. Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, 1908, p. 232 ff., Eng. tr., *Light from the Ancient East*, 1911, p. 322 ff., needs the correction of Zahn as cited, and of the facts adduced by F. Steinleitner, *Die Beicht im Zusammenhange mit der sakralen Rechtspflege in der Antike*, 1913, p. 37 f.; James Denney, *The Death of Christ*, 1902; also from differing points of view, E. Kühl, *Die Heilsbedeutung des Todes Jesu*, 1890; A. Seeberg, *Der Tod Christi in seiner Bedeutung für die Erlösung*, 1895; J. F. S. Muth, *Die Heilstat Christi als stellvertretende Genugtuung*, 1904; M. Kähler, *Zur Lehre von der Versöhnung*, 1898; G. B. Stevens, *The Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, 1905, together with his earlier *The Pauline Theology*, 1892, *The Theology of the NT*, 1899; E. Ménégoz, *Le Péché et la Rédemption d'après Saint Paul*, 1882. Julius Kaftan has made a particularly sustained effort to interpret the Christian doctrine of 'ransoming from sin' in terms of the general religious idea of 'deliverance from the world': *Dogmatik*, 1897, § 48; *Die christliche Welt*, xvi. [1902] 411 ff.; *ZTK* xiv. [1904] 273–355, reprinted in *Zur Dogmatik*, 1904, pp. 255–337; *Jesus und Paulus*, 1906, p. 30 ff.; *ZTK* xviii. [1908] 237–292. In connexion with Kaftan there should be consulted: W. Wrede, *Paulus*, 1904 (Eng. tr., 1907), to which Kaftan's *Jesus und Paulus* is an answer: Wrede, under the same terminology of 'deliverance from the world,' interprets Paul as teaching not, as Kaftan, a purely subjective, ethical 'redemption,' equivalent to regeneration, but an objective one, explained as deliverance from the evil spirits and demons which dominate the world, a notion repeated in H. B. Carré, *Paul's Doctrine of Redemption*, 1914. See also Max Reischle, *Die christliche Welt*, xvii. [1903] 10 ff., 28 ff., 51 ff., 76 ff., and 98 ff., the last of which is a criticism of Kaftan. Reischle's articles discuss, under the title of 'Erlösung,' the general religious doctrine of 'deliverance,' and in connexion with them should be read E. Nagel, *Das Problem der Erlösung: eine religionsphilosophische, philosophiegeschichtliche und kritische Untersuchung*, 1901. There seems to be nothing in English which covers the ground of Nagel's book; but cf. H. O. Taylor, *Deliverance*, 1915. Josef Wirtz, *Die Lehre von der Apolytrosis. Untersucht nach den heiligen Schriften und den griechischen Schriftstellern bis auf Origenes einschliesslich*, 1906, deals very slightly with the biblical material, and, for the rest, investigates the history of the Patristic doctrine of ransoming from Satan.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

RED SEA.—The passage of the Red Sea with the destruction of Pharaoh's army was one of the great miracles of Jewish history which the people loved to recall. There are three distinct references to this event in the NT. In Ac 7^{36} St. Stephen mentions it as manifesting the glory of Moses. In He 11^{29} it is referred to as a striking instance of what faith can do. But the chief reference is in 1 Co 10$^{1.2}$, where St. Paul, in warning the Corinthians of the danger of neglecting their Christian benefits, quotes Israel's escaping from Egypt as an illustration. Of several great benefits bestowed by God on His people Israel one was that they all passed through the Sea; while a second was that they were all baptized in the Sea as followers of Moses. But all their great benefits did not save them when they afterwards became disobedient. St. Paul here conceives the passage through the Red Sea to have been an initiatory rite like baptism (see G. G. Findlay, *EGT*, '1 Corinthians,' 1900, p. 857).

J. W. DUNCAN.

REED (κάλαμος, Heb. קָנֶה=Eng. 'cane').—The 'reed like a staff' (κάλαμος ὅμοιος ῥάβδῳ) which St. John used for measuring the temple of God (Rev 11^1) was probably the *arundo donax*, which flourishes especially in the Jordan Valley, growing in marshy brakes to a height of 15 to 20 ft. and strong enough to be used as a walking-stick (Ezk 29$^{6.7}$, Is 36^6). Being straight and light, this reed served also as the most convenient measuring-rod (Ezk 40$^{3.5}$), and as a definite measure it was 6⅔ cubits long = about 9 ft. (Liddell and Scott, *s.v.*). The New Jerusalem was measured by an angel who had for a measure a golden reed (Rev 21$^{15.16}$).

JAMES STRAHAN.

REFORMATION (διόρθωσις).—This word—fraught with so much significance in the history of Christendom—occurs only once in the English Bible. The passage is He 9^{10}, in which the writer, speaking of the ordinances of the First Covenant, says that they are 'carnal ordinances, imposed until a time of reformation' (RV). The time of reformation referred to is the period of the New Covenant, described in He 8$^{8ff.}$ by a quotation from Jer 31$^{31-34}$. The inauguration of it by the offering of Christ is set forth in He 9$^{11ff.}$, where His perfect sacrifice of Himself is contrasted with the annual sacrifices of the older dispensation.

It is from an Old Testament point of view that this title is bestowed on the Christian era. Other aspects of that era, from the same point of view, are indicated by the words 'regeneration' (παλινγενεσία, Mt 19^{28}) and 'restoration' (ἀποκατάστασις, Ac 3^{21}).

The aspect of ‘reformation’ is complementary to these, and involves a necessary element. It was when Christ, the ‘High Priest of the good things to come,’ appeared that all defects inherent in the ancient system were remedied. The numerous ineffectual sacrifices were replaced by the one perfect Sacrifice; the veil was taken away. Religion became less a matter of mechanical routine, and more a matter of rational spiritual service.

The corresponding Greek word *διόρθωσις* is equally unique in biblical usage. Except in He 9^{10} it does not occur in the Greek Bible. It is fairly common in later Greek in the general sense of ‘amendment’ or ‘correction.’ Aristotle so uses it with reference to laws and constitutions (*Pol.* III. i. 5, VII. i. 9). Polybius employs it of the rectification of things that have mischanced or gone amiss (V. lxxxviii. 2, VI. xxxviii. 4). The corresponding verb *διορθοῦν* is used in the LXX of amending one’s ways (cf. Jer $7^{3.5}$, Wis 9^{18}).

LITERATURE.—J. F. Schleusner, *Novum Lex. Gr.-Lat. in Nov. Test.*, Leipzig, 1819, *s.v.*, and the Commentaries on Hebrews, *in loc.*, esp. B. F. Westcott (London, 1889, p. 254); A. B. Bruce (Edinburgh, 1899, p. 324 f.).

DAWSON WALKER.

REGENERATION.—*Introductory.*—A study of the NT idea of regeneration does not mean, of course, simply an examination of the passages in which that particular metaphor occurs, but a consideration of the theory which the NT writers held as to the nature of the experiences which they found in themselves and in their converts. These experiences did not take place in a vacuum, but in a world in which supernatural religion was an intensely significant interest. No movement can ever be so original that it is entirely independent of the ideas and conditions of its day. However new it may be in its spirit, it will inevitably clothe itself in the familiar forms of human speech and conduct, even though it give to them a wholly new significance. In the time of Jesus, people believed already in a Divine power which would make them fit for an immortality of bliss. They thought of the necessary transformation as a death and resurrection, as a new birth, as a purification. If the totality of the utterances of later Judaism and of the non-Christian religions be considered, it is probable that we should regard the conditions of the new life which they present as, for the most part, unethical, external, magical. But when the finest of these utterances are read with due appreciation, it must be recognized that they have a large ethical meaning.* The gospel of regeneration was not a striking novelty either to the Jewish or to the pagan world, and if the condition of regeneration were simply stated as a belief that Jesus was the Messiah, the Son of God, it might seem quite consonant with the common faith of the time. And this was probably so much the case that one of the great problems before the creative personalities of Christianity, who were passionately inculcating a spiritual faith, was to put ethical content into those supernatural conceptions of the new religion with which the people were all too easily satisfied. It is probable, therefore, that we shall have to look for the highest meaning of regeneration as conceived by the apostles, not so much in those miraculous aspects which have generally attracted attention, important as these are in NT thought, but rather in what was added of real ethical quality to the conceptions that otherwise might have been largely external and magical.

So far as Judaism is concerned, it has always been recognized that early Christianity formed itself against the background of the great faith that had come from the OT, and it has latterly been quite generally recognized that the background of NT theology is also that apocalyptic Messianism that had come to such elaborate development at the time. The continuity of revelation which has been thought of between the OT and the NT has made it easy for us to think of Christianity as accepting the language, the metaphors, and many of the externals of Judaism, giving to them a larger significance. But it is necessary also to realize that Christianity was able to take over the whole *schema* of apocalypticism by simply putting Jesus as the expected Messiah. The conditions for a doctrine of regeneration were then complete. Current Judaism made sharp distinction between the present age under the dominion of Satan and the coming age when the Messiah would be in power. Among the most glorious expectancies regarding the Messiah were the supernatural endowments that He would bestow upon His people. And there was not wanting the ethical expectation that sin would be pardoned, and a great era of righteousness would ensue. If, then, Jesus were the Messiah already manifested, crucified for sin, raised from the dead, coming again in glory, empowered to bestow an earnest of the gifts of the coming age, a supernatural new life would, of course, be possible. The believer in those redemptive facts would be translated from the Kingdom of Satan to that of Messiah. He would receive salvation, he would become a child of God, he would be miraculously re-born (a phrase already probably used of proselytes), and he would obtain the gift of the Spirit with its miraculous effects. It is evident that there is here a possibility either of the highest ethical motive or of confidence in a mere magical salvation. The whole spiritual quality of the new faith depended upon the degree in which the acceptance of Jesus became a moral power in human lives. If regeneration gave men a sure status, guaranteeing that they would be pardoned in the coming Judgment, so that they might live secure in having made comfortable provision for the future, then the whole supernaturalism would be in vain. If, on the other hand, it inspired them to be worthy to reign with Christ, it would have the highest moral quality. The great NT passages are concerned not with a definition of regeneration, but with entreaties and exhortations to live the new life which had been so Divinely bestowed.

But not only in Judaism was there a background for the doctrine of regeneration. The researches of recent years compel us to recognize that there were widespread hopes and expectancies of new life among the people who had felt the influence of the great mystery-religions.* And these were not national and racial, as were those of the Jews, but personal. The individual could be saved through a purification, this sometimes seeming to be ethical, perhaps more often ceremonial. There was intense interest in personal immortality, and a belief that the way to this salvation and immortality was that of initiation into the mysteries, involving mystic communion with the god. The very metaphor of the new birth was in all probability employed, indicating the attainment of a new status and the possibility of miraculous charismata. Indeed, it is not without significance that the word ‘regeneration’ is not used in the great NT passages. Its only occurrence as applied to the individual is Tit 3^5, a passage of very doubtful Pauline authenticity, where the most obvious interpretation is that salvation is effected by baptism. Is it possible that the word had so sacramental a significance that it was better avoided by those who were insisting upon an actual ethical renewal? With the triumph of sacramentalism in the Church the word attained its technical value.* Of course the documents that present these ideas so fully belong for the most part to a period not earlier than the end of the 2nd cent. A.D., and it is possible to maintain that they have been coloured by Christianity. But the essential doctrines of the mystery-religions could not have been so soon completely metamorphosed. Clemen (*Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources*, p. 231), in a very careful examination of the material, recognizes the priority in the mystery-religions of many of the redemptive doctrines, and these not without ethical character. So far as regeneration is concerned, he believes that even the *γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν* (Jn 3^{7}) might be so derived. He thinks also that the mention in the Naassenic sermon of a *πνευματική, ἐπουράνιος, ἄνω γένεσις*, in which the reference is to the Eleusinian mysteries, may well indicate a general influence, at least upon the Christian phraseology. This is not to say that Christianity borrowed its ideas from paganism at the same time that it felt the most intense revulsion against the idolatries, but only that certain common religious thought-forms concerning miraculous purifications and transformations were current, and Christianity inevitably expressed its own new-born faith in the language of the day. If, then, in the non-Jewish world Jesus was proclaimed as the Son of God, who had become incarnate, had died the sacrificial death, had risen from the dead and ascended into heaven, was coming again to give immortality to His followers, it would be quite in accord with the religious ideas of the time to believe that an acceptance of these redemptive facts would constitute one a child of God, and would avail to secure the gifts of the Spirit, which would be the attestation of having passed from death unto life. And, again, as among the Jews, it would be possible to accept such a doctrine in a wholly external way, making the salvation process merely miraculous. There was, of course, the other glorious possibility that those who believed themselves saved from sin and translated into eternal life by the loving acceptance of the grace of God in Jesus Christ would be actually impelled by new ethical motive, and would manifest the moral, as well as the miraculous, fruits of the Spirit. This was the experience of the NT writers themselves, and it is to this new life of love and moral endeavour that they exhort their readers.

---

* Reitzenstein’s comparison of the NT with these is, however, significant: ‘the tremendous seriousness with which guilt and atonement are preached is, so far as I can discover, lacking in Hellenism’ (*Poimandres*, p. 180, n. 1).

* See art. MYSTERY, MYSTERIES.

The basis for a doctrine of regeneration is therefore to be found in the sacramentalism of both Judaism and the mystery-cults. And the NT writers believe in a miraculous change of status brought about at the moment of faith. But they always insist that this has no meaning unless a new moral life, governed by new motives, has actually resulted. And this is a practical nullification of the sacramental conception. It is further a nullification of the artificial distinction which later theology elaborated between regeneration and sanctification. In the effort to make a self-consistent theology all the passages which referred to the miraculous change of status were used for a doctrine of regeneration, and those which referred to the ethical agency of the Spirit for one of sanctification. There was thus developed the idea that regeneration produced a complete change of nature, an idea which neither common human experience nor scientific psychology supports. The NT writers, far more concerned with the facts of experience than with the formulation of a self-consistent theology, developed no such theory. To them regeneration was always a moral fact. Hence the idea of the regeneration of infants, very easily held by those who believe in the possibility of a supernatural change of nature, does not appear in the NT. The reason for this will be noted in the discussion of 1 John.

The examination of the NT documents may well begin with Jesus' teaching in the Synoptics, then proceed to the Book of Acts as presenting the external manifestations of the early Christian experience with the interpretations that were current in the Church, and then to the writings that more clearly express the personal contributions of the great spiritual leaders.

1. The Synoptics. — The idea of regeneration, strictly so called, does not appear in the words of Jesus in the Synoptic tradition. This is significant at once of the faithfulness of the tradition and of Jesus' own extraordinary originality. The *παλιγγενεσία* of Mt 19^{28} is, of course, the Messianic consummation. But neither here, nor in any other passage that refers to the Kingdom of God in apocalyptic fashion, is there any statement of a miraculous change of status of the individual. The saying of John the Baptist that the Coming One shall baptize with the Holy Spirit (Mt 3^{11}, Lk 3^{16}) implies the supernaturalism of the charismata, but Jesus' own words have to do with the simplicity of a religious experience within the reach of all who fulfil the ethical conditions of thorough-going repentance (Mt 18^{3}) and heroic, sacrificial choice of the higher values (10^{39} $11^{25ff.}$ $16^{24ff.}$ $18^{8f.}$). Of course God Himself reveals truth to the obedient soul (16^{17}), but there is no natural incapacity for righteousness. Men can become sons of their Father if they will (5^{45}). The striking figure used of the Prodigal, who was alive after being morally dead, is only a strong expression of the happy result when the foolish sinner 'came to himself.'

2. The Book of Acts.—That the specific metaphor of regeneration had not been theologized in the primitive Church is evident from the entire absence of the figure from this book. The only reference to men as the children of God is the quotation from the Greek poet (17^{28}). However, there is here the essentially similar idea, as throughout the NT, that the saved man is one who has received the gift of the Holy Spirit. He is Divinely possessed. He may be so carried out of himself by the supernatural enthusiasm that he appears to onlookers as drunk (2^{13}); more generally he has the miraculous power of uttering ecstatic sounds (speaking with tongues, 2^{4} 10^{46} 19^{6}), and declaring his faith in exuberant public speech (prophesying, 11^{28} 19^{6} $21^{9.\,10}$); while those especially endowed may work miracles (2^{43} 4^{30} 5^{12} 8^{13} 14^{3}). This gift of the Holy Spirit, with its wonderful manifestations, is the distinguishing mark of the Christian ($2^{33.\,38}$ 5^{32} 8^{17} 10^{44} 15^{8} 19^{6}). The *schema* of the new religion is clearly set forth; Jesus is the Messiah (2^{36} 5^{42}), predicted in the Scriptures (7^{52} 8^{35} 13^{47}), attested by the Resurrection (2^{32} 10^{41} 13^{33} 26^{23}); acceptance of Him as such is the basis of salvation (4^{12} 10^{43} 13^{39}); but there must be also a very definite repentance, not merely for having crucified the Messiah (2^{38}), but a turning from iniquities (3^{26}), and from darkness to light (26^{18}), and this is to be followed by works worthy of repentance (26^{20}); baptism follows on repentance and seems to have a sacramental efficacy (*βαπτισθήτω . . . εἰς ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ὑμῶν*, 2^{38}; *βάπτισαι καὶ ἀπόλουσαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας σου*, 22^{16}). As regards baptism, it is noteworthy that Cornelius and his company are accepted of God and receive the gift of the Holy Spirit before they are baptized ($10^{44.\,47}$), though in every other case the gift of the Spirit is subsequent to baptism.

---

* For a careful study of the word *παλινγενεσία* see art. 'Regeneration' in *HDB*, by J. Vernon Bartlet, and for its use in the mystery-religions see Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, and *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, s.v. *παλιγγενεσία* in Index.

Finally, those who are thus saved and endowed are ordained unto eternal life (13[46. 48]), the blessed inheritance of the future (26[18]). While it is evident that much of this programme would be entirely familiar to the world of the mystery-religions, the peculiar power of primitive Christianity was manifest in its fine moral glow and its gracious charities, as well as in its religious enthusiasm. And this story of the early Church reveals, on the one hand, an utter absence of those coarser elements, from which the mystery-cults, whatever may have been their philosophical refinements, never freed themselves, and, on the other hand, a positive moral power resulting from glad allegiance to the Historical Founder of Christianity, such as was never accorded to the mythical founders of the other religions of the time.

3. The Pauline writings.—The central passage for St. Paul's thought on the experience of regeneration is Ro 6–8. It is evidently autobiographical in fact as well as in rhetorical form, and is a wonderful piece of self-revelation. It is a classic of religious experience, and yields in a most interesting way to clear psychological interpretation. The passage exhibits what the experience of regeneration really is in the case of such persons as are conscious of what has been called 'the divided self.' It is the case, familiar enough in some form to most of us, where all one's ethical ideals reinforced by education lead in one direction, while the strength of many habits and even of primitive instinct (if *ἐπιθυμία* in 7[7] is to be understood as 'lust') impel one in another direction. When attention is concentrated upon duty, a man acts according to his sense of higher values; when impulse determines his conduct, he is false to his better knowledge. And so, in spite of longings and endeavours after moral victory, defeat is the constant result. To the earnest Pharisee the terrible *impasse* is reached, that he wants to be righteous but he cannot (7[21-24]): he must actually do what he hates (7[15]). Some new idea with very high emotional quality is essential to secure the concentration of attention on the nobler course of conduct. This comes to St. Paul in his conversion experience. He feels himself thereupon released from the thrall of the lower self and empowered to live in the higher self. The new idea has the emotive power necessary to make his ethical ideals actually attainable, and so he comes into the experience of the peace of the unified self (7[24. 25]; cf. 5[1]). An element of this new idea that has strong emotional value is the belief that there awaits the victor in the conflict an eternity of splendid peace in the full enjoyment of all those experiences for which now he must contend so hardly (8[15-17]). This creates a condition distinctly favourable for pursuing lines of conduct conducive to the desired end. The transformation has thus taken place, that ethical ideals are no longer merely intellectually conceived, but have gained an emotional quality that renders the inhibition of contrary tendencies easy and natural (8[2]). Of course under strong provocation the old impulses to wrong conduct would revive, and sometimes so strongly as to overcome the new inhibitions and pass over into action. But the experience of victory and unity would be so vivid that this re-emergence of the divided self would be painful, the new desirable lines of conduct would renew their hold upon the attention, the inhibitions would regain their sway, and peace would again ensue. (This involves an interpretation of 7[7-25] as a continuous experience, and not merely a post-conversion memory.)

St. Paul's own interpretation of this regeneration experience is based on the antagonism between the *σάρξ* and the *πνεῦμα*. Whether his psychology involves an actual anthropological dualism it is perhaps not necessary to decide. He was probably not conscious of attempting a philosophical explanation, but was using the currently conceived antagonism between flesh and spirit to express the fact of his own experience and observation. The resolution of the antagonism is to St. Paul a Divine miracle of grace (7[25]). The flesh is gaining the victory, but the Divine Spirit comes to the reinforcement of the human spirit and overcomes the flesh. St. Paul conceives the *πνεῦμα θεοῦ* as an actual external power coming to the aid of the believer, as a donation to be received (8[15]; cf. 2 Co 1[22], Eph 1[13] 4[30]). It is difficult here to follow him exactly because we are not sure of his psychology, but it is not at all difficult to arrive at his practical purpose. He is not so much concerned to explain the religious experience of the Christian, except to ascribe it to the power of God, as he is to insist that it must be a moral experience, involving necessarily the active moral endeavour of the believer. The passage is primarily hortatory, only incidentally doctrinal. St. Paul knows that eternal vigilance has been the condition of his own moral victory, God-given though he believes it to be, and he is anxious for his readers not to fail of victory by any easy acceptance of an external salvation.

The four rich metaphors of this passage, of which regeneration is not one, are all employed with this hortatory aim. (1) Death and resurrection.—Under the symbol of baptism, the believer is pictured as dead and risen again, in order to enforce the obligation of living in newness of life (6[3-11]). (2) Change of masters.—The figure of the bondservant is used to press the alternative that we belong either to sin or to righteousness. Our conduct determines which is master (6[16-23]). (3) Remarriage of a widow.—Just as a widow assumes a new loyalty when she marries a new husband, so are we free from the old sense of moral obligations and under the highest necessity of being true to the new (7[1-6]). (4) Legal adoption of children.—The most significant figure of adoption is employed to indicate a new relationship to God attested by the presence of the Divine Spirit, enabling the believer to call God his Father. But this is all dependent upon actual life in the Spirit (or in the spirit, conceived as the higher human nature) (8[12-17]). The Apostle is peculiarly careful that these metaphors shall not be pushed to an unethical conclusion. He sees the danger in his own day, which was fully realized in the history of the doctrine of regeneration. If any reader assumes that, having been baptized, he is therefore dead to the old life, St. Paul is not afraid to present to him the paradox, that the man who has died to the flesh and is thus released from its bondage (6[6. 7] 8[10]) is still to go on putting to death the doings of the body (8[13]). In close juxtaposition he speaks of a definite bestowal of the Spirit (aorist *ἐλάβετε*, 8[15]), with a constitution of the status of adoption, and of a relationship to God contingent on an ever-present obedience (*ὅσοι ἄγονται*, 8[14]). So the new life of the Christian is at the same time an ethical achievement and a supernatural gift. St. Paul does not carefully distinguish between these. They are merged in any vital religious experience, so that the regenerate man is the one who is in the actual experience of living the new life of moral victory (8[9]).

Entirely in keeping with Ro 6–8 are all St. Paul's references to the new spiritual life. He assumes that it has had a miraculous beginning (note his use of the past tense: *δικαιωθέντες*, *ἐλευθερωθέντες*, *κληθέντες*, *ἡγιασμένοι*), but he lays the emphasis upon the ethical endeavour, which alone can make the potential actual. Thus in Ro 12[2], using the word *ἀνακαίνωσις*, very near akin to the idea of regeneration, he calls upon his readers to make a complete change for the better. Sanday-Headlam (*ICC*, 'Romans'^{5}, 1902) paraphrase, 'do not adopt the external and fleeting fashion of this world, but be ye transformed in your inmost nature.' Denney (*EGT*, 'Romans,' 1900) says that the process would in modern language be rather sanctification than regeneration, but that the latter is assumed. Would it not be nearer to the Apostle's thought, as to his experience, to say that he regards the process of spiritual renewal as one bestowed by God through faith, but rendered significant and vital only by continued faithfulness? To the Colossians he affirms in repeated metaphors a definite change that has been effected by Divine agency: a translation from the kingdom of evil to the Kingdom of Christ (1^{13}), a reconciliation from alien enmity ($1^{21.\ 22}$), a death and resurrection with Christ (2^{20} $3^{1.\ 3}$), an unclothing and reclothing ($3^{9.\ 10}$). But the reconciliation is dependent on continuance in the faith (1^{23}); the members of the dead man are to be put to death (3^5); and the new man is to be renewed (3^{10}). In the last passage the equivalent word for regeneration (ἀνακαινούμενον) is clearly used in the sense of process as in 2 Co 4^{16}, where the contrast is between the loosening hold upon physical life and the growing sense of spiritual reality. To the Ephesians St. Paul writes in the most absolute terms of a fore-ordained adoption as sons (1^5) and of salvation as a free gift (2^8), and the metaphor of the new life is a resurrection ($2^{1.\ 5.\ 6}$), not as in Romans a dying and rising with Christ, which is merely a bold use of the symbol of baptism, but a resurrection to new life of a nature so corrupt as to be regarded as morally dead. And yet the splendid description of Divinely given salvation is only an argument for a realization of an actual moral renewal, progressively to take place: putting away the old man, putting on the new, being renewed (ἀνανεοῦσθαι) in the spirit of their minds (4^{22-25}). The same paradox, though with a change of metaphor, appears in 5^8.

4. The Epistle to the Hebrews.—The figure of regeneration is not used in this document. Christians are called sons of God and brethren of Christ, but are not said to have been made so. When they are called the sons whom Jesus brings unto glory (2^{10}) the antithesis is not between sons of God and the unregenerate, but between the mortal humanity of the sons whose likeness Jesus took and the immortal glory of His own proper estate which they shall share. And in the consciousness of sonship that is gained through suffering (12^8) the antithesis is between uncared-for children who receive no correction and those beloved who are the objects of paternal discipline. However, the initial Christian experience as a definite change of attitude and relationship is very clearly expressed. It is an enlightenment (10^{32}), a tasting of the heavenly gift (of forgiveness), a reception of the Holy Spirit, a tasting of the good word of God, and of the powers of the age to come (*i.e.* a foretaste of the blessed experiences that the expected Messianic Age would bring) ($6^{4.\ 5}$). This experience is elaborated in many passages of the Epistle and is represented as produced by Divine power. The blood of Christ cleanses the conscience from sin, and makes it possible for the man of faith to serve the living God (9^{14} 10^{22}). The blood of the covenant is that which sanctifies (sanctification being here equivalent to regeneration) (10^{29}). Baptism symbolizes (or perhaps effects) the cleansing (10^{22}). The Holy Spirit is bestowed as a gift (2^4). Indeed, salvation would seem to be altogether miraculous when it is said that by one offering God hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified (10^{14}). And yet the purpose of the Epistle is to warn against apostasy, and to insist that all the blessedness of the new life is only a potentiality to be realized by faithfulness. The great passage (6^{4-6}) which enumerates all that has been done for the believer is written for the sake of the conclusion that if apostasy follows such blessedness there is no further hope. If we hold fast, we belong to Christ (3^6), and are partakers of Christ (3^{14}). We shall not escape if we turn away (12^{25}), and if we sin wilfully after being enlightened there is no further means of salvation (10^{26}). Thus, although the new religious experience is Divinely bestowed and sustained (12^2) and perfected ($13^{20.\ 21}$), it is not magical and sacramental, but dependent upon ethical striving and continued faithfulness.

5. The Catholic Epistles.—In the *Epistle of James* the idea of regeneration is connected with the coming Messianic Age: believers are Divinely brought forth (ἀπεκύησεν) as firstfruits of the new order (1^{18}). In another figure the dualism between this world and the Divine order is indicated, when God's people are represented as joined to Him by a marriage vow so that 'the friendship of the world is an adultery' (4^4). Yet, while this Epistle recognizes miraculous salvation, it distinctly affirms that religion can be defined only in ethical terms ($1^{26.\ 27}$), and lays careful emphasis on justification by works (2^{14-26}).

1 Peter is full of the exultant expression of a rich religious experience. The metaphor of regeneration appears several times. It is used to express the utterly new life which belongs to the person who has attained a hope of resurrection and heavenly glory (ἀναγεννήσας, 1^3). Again, Christians are said to be begotten again (ἀναγεγεννημένοι) to a new life of brotherly love, the moral quality of the regeneration being very marked ($1^{22.\ 23}$). And, with expansion of the figure, the new-born babe is urged to desire the fitting nourishment for producing the maturity of salvation (2^2). St. Paul's great figure of death and resurrection is employed to indicate that union with Christ means a death to sins and a life unto righteousness (2^{24}).

In *2 Peter* the new life is separated from the old by a καθαρισμός (1^9). It is described as an escape from the corruptions of the world (1^4 2^{20}). Christians thus become 'partakers of the divine nature' (1^4). This is effected through knowledge (ἐπίγνωσις) of God ($1^{2.\ 3}$) and of Christ ($1^{2.\ 8}$ 2^{20} 3^{18}). But if, in spite of this redemptive knowledge, there should be a return to the defilements of the world, salvation is lost and 'the last state is become worse with them than the first' (2^{20}). The Epistle is throughout strongly ethical.

6. The Johannine literature.—The purpose of the *Gospel of John* is definitely stated in the conclusion (20^{31}) to be a demonstration that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God, in order that men might believe and have life in His name. Life is the key-word of the Gospel. This is more than a hope of immortality, which of course it includes (6^{40} 14^{19}). It seems to imply a certain rich and exuberant experience as a result of the indwelling of the Spirit. One becomes, as it were, a perennial spring of spiritual vitality (4^{14} $7^{38\text{f.}}$). It is an experience of spiritual apprehension (8^{47}), of walking in light and not in darkness (8^{12}). The object of salvation is that one shall live to the full, abundantly (10^{10}). It may be doubted whether our modern social interpretations of the abundant life were in the mind of the writer, but he evidently referred to an exultant sense of the glorious worthfulness of being a child of God, superior to worldly circumstance, possessed of the Spirit, with miraculous powers, and certain of a glorious future. This new life is so different from ordinary mundane life that very naturally the metaphor of regeneration is used to explain it. As our human begetting by the will of man bestows upon us common life, so the Divine begetting gives us life eternal (1^{13}). The antithesis is clear: one is either regenerate or not (3^{6}). The conversation with Nicodemus affords the opportunity for presenting the doctrine. The Kingdom of God comes not by natural heritage even to a Jewish Rabbi, but by supernatural bestowment. It is mysterious as the incalculable winds, but is inevitable and essential (3^{8}). The condition of this regeneration is a belief that Jesus is the Messiah, Son of God; for what is definitely stated in the prologue ($1^{12.\ 13}$) is implied in the believing unto eternal life (3^{15}). Regeneration as thus presented might seem to be the mere change of status with miraculous charismata in consequence of an external act of homage, which the pagan heart would so well understand. But faith is not an external act in this Gospel. He that doeth the truth cometh to the light (3^{21}); he that is willing to do the will of God gains experiential evidence of the truth of the gospel (7^{17}). And the great central teaching of the last discourse of Jesus is fundamentally ethical. The figure changes from regeneration to that of the branch in the vine. The question is not whether the branch is in the vine, but whether it bears fruit, failing which it is cast forth and burned (15^{5}). And the fruit is love (15^{12}). So the test of regeneration is the actual experience of love of the brethren, the actual fulfilment of the commandment of Christ. Belief, then, through which comes regeneration, is not an intellectual assent, but a passionate loyalty, rich in ethical impulse, and a continuous experience.

1 John has the same theme as the Gospel, but the treatment is more homiletic. The conditions are peculiarly favourable to the definition of a doctrine of regeneration, for the letter is evidently written to a Christian community or communities, in which many must belong to the second or third generation of believers, and therefore would not have experienced the decided change involved in a conversion from heathenism. The silence of the NT upon the matter of the regeneration of children is interesting in view of the large place which it has held in subsequent theological discussion. In the NT, however, regeneration is always dependent upon faith. The children would, of course, receive such instruction as would enable them to believe. Both the Jewish and the Greek world were thoroughly familiar with the idea of a coming of age at puberty, and the children probably received the baptism which was the seal of their faith at that time. The figure of regeneration had not been so thoroughly theologized that the question whether or not children were regenerate would arise. The silence of the NT is an assumption that the children of believers were candidates for salvation. But a religion dependent on instruction might easily become merely formal. And it is such a situation that this Epistle presupposes. It is addressed to the Christian community (5^{13}), to fathers who have long known the truth, to young men who are conquering evil ($2^{13.\ 14}$), all of whom have received the gift of the Spirit, which is an abiding enlightenment (2^{27}). The writer identifies them with himself in the absoluteness of salvation —'we are of God, and the whole world lieth in the evil one' (5^{19}). And yet the distinctive emphasis of the Epistle is upon regeneration as a moral experience rather than as a religious status. When the author says, 'whosoever believeth is begotten of God' (5^{1}), he is stating the fact which any primitive Christian would have understood. But with equal emphasis he insists that 'everyone that doeth righteousness is begotten of him' (2^{29}), and again that 'everyone that loveth is begotten of God' (4^{7}). He does not say that we know that we have passed from death unto life because we have been baptized, but because we have the Spirit (4^{13}), and the evidence of this is love of the brethren (4^{12} 3^{14}). The ethical quality of regeneration is still more emphatically stated—'whatsoever is begotten of God doeth no sin' (3^{9} 5^{18}). Thus mankind is divided into children of God and children of the devil, each living according to the paternal nature that is in them ($3^{9.\ 10}$). Of course this is stated in absolute terms, and the correction is at hand: 'if we say we have no sin we deceive ourselves,' etc. ($1^{8.\ 10}$). It is St. Paul's fine paradox again: we are children of God by supernatural creation; the Divine seed is in us; what is Divine cannot sin; therefore the believer does not sin in his own proper nature, and if he does sin he seeks and finds forgiveness. And the paradox is true to the real religious experience. But sacramentalism is avoided, and the whole conception of regeneration is ethicized by the warning against confidence in a formal regeneration which does not manifest itself in new life. The regenerate life is an exultant and abiding love to God and the brethren ($4^{12.\ 13.\ 16}$), and if this is absent there is no regeneration at all (1^{6} 2^{9}).

LITERATURE.—Art. 'Regeneration' in *HDB* by J. V. Bartlet, in *DCG* by J. Denney, and literature there cited; works on NT Theology, especially B. Weiss (Eng. tr., 1882–83), W. Beyschlag (Eng. tr., 1895), H. J. Holtzmann (1896–97), G. B. Stevens (1899); also special works: T. D. Bernard, *The Progress of Doctrine in the NT*, 1864, ^{5}1900; G. B. Stevens, *Johannine Theology*, 1894, *The Pauline Theology*, 1892; O. Pfleiderer, *Paulinismus*^{2}, 1890 (Eng. tr., 1891); A. B. Bruce, *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, 1894; P. Gennrich, *Die Lehre von der Wiedergeburt*, 1907. For the historical background: R. Reitzenstein, *Die hellenist. Mysterienreligionen*, 1910, *Poimandres*, 1904; J. G. Frazer, *GB*^{3}, pt. iv., *Adonis Attis Osiris*, 1914; F. Cumont, *The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism*, Eng. tr., 1911; M. Brückner, *Der sterbende und auferstehende Gottheiland*, 1908; A. Loisy, 'The Christian Mystery,' in *HJ* x. [1911] 45 ff.; C. Clemen, *Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources*, Eng. tr., 1912; T. G. Soares, 'Some Psychological Aspects of Regeneration,' in *BW* xxxvii. [1911] 78 ff.; E. D. Burton, 'Spirit, Soul, and Flesh,' in *AJTh* xvii. [1913] 563 ff., xviii. [1914] 59 ff., 395 ff., 571 ff.

THEODORE GERALD SOARES.

REJECTION.—Rejection is an idea expressed by more than one word in the NT. (1) *ἀποδοκιμάζειν*, which means 'to reject after trial,' is used of our Lord in His own Person (Mk 8^{31}, Lk 9^{22} 17^{25}), and of our Lord as 'the stone which the builders rejected' (Mt 21^{42}, Mk 12^{10}, Lk 20^{17}, 1 P $2^{4.\ 7}$, in all these places quoted from Ps 117 $(118)^{22}$, although St. Luke, in reporting St. Peter's words in Ac 4^{11}, uses of the rejected stone *ἐξουθενηθείς*), and of Esau (He 12^{17}); (2) *ἀποβάλλειν* (in the forms *ἀπόβλητον*, 1 Ti 4^{4}, and *ἀποβολή*, Ac 27^{22}, Ro 11^{15}) and (3) *ἀπωθεῖσθαι* (Ac $7^{27.\ 39}$ 13^{46}, Ro $11^{1.\ 2}$, 1 Ti 1^{19}) are used in a general sense in most of the references.

In the references to Romans, (2) and (3) are employed in the special sense of the rejection of Israel to make way for the Gentiles as recipients of the gospel. It was a cause of deep distress (Ro $9^{2.\ 3}$) to St. Paul that God's chosen people whom He foreknew seemed to be rejected, and it was taken by opponents as a reflexion upon his apostleship that Israel as a nation rejected his gospel. But St. Paul did not admit the final rejection of Israel. 'Did God cast off his people (*μὴ ἀπώσατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ*, 11^{1})? God forbid. . . . God did not cast off his people which he foreknew.' He then proceeds to show that Israel's rejection is not final, and does not exclude individual members of the chosen race from the acceptance of gospel blessing. But Israel itself as a nation rejects the gospel (Ac 13^{46}) in order that the offer of it may be made to the Gentiles, who had no hereditary claim to it and were not even seeking it (Ro 10^{20}).

The unbelief or disobedience of Israel is noted by St. Peter (1 P 2^{8}), who points out also, in language as strong as St. Paul's, that Israel's stumbling and rejection had a place in God's great purpose in the salvation of men 'whereunto they were appointed.' This is a great mystery which St. Paul sets forth

(Ro 11^{25}), but in Gentile communities and under the conditions of Gentile life, the gospel had scope for world-wide extension and universal acceptance which were not possible among the Jewish people. Such, however, is the inherent genius of the Jewish people for religion that when they mark the blessedness and joy of Christian believers and the manifestations of grace in those who bear the name of Christ, they will be stirred up to seek as their own the righteousness and holiness manifested in the lives of Christians. 'And so all Israel shall be saved' and their election at the first upheld, seeing that the gifts and calling of God are incapable of being revoked (vv.$^{25.29}$). 'Did they stumble that they might fall?' asks the Apostle. 'God forbid: but by their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles. . . . For if the casting away of them (*ἡ ἀποβολὴ αὐτῶν*) is the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?' (vv.$^{11-15}$).

THOMAS NICOL.

RELIGION.—The uses of the word 'religion' in the apostolic writings may be classified under three heads.

1. In Gal $1^{13f.}$ *Ἰουδαϊσμός* is twice translated 'the Jews' religion.' St. Paul reminds the Galatians that they had heard of his manner of life aforetime when he followed Judaism, and that they knew his proficiency in Judaism. In this context the literal rendering 'Judaism' is to be preferred, for the factious rather than the religious aspect of Judaism is prominent. The EV 'Jews' religion' is an 'unfortunate' translation, because 'it implies a definite separation between the two religions which did not then exist, . . . and it puts this view into the mouth of Paul, who steadfastly persisted in identifying the faith of Christ with the national religion. . . . Here *Ἰουδαϊσμός* denotes Jewish partisanship, and accurately describes the bitter party spirit which prompted Saul to take the lead in the martyrdom of Stephen and the persecution of the Church. . . . He advanced beyond his fellows in sectarian prejudice and persecuting zeal' (F. Rendall, in *EGT*, 'Galatians,' London, 1903, p. 153 f.).

2. The Greek adjective *δεισιδαίμων* is rendered in Ac 17^{22} 'superstitious' (RV) and 'religious' (RVm). The derivative noun *δεισιδαιμονία* is rendered in Ac 25^{19} 'religion' (RV) and 'superstition' (RVm). The dominant meaning of the words in classical Greek is 'due reverence of the gods,' but in the 1st cent. A.D. they had a depreciatory sense and signified 'excessive fear of the gods' (cf. E. Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*, Oxford, 1889, p. 45). It does not, however, follow that 'religion' is an impossible rendering in the address of Festus to the Jewish king, Agrippa, who paid outward deference to the Jewish religion. But although Felix is not likely to 'have used the term offensively . . . he may well have chosen the word because it was a neutral word (*verbum μέσον*, Bengel) and did not commit him to anything definite' (R. J. Knowling, in *EGT*, 'Acts,' London, 1901, p. 497). 'Superstitious' is more probably, though not certainly, the correct translation in Ac 17^{22}. St. Paul was addressing Athenians, and they 'would instinctively recall the literary associations of the word. . . . In point of fact, the words *ὡς δεισιδαιμονεστέρους* give, in a form as little offensive as possible, St. Paul's view of Athenian idolatry already noticed by the historian (v.^{16}). The *ὡς* brings out the fact that the word *δεισιδαιμονεστέρους* expresses the speaker's own impression' (F. H. Chase, *The Credibility of the Book of the Acts of the Apostles*, London, 1902, p. 213).

3. In Ac 26^{5} and Ja $1^{26f.}$ 'religion' is the rendering of *θρησκεία* which in Col 2^{18} is translated 'worshipping.' The contemporary meaning of the word is religion in its external aspect—'cultus religiosus, potissimum externus' (Wilke-Grimm, *Clavis Novi Test.*, 1868). It is appropriately used by St. Paul in his address to Agrippa (Ac 26^{5}). Calling to remembrance his life as a Pharisee, the Apostle claims to have been 'a zealous and diligent performer . . . of the outward service of God' (R. C. Trench, *Synonyms of the NT*^{11}, London, 1890, p. 175). In Ja $1^{26f.}$, when the word is rightly understood, there is no support for those who disparage inward and spiritual religion, nor for those who so exalt its outward aspects as practically to identify it with morality and works of benevolence. What St. James asserts of such works is that they are 'the body, the *θρησκεία*, of which godliness, or the love of God, is the informing soul. . . . The apostle claims for the new dispensation a superiority over the old, in that its very *θρησκεία* consists in acts of mercy, of love, of holiness, in that it has *light for its garment*, its very *robe* being righteousness; herein how much nobler than that old, whose *θρησκεία* was at best merely ceremonial and formal, whatever inner truth it might embody' (R. C. Trench, *op. cit.* p. 176, who says, 'these observations are made by Coleridge, *Aids to Reflection*, 1825, p. 15').

J. G. TASKER.

REMISSION.—See FORGIVENESS.

REMNANT.—This word occurs only twice as a substantive in the English NT, both instances being in the Epistle to the Romans.

1. Ro 9^{27}, *ὑπόλειμμα* (WH, *ὑπόλιμμα*) with ℵ*AB Eus. The TR reads *κατάλειμμα* with later authorities. The latter variant probably originated in the desire to make St. Paul's word correspond exactly with that of the passage in Is 10^{22}, which he is here quoting from the LXX: 'And Isaiah crieth concerning Israel, If the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, it is the remnant that shall be saved' (LXX, *τὸ κατάλειμμα αὐτῶν σωθήσεται*).

The Apostle is expressing, in language adapted from the OT, his conviction that only a remnant of the Jews will be saved, a conviction forced upon him by the repeated experiences of his missionary journeys. This sad outlook on the immediate present is afterwards modified by his prophetic forecast of the ultimate return of the whole people, when 'all Israel shall be saved' (11^{26}).

The passage in Isaiah is one of central significance. The prophet is convinced that the Assyrians, the instruments of God's punishment, will overthrow not only Samaria but Jerusalem. As a State, Judah will be destroyed. The only survivors will be the 'remnant,' the group of true-hearted believers who submit to God's word spoken by the prophet. We have here for the first time the dissociation of the religious from the national life, the conception of a Church as free from political associations. Of this 'remnant' the prophet says that it 'shall return' (יָשׁוּב). The LXX rendering, *σωθήσεται*, lends itself more directly to St. Paul's reference to the Messianic salvation. To show, as he does here, that not only the calling of the Gentiles, but also the partial rejection of the Jews, was foretold in the prophetic writings, was both a ground of assurance to himself and an effective answer to Jewish criticism.

2. Ro 11^{5}, *λεῖμμα* (WH, *λίμμα*): 'Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace.' The comparison here is with the 'seven thousand men' who during the religious persecution of Ahab's reign had not 'bowed the knee to Baal' (1 K 19^{18}). The reference, as in 9^{27}, is to the small body of faithful believers who constituted the true Israel, in contrast with the recreant and disobedient majority.

The 'remnant' in the time of Elijah and that in the time of Isaiah are prototypes of the believing minority of Jews who accepted Jesus as the Messiah.

LITERATURE.—The Commentaries on Romans *in locc.*; F. Delitzsch, *Jesaia*^{2}, Leipzig, 1869, on Is 10^{22}; G. F. Oehler, *Theology of the OT*, Eng. tr., Edinburgh, 1874–75, ii. 381 ff.; G. A. Smith, *Expositor's Bible*, 'Isaiah,' London, 1888–90, i. 126 ff.

DAWSON WALKER.

REPENTANCE.—Repentance (*μετάνοια*) is one of two words used in the NT, both of which originally denoted a change of mind of any sort. It is so used, though only occasionally, in Thucydides, Plato, Polybius, etc., and the phrase *locus pœnitentiæ* ('opportunity for a change of mind'; cf. *τόπον μετανοίας*, Wis 12^{10} and He 12^{17}, both with a deeper religious meaning—for the latter passage see B. F. Westcott, *Hebrews*, 1889, *in loc.*) is found in the Roman jurists. *μετανοεῖν* is common in the LXX; there, with *παρακληθῆναι* (cf. the use of *ἵλεως*), it denotes change of mind or attitude, both in man and in God, as the translation of נחם (Niph), whose causative mood is used for bringing about the special change from sorrow to ease (*e.g.* Gn 6^7, Ex $32^{12.\,14}$, 1 Ch 21^{15}, Jl 2^{13}, 1 S 15^{29} [cf. v.^{11}]). The noun is very rare in the LXX, occurring only in Pr 14^{15}, Wis 11^{23} $12^{10.\,19}$, and Sir 44^{16} (*Ἐνὼχ . . . ὑπόδειγμα μετανοίας*). In the NT, a differentiation takes place: *μεταμέλομαι* (which is also found in a few passages in the classics) is used for a general change of attitude or purpose (Mt 21^{30} 27^3 and He 7^{21}, a quotation from Ps 110^4, the only reference to a change of mind in God in the NT, though cf. 2 Co 7^8); *μετάνοια* and *μετανοεῖν* are used of a religious change of attitude to God and to sin, often occurring in the phrase *μετάνοια ἀπὸ* or *ἐκ*. No such idea is found in classical Greek literature. It is commoner in Acts than in any other book of the NT. The earliest Christian preaching, as there described, involved the announcement of Jesus as the Messiah and the simple call for repentance in view of His near return (Ac 2^{38} 3^{19} 8^{22} 20^{21}). This is equally true of the sermons of the original apostles and of St. Paul; in Ac 17^{30}, St. Paul tells the Athenians that God is summoning all to repentance, using the same phrase—*ἀπαγγέλλειν μετανοεῖν*—as he uses of his own action in 26^{20}. In essence, this is identical with the preaching of the Baptist (Ac 13^{24} 19^4; cf. Mt 3^2 and ∥s), except that the Baptist spoke of Jesus as coming, and of the Kingdom, or the Messiah, as at hand, while the apostles referred to Jesus as already come. How repentance is to be brought about is not stated. The imperative mood implies an act of human will, possible for all to whom the call comes. On the other hand, the apostles speak of Jesus as having been exalted by God as Captain and Saviour, to give repentance unto Israel, and remission of sins (Ac 5^{31}); and the Christians in Jerusalem, hearing of the conversion of Cornelius, exclaim, 'Why, God has given repentance to the Gentiles' (Ac 11^{18}; cf. Wis 12^{19}). There is probably here no contradiction, though, if such existed, it might easily have been overlooked by the early preachers. Man could not be thought of as forced into repentance independently of his own will; but repentance is none the less made possible only through a dispensation of God's grace (cf. art. ATONEMENT, and 2 P 3^9, where the Lord is said to will that all men should come to repentance). As in the preaching of the Baptist (Mt 3^2 and ∥s), repentance is expected to manifest itself in conduct (Ac 26^{20}).

The above passages show that repentance was an integral part of St. Paul's preaching; but references to repentance in the Pauline Epistles are very rare, though of great interest. The kindness of God leads to repentance (Ro 2^4; a strikingly similar thought is also found in Ezk $36^{29\text{ff.}}$, though in Ezk 6^9 the impulse to repentance is attributed to a different cause; cf. the interesting passage Wis 12^{22-27}). The forbearance and mildness characteristic of the servant of God may lead to God's giving repentance to those who experience such treatment (2 Ti 2^{25}). In each case, the simple conception of Ac 5^{31} 11^{18}, that repentance is an attitude induced or made possible by God, is at once elaborated and modified. There is no explicit reference here to the work of Christ; but, as in Ezekiel, the experience of blessings felt to be unmerited, or the shock of unmerited forbearance from Christian people, brings about a change of mind towards sin and God. With the foregoing, we may compare the simple statement in Clem. Rom. (*Ep. ad Cor.* i. 7) that from generation to generation the Master has given opportunity for repentance to those who wish to turn to Him.

How is this wish caused? Hitherto, we have met no reference in the NT to the 'godly sorrow' for sin emphasized by Ezekiel. In converts from heathenism there might be fear at a threatened catastrophe (cf. the Philippian jailer) but not sorrow. In one passage, however, St. Paul is led to develop very clearly the influence of sorrow for sin on believers. He is referring to the effect of his previous sharp rebuke on the Corinthian Church, which hitherto had refused to mourn for the presence of sin within its borders (1 Co 5^2; cf. 12^{26}). He does not now regret (*μεταμέλεσθαι*, not *μετανοεῖν* in this case) the pain he had caused them, since this pain was experienced in the way of God (*κατὰ θεόν*) rather than in the way of the world, and this worked not death (cf. the young man's sorrow in Mt 19^{22}) but repentance, arousing in them indignation, fear, longing, and a passionate desire to set themselves right. The result of such sorrow in the community is seen in the punishment inflicted on the guilty member; and once this has brought repentance to him also, he must be comforted by his fellow-believers, lest he be overwhelmed by his pain. If, on the other hand, this punishment is ineffectual, more drastic treatment from the Apostle will be needed (2 Co 13^2). At the same time, he knows that the sin of his converts and friends will cause a deep sorrow, a 'vicarious repentance,' in him (12^{21}; cf. Jer $8^{18\text{ff.}}$).

One passage, denying the possibility of repentance to those who fall away after illumination (He 6^6; cf. 12^{17}) has occasioned great difficulty to interpreters. With the theological questions raised by the verse we have no concern here; repentance, however, is evidently used in its largest sense of an entire change of attitude, and the writer's meaning is that when a man has definitely relinquished the fullest spiritual privileges, it is impossible (for human agency) to enter on a process of making him anew (the expressions and the tenses used are noteworthy). Apart from this passage, however, the possibility that repentance may be for some men unattainable is never hinted at. Repentance in believers has a prominent place in the messages to the Seven Churches. There, it is expected that repentance will follow from the accusation and conviction of sin. If not, a sudden punishment in each case is to fall on both the guilty church and the sinners harboured in it (Rev $2^{5.\,16.\,21}$ 3^3, etc.). In the Apostolic Fathers, explicit references to this repentance are lacking. Even the letters of Ignatius, though addressed to churches with whom their writer had considerable fault to find, say nothing definite on the subject. Hermas is aware that this sorrow may be a blessing; but he is more concerned to point out that, in general, sorrow may distress the Spirit which dwells in the Christian (*Mand.* x. iii. 1, 2). In the Apostolic Age, indeed, it would seem that Christians were so eager to enter into the new joy, that they would not stay to contemplate sorrow (Ac 2^{46}, Eph 1^3; if they groaned, it was for a fuller illumination, Ro 8^{23}). This frame of mind finds constant expression in the *Odes of Solomon*; in almost the only place where repentance and sorrow might have occurred to the writer (xxxiii., Christ's preaching in Hades), they are unmentioned. As for the heathen, their sins had been overlooked (Ac 17^{30}). Divine punishments for sin might well bring sorrow to the evildoer (Ja 5^{1}, Rev 9$^{20.21}$ 16$^{9.11}$, where the most drastic treatment meted out to the sinners in the world before the Parousia fails to produce repentance); but such sufferings as come to the Christian are lifted up into the rapture of communion with Christ (Col 1^{24}, 1 P 4^{13}).

These considerations may be thought hardly sufficient to explain the comparative silence of St. Paul. It may be added that he was writing for believers, in whom repentance was an accomplished fact, his chief concern being to lead them on to religious conceptions and levels of conduct of whose significance they could not have been aware when they first turned from dead works. Further, he does not lay great emphasis on the original and simple change of attitude in his converts. He rather analyzes what would seem to have been his own experience of it: the crushing weight of law; the emergence of desire: the resultant sense of helplessness; and the deliverance wrought by the grace of God (Ro 7^{24}; cf. I. A. Dorner, *System of Christian Ethics*, Eng. tr., 1887, p. 364; the wretchedness to which St. Paul here refers is not sorrow for sin, but the resulting sense of being torn in two); or else he describes its immediate consequences, in relation to Christ, under the figures of death and resurrection (Col 2^{20}). Similarly, no reference is made to repentance in the Johannine Epistles or the Fourth Gospel. Its place is taken by the figures of the new birth (Jn 3^{8}; cf. also 1 P 1^{23}) or the passage from darkness to light (Jn 8^{12}, 1 Jn 2^{8}), which are equally applicable to repentance and conversion.

For this comparative neglect in the NT a psychological reason may perhaps be suggested. Repentance and conversion, unless either is imperfect, must go together. They are two sides of the same process. In repentance, however, the emotional side of the process is more prominent; but it is questionable whether a past emotion is ever recalled. The memory of its occurrence can of course be retained, and an appropriate stimulus may arouse a similar emotion. But it may be that such a stimulus never occurs. This would be the case with the normal Christian. Sorrow for sin becomes as much a thing of the past as sin itself. The emotions associated with repentance are only memories, and the forward look (Ph 3^{13}, He 12^{1}) and the preoccupation of the mind with the things of the Kingdom (Ph 4^{8}) will prevent any morbid dwelling on an experience which can only be temporary and ought to be short-lived, just as, by these means, any desire for a formal analysis of a past psychosis will be removed. St. Peter never refers, save by way of allusion, to his own repentance; and the long description of the stages previous to repentance and conversion in Augustine's *Confessions* and Bunyan's *Grace Abounding* would seem to be foreign to the spirit of the NT writers. They prefer to dilate on the consequences of the process (1 Co 6^{11}, Tit 3^{5}).

The same absence of interest in abstract analysis explains the silence of the NT on the question of the relative parts played by man and God in repentance. The attitude of the NT writers is rather that of the normal believer, who knows that his attitude of mind changed (see above), and that he once willed a very different set of actions, while he is equally sure that this change could never have happened apart from the grace of God (Ro 11^{33}). The argument in Ro 9$^{14-18}$ is not intended to prove that God arbitrarily grants repentance to some and withholds it from others (cf. the catalogue of warnings given to Israel, Ro 10); but only that if God's favours are withheld, God cannot rightly be blamed (see Sanday-Headlam, *ICC*, 'Romans'^{5}, 1902, p. 248 ff.). On the other hand, with regard to the ethical consequences of repentance, there is no ambiguity whatever: a fact which is the more remarkable since the belief in the near approach of the Parousia might have been expected to lead to an 'Interimsethik,' or, as some of the Thessalonian converts believed, to no ethics at all (1 Th 5^{7}, 2 Th 3^{11}). The same thing may be seen clearly in the *Epistle of Barnabas*, in which the apocalyptic section is followed immediately by the transcription of the 'Two Ways.' (See Schweitzer, *Geschichte der paulinischen Forschung*, 1911, who points out that the same stress on the importance of ethics in the descriptions of the coming world after the Parousia effectually distinguishes Jewish and Christian from pagan eschatology.)

But in truth, no multiplied references to repentance were necessary. No Christian could forget the new light in which he had come to look upon his past life (the paganism around him would make this impossible), nor the act of loving self-surrender to a new personal influence which accompanied it (Ac 20^{21}; cf. Mk 1^{15}, He 6^{1}); and, though he might fail to display at the first all the graces of a mature Christian character (Eph 4^{28}), he knew that repentance and faith together had wrought a real deliverance for him (1 P 4^{3}); and if he had felt less sorrow at the time than we might have expected for sins which hitherto he had not thought of as sins, he now regarded them with the more loathing and contempt.

LITERATURE.—R. J. Drummond, *Relation of the Apostolic Teaching to the Teaching of Christ*, Edinburgh, 1900; H. H. Henson, *Moral Discipline in the Christian Church*, London, 1905, esp. ch. iv.; R. J. Knowling, *The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ*, do., 1905; H. Weinel, *St. Paul: The Man and His Work*, Eng. tr., do., 1906; W. P. DuBose, *The Gospel according to St. Paul*, do., 1907; R. Allen, *Missionary Methods: St. Paul's or Ours?*, do., 1912; W. M. Macgregor, *Christian Freedom*, Edinburgh, 1914.

W. F. LOFTHOUSE.

REPHAN (Ac 7^{43}, so RV; AV 'Remphan,' WH 'Rompha,' Tisch. 'Romphan').—St. Stephen in his speech is quoting from LXX of Am 5^{26}. None of the above forms is known at all as the name of a god elsewhere, the suggestion of Lipsius that it is connected with the name *repa-n-neteru*, 'youngest of the gods,' a title of the god Seb (=Saturn), being too far-fetched. The Hebrew has *Chiun*, which may have been read as *Kewan*, and changed into *Rephan*, a similar change of כ to ר in LXX occurring in Nah 1^{6}. The Hebrew *Kewan* might represent the Babylonian *Kaawanu*, 'Saturn' (Schrader, *KAT*^{2}, 1883, p. 409 f., Eng. tr., 1885–88, ii. 141 f.), but more probably it is not a proper name at all (W. R. Smith).* The mention of the 'star' is all that is requisite for St. Stephen's purpose, namely, to show that the foreign idolatrous planet-worship had crept in and meant apostasy from the true worship of Jahweh. See, further, Commentaries on Acts and Amos.

F. W. WORSLEY.

REPROACH.—So far as the RV rendering of the apostolic writings is concerned, this word represents the Greek *ὀνειδισμός*. It occurs twice in the Pauline Epistles and three times in Hebrews, and affords interesting instances of references to OT thought and employment of OT language. The word *ὀνειδισμός* belongs to the sphere of Hellenistic as distinct from classical Greek. It is of frequent occurrence in the LXX throughout the later prophetic writings and, for the most part, represents the Hebrew חֶרְפָּה.

---

* 'The words כוכב אלהיכם ['star of your God'] are a gloss, as is indicated by the fact that the Septuagint read them before Ραιφαν=כיון. The gloss arose from the idea that Chiun is equivalent to the Syriac Kêwân, a Persian name of the planet Saturn. But the date of Amos forbids this interpretation. Both סכות and כיון must be common nouns in the construct state, probably "the *shrine* of your (idol) king and the *stand* of your images," *i.e.* the portable shrine and platform on which the idols were exhibited and borne in processions' (*OTJC*^{2}, London, 1892, p. 294 n.; cf. also *Prophets of Israel*, do., 1882, p. 401).

St. Paul (Ro 15^{3}), in appealing to the 'strong' to bear the infirmities of the 'weak,' adduces the example of Christ, who 'also pleased not himself, but'—and here the Apostle breaks the grammatical construction in order to introduce intact an OT quotation — 'the reproaches of them that reproached thee fell upon me.' This is an exact employment of the words of Ps 68^{10} in the LXX (EV 69^{9}), *οἱ ὀνειδισμοὶ τῶν ὀνειδιζόντων σε ἐπέπεσον ἐπ' ἐμέ*. The general purport of this psalm is to describe the sufferings of the typically righteous man at the hands of the ungodly. Many passages from it are referred to our Lord in various parts of the NT. In v.^{10} the righteous sufferer is represented as speaking to God and as saying that he has to bear the reproaches uttered against God. St. Paul here puts the words into our Lord's lips, who is conceived as speaking, not to God, but to a man, and as saying that in enduring reproaches He was bearing, not His own sufferings, but those of others.

The passage so used is an interesting example of the way in which St. Paul takes OT phraseology out of its original context and employs it for his own purpose. In the hands of one who viewed Ps 68 as Messianic in its reference, this procedure was both legitimate and appropriate.

In 1 Ti 3^{7} the Apostle, enumerating the characteristics requisite for a bishop, says that 'he must have good testimony from them that are without; lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil.' There is considerable uncertainty as to the exact meaning of this passage. One question is, whether 'reproach' is to be taken alone, or whether 'reproach and snare of the devil' is to be treated as all one phrase. Some, perhaps feeling that 'reproach of the devil' is an impossible expression, take *διαβόλου* here in the general sense of 'slanderer,' and translate, 'lest he fall into the reproaches and snares prepared by slanderers.' On the whole, the RV as given above seems to afford the most natural meaning. A bishop's life must be such as not to forfeit the approval in general of surrounding non-Christian society. Should he fail to secure this general approval, there is the probability that his life is open to adverse criticism and that he may thus fall a prey to the wiles of the tempter.

He 10^{33} recalls how the readers of the Epistle had been 'made a gazingstock both by reproaches and afflictions'; but the passages of greater interest in this book are 11^{26} and 13^{13}. The reference in each is to the 'reproach' of Christ. In 11^{26} it is said that Moses accounted 'the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt.' The 'reproach' which Moses endured is called 'the reproach of the Christ' because it was on account of his belief in God's saving purpose that he suffered it. 'The reproach which Moses suffered in the fellowship of the People of God—the hardship, contempt, and the like, inflicted at the hands of the Egyptian world then—was the same as that inflicted on Christ in the days of His flesh, and the same as was borne by the Hebrew believers in their day, or as is borne by believers at all times. Though the reproach and the sufferings are the same, however, Christ is worthy to give name to them; to others they derive their meaning from having been endured by Him, and in Him they reached their climax' (A. B. Davidson, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Edinburgh, n.d., p. 228). The statement does not necessarily imply belief on the part of Moses that a personal Christ was to come. What he did believe in was the fulfilment of God's promise, which, in point of fact, was fulfilled in the coming of Christ.

In He 13^{13} the readers are exhorted to 'go forth unto him [Jesus] without the camp, bearing his reproach.' They must make their choice between Christianity and Judaism, for the two cannot be amalgamated. Christ's death 'without the gate' was the symbol of His being cast out of the community and religious life of the OT Israel. To realize the full power of His redeeming work, His followers must abandon 'the camp'—the sphere within which the religious life and ordinances of Israel prevail—and must go forth to Him. To be branded as a traitor and to be deprived of Jewish privilege was 'the reproach of the Christ.' This His followers must share.

It is not improbable that the language of Ps 89$^{50-51}$ underlies both of these passages in Hebrews (LXX Ps 88$^{51.\ 52}$), *μνήσθητι Κύριε, τοῦ ὀνειδισμοῦ τῶν δούλων σου . . . οὗ ὠνείδισαν τὸ ἀντάλλαγμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου.*

In the AV the word 'reproach' occurs in two passages in 2 Corinthians. In 11^{21} it is used to translate the Greek *ἀτιμία* (RV 'disparagement'). In 12^{10} it is used to translate *ὕβρις* (RV 'injury').

DAWSON WALKER.

REPROBATE.—'Reprobate' is the rendering of the Greek word *ἀδόκιμος*, which is used in the NT only by St. Paul and only of persons, except in He 6^{8}, where it is used of the land. It is the negative form of *δόκιμος* (from *δέχομαι*), 'acceptable,' 'tested,' 'worthy,' and means 'unacceptable,' 'unworthy,' 'rejected after trial.' 'Reprobate silver shall men call them,' says Jeremiah of God's degenerate people, 'because the Lord hath rejected them' (6^{30} LXX). In Ro 1^{28} St. Paul uses the word when speaking of the natural condition of the heathen world, alienated from God, abandoned to their lusts and passions and to a reprobate mind (*εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν*), as if, having failed to avail themselves of the light of nature, they were now left without it altogether and without hope of amendment at all. A 'reprobate mind' in the judgment of St. Paul is proof of the deep depravity of the heathen and at the same time its awful punishment. In 1 Co 9^{27} St. Paul uses the word in a passage where he is comparing the Christian life in its strenuousness to the contests in the Grecian games. In them the racer or the boxer must contend strictly according to the rules, for if he is found fouling a rival or transgressing the rules of the contest, he is liable to be cast out of the lists and scourged, and at any rate will be declared disqualified for a prize. It was in this spirit that Ignatius, on the way to martyrdom at Rome, entreated the prayers of his fellow-Christians so as to be found worthy of the lot he had set before him, that in the end he might not be found 'rejected' (*ἀδόκιμος*) (Ignatius, *ad Trall.* xii. 3). See CASTAWAY. Elsewhere St. Paul urges the necessity of earnest self-examination and the close following of Christ if his readers would escape this reproach (2 Co 13$^{5-7}$); and utters words of solemn warning against men who after having made a Christian profession become depraved in mind and heart, or content themselves with an outward profession, whilst, as regards the faith and every good work, they are discredited, 'reprobate' (2 Ti 3^{8}, Tit 1^{16}).

The passage in He 6^{8} where *ἀδόκιμος* is used not of persons but of the land is, taken in connexion with its preceding context, very suggestive. The land which drinks in the rain and brings forth the looked-for crop receives blessing of God, but that which receives the same benign influence and produces only thorns and thistles is 'rejected' (*ἀδόκιμος*), gets no share of that blessing, but is fit only, like Sodom and Gomorrah, for the fire. It is in these solemn words that the writer sums up his urgent message to the Hebrew Christians to press on unto perfection and to be on their guard against spiritual sloth, which may issue in falling away. He speaks as if a fall from grace were possible even on the part of those who have experienced spiritual enlightenment and renewal, as if there were a point even in the spiritual life where backsliding becomes apostasy, and the man who crucifies the Son of God afresh and puts Him to an open shame is beyond repentance, rejected, reprobate. St. Paul and the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews in these passages are not presenting a reasoned system of predestination and election, but rather dealing with what may happen under the stress and strain of temptation and trial in the ordinary tenor of the Christian life, and emphasizing the need of diligence and watchfulness, if they and their readers would make their calling and election sure.

Of 'reprobation' as the issue of a Divine decree there is no direct statement in the NT, St. Paul, indeed, seeming deliberately to avoid any such statement. When asserting the Divine sovereignty under the figure of the potter who makes of the same lump one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour, he asks, 'What if God, willing to shew his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much long-suffering vessels of wrath fitted unto destruction: and that he might make known the riches of his glory upon vessels of mercy, which he afore prepared unto glory?' (Ro 9$^{21-23}$). The distinction drawn by the Apostle when speaking of 'the vessels of wrath' and 'the vessels of mercy' in the above passage is significant. Of the former he uses the passive and impersonal form, 'fitted to destruction'; of the latter he speaks in the active voice, 'the preparation' being directly attributed to God. Our Lord similarly distinguishes between the sentence which He will pass in the Judgment on those on His right hand and that on those on His left. To the former, the address is, 'Come, ye blessed of my Father'; to the latter, 'Depart, ye cursed,' the blessing being all of God, the curse entirely of themselves. In the same connexion 'the everlasting fire' is 'prepared for the devil and his angels,' but the Kingdom to which the righteous are summoned is prepared for them 'before the foundation of the world.'

It is interesting as a matter of NT interpretation to notice that three of the most notable of the Reformed Confessions—the Heidelberg Catechism, the Revised Thirty-nine Articles, and the Scots Confession of 1560—pass the subject of reprobation over in silence.

THOMAS NICOL.

REPROOF.—The subject of reproof, *i.e.* the refutation of error, the discovery of sin, the convincing and convicting of the wrongdoer (*ἐλεγμός, ἔλεγχος, ἐλέγχω*: LXX for תּוֹכֵחָה, תּוֹכַחַת, הוֹכִיחַ), is mentioned frequently in the Bible. Reproof is used generally in the sense of rebuke. Rules are laid down for its administration, and advice given as to its reception. It is necessary, beneficial, and not to be despised. The great and constant dangers to be avoided are these—reproving unskilfully; withholding reproof unfaithfully, and resenting reproof administered in love. Christians in general are exhorted to reprove 'the unfruitful works of darkness' (Eph 5$^{11.\,13}$; cf. Mt 18$^{15-18}$), and Christian ministers in particular must regard reproof as an important duty of their office (1 Ti 5^{20}, 2 Ti 4^{2}, Tit 1$^{9.\,13}$ 2^{15}).

Reproof may be administered (*a*) by word, in which case there is the underlying idea of severe rebuke and admonition. The offender must be called upon to give an explanation of his conduct and his fault must be made plain to him (1 Ti 5^{20}, 2 Ti 4^{2}, Jude ^{15}; cf. Mt 18^{15}, Lk 3^{19}); (*b*) by deed, in a two-fold sense: (i.) by deeds of light being manifested in a way that will be a virtual reproof of deeds of darkness (Eph 5^{13}; cf. Jn 3$^{19-21}$); (ii.) by chastening or punishment (He 12^{5}; cf. Ps 37 (38)^{2} 94^{12} 119$^{67.\,75}$, Pr 3^{11}, Jer 31$^{18.\,19}$, Rev 3^{19}, Wis 12^{2}, To 11^{15} 13$^{5.\,9}$, Jth 8^{27}); (*c*) by the Scriptures (2 Ti 3^{16}). Behind the censure lies the fundamental idea of the conviction of sin. The verb *ἐλέγχω* signifies 'prove, refute, expose, convict.' It is used with these meanings in classical writers from the time of Euripides. Many scholars hold the opinion that it means rather more than 'reprove' and rather less than 'convince.' For 'reprove' in the sense of 'bring to the proof' see 2 Ti 4^{2} RVm; cf. Ps 38^{14} RVm. For reproof in relation to sin, see 1 Co 14^{24}, Ja 2^{9}, Jude ^{15}; cf. Jn 8$^{9.\,46}$ 16^{8}; Aristoph. *Plut.* 574. For reproof of false teachers, see Tit 1$^{9.\,13}$ 2^{15}.

H. CARISS J. SIDNELL.

REPUTATION.—This word occurs in four passages of the AV. In each case it is employed as a rendering of a different Greek adjective or verb, and in each case the RV uses some other expression which translates the Greek somewhat more literally and exactly.

1. Ac 5^{34} speaks of Gamaliel as a *νομοδιδάσκαλος τίμιος παντὶ τῷ λαῷ*. AV renders this: 'had in reputation among all the people,' RV more literally, 'had in honour of all the people.'

2. Gal 2^{2} tells of St. Paul's visit to Jerusalem, when he communicated the gospel which he preached to the Gentiles *κατ' ἰδίαν τοῖς δοκοῦσι*. AV renders this: 'privately to them which were of reputation'; RV—in almost identical terms, but again with a degree of greater exactness—'who were of repute.' *οἱ δοκοῦντες* is in itself a term of honour, and is used as such here. The meaning, however, may vary with the context, and in Gal 2^{6} it is depreciatory, not of the worth of the apostles, but of the extravagant claims advanced by some on their behalf.

3. Ph 2^{7} says of Christ that He *ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε*. AV renders this: 'made himself of no reputation'; the RV 'emptied himself' is obviously more exact. The import of this mysterious predicate is discussed in art. PHILIPPIANS, EPISTLE TO THE, above, p. 226 f.

4. Ph 2^{29} is the passage in which St. Paul, commending Epaphroditus to his Philippian friends, bids them *τοὺς τοιούτους ἐντίμους ἔχετε*. AV renders this: 'hold such in reputation.' The RV 'hold such in honour' is equally clear and maintains closer correspondence with the Greek adjective.

DAWSON WALKER.

RESPECT OF PERSONS.—The abstract noun *προσωπολημψία* occurs in the NT four times. In three of these instances (Ro 2^{11}, Eph 6^{9}, Col 3^{25}) it is used with reference to God, in the fourth (Ja 2^{1}) with reference to man. The cognate verb *προσωπολημπτέω* occurs once only in the NT in Ja 2^{9}. The masculine form *προσωπολήμπτης* occurs only once in Ac 10^{34} and the negative adverb *ἀπροσωπολήμπτως* only once in 1 P 1^{17}. The compound is a late Hellenistic formation, appearing only in the NT and in ecclesiastical literature.

Before the formation of the compound, and along with it, the constituent elements were used together as separate words. The expression *λαμβάνειν πρόσωπον* is used in the LXX to translate נָשָׂא פָּנִים, 'to accept the face,' *i.e.* to receive kindly or look favourably upon any one (cf. Lv 19^{15}). Originally the expression was a neutral one, involving no idea of improper partiality. When, however, it becomes a distinctive expression, as, *e.g.*, in Gal 2^{6} (*πρόσωπον θεὸς ἀνθρώπου οὐ λαμβάνει*), it takes a worse sense. Lightfoot (*in loc.*) suggests that this is owing to the secondary meaning of *πρόσωπον*, 'mask,' so that *πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν* signifies 'to regard the external circumstances of a man'—his rank, wealth, etc.—as opposed to his real intrinsic character. The phrase *λαμβάνειν πρόσωπον* occurs again in the NT in Lk 20^{21}. It also occurs in the *Didache* iv. 3: *κρινεῖς δικαίως, οὐ λήψῃ πρόσωπον ἐλέγξαι ἐπὶ παραπτώμασιν*. Alternative expressions with a similar meaning are *βλέπειν εἰς πρόσωπον* (Mt 22^{16}, Mk 12^{14}) and *θαυμάζειν πρόσωπον* (Jude ^{16}).

The NT instances of the compound word fall into three main groups. Ac 10^{34}, 1 P 1^{17}, and Ro 2^{11} constitute the first of these. In Ac 10^{34} St. Peter, addressing the assembled household of Cornelius, says, *καταλαμβάνομαι ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν προσωπολήμπτης ὁ Θεός*. On this assertion of God's character, as free from partiality to one nation above other nations, the Apostle bases his repudiation of the exclusive covenant of Israel. In Ro 2^{11} St. Paul asserts the same view with the similar phrase *οὐ γάρ ἐστιν προσωπολημψία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ*. The expression in 1 P 1^{17} describing God as *τὸν ἀπροσωπολήμπτως κρίνοντα κατὰ τὸ ἑκάστου ἔργον* involves the same assertion, but it also involves a warning (with a possible reference to Dt 10^{17}) that, under the New Covenant as under the Old, God would show no favour to those whose deeds made them unworthy of it.

The two passages Eph 6^{9} and Col 3^{25} form the second group. Both are concerned with the mutual relations of masters and slaves. In Eph 6^{9} masters are counselled as to the right treatment of their slaves, 'knowing that both their Master and yours is in heaven, and there is no respect of persons (*προσωπολημψία*) with him.' In Col 3^{25} the word occurs in the counsels addressed to the slaves. The passage is interesting as showing that *προσωπολημψία*, though usually exercised in favour of rank and power, might occasionally be employed on the opposite side (cf. Lv 19^{15}). The slave might assume that because man's *προσωπολημψία* would usually be on the master's side, there would be a corresponding *προσωπολημψία* of God on the slave's side. St. Paul's warning in this passage corrects any such mistaken impression.

The third group of passages consists of the two in St. James, the noun in 2^{1} and the corresponding verb in v.^{9}. In the general context it is partiality in favour of the wealthy, well-dressed member of the Christian assembly that is condemned. In 2^{1} the noun is used in the plural, *ἐν προσωπολημψίαις*, with probable reference to the many ways in which partiality may display itself.

In the sub-apostolic writings *προσωπολημψία* occurs only in Polycarp, *ad Phil.* vi. 1. Elders are warned that they should be compassionate and merciful, *ἀπεχόμενοι πάσης ὀργῆς, προσωπολημψίας, κρίσεως ἀδίκου*. The negative adverb occurs in 1 Clem. i. 3 (*ἀπροσωπολήμπτως γὰρ πάντα ἐποιεῖτε*) and in *Ep. Barn.* iv. 12 (*ὁ κύριος ἀπροσωπολήμπτως κρινεῖ τὸν κόσμον*).

Literature.—Sanday-Headlam, *ICC*, 'Romans'^{5}, Edinburgh, 1902, p. 58; J. B. Lightfoot, *Galatians*^{6}, London, 1876, p. 108, *Colossians and Philemon*, new ed., do., 1879, p. 230; J. B. Mayor, *James*^{3}, do., 1910, p. 78.

Dawson Walker.

REST.—So far as the apostolic writings are concerned, the teaching on rest in its relation to the believer's life is confined to two great passages—He 4^{1-11} and Rev 14^{13}. The basis of the idea is the Divine rest, the rest on which God entered at the completion of His work of creation. Participation in this rest is a Divine gift to man. The natural tendency is to conceive rest as mere cessation of work. So far as the Jews shared this misapprehension, it is corrected by our Lord in the discourse of Jn $5^{17\text{ff.}}$ beginning with the words, *ὁ πατήρ μου ἕως ἄρτι ἐργάζεται, κἀγω ἐργάζομαι*. This idea of rest as freedom for further work finds expression in Rev 14^{13}: 'Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours (*κόπων*); for their works (*ἔργα*) follow with them.' The 'labours' of the Christian's life are ended at death; its 'works'—*i.e.* habits, methods, and results—abide and remain in the new life.

It is in He 4^{1-11} that we find the most exhaustive treatment of this theme. The whole passage may almost be called a homily or discourse having for its text the words of Ps 95^{11}, *ὡς ὤμοσα ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μου, εἰ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου*. The rest to which God, as quoted by the Psalmist, refers is the Divine rest, after creation, of which Gn 2^{2} speaks: *καὶ κατέπαυσε τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ ὧν ἐποίησε*, a passage which links the idea of Divine rest indissolubly with the Sabbath. The writer's argument is briefly this. The inspired oracle in Ps 95 speaks of a 'rest' of God. The Psalmist tells how in the days of Moses this rest lay open to God's people, but they did not enter in through disobedience. Neither then nor at the entry into Canaan under Joshua was the Divine idea of rest realized. The Psalmist, in fact, implies that the Divine idea still remains unrealized, it still awaits fulfilment; and the author of Hebrews, taking the Psalmist's word as the last utterance of the OT on the subject of rest, applies it with confidence to his hearers of the NT epoch. He draws the inference *ἄρα ἀπολείπεται σαββατισμὸς τῷ λαῷ τοῦ θεοῦ*.

The word *σαββατισμός* (RV 'Sabbath rest') occurs here only in the Greek Bible. It is not a coinage of the author's, because it is found in Plutarch, *de Superstit.* 3. Its occurrence therefore in Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 23 B, is not necessarily dependent on Hebrews. The substitution of this word for *κατάπαυσις*, the word employed throughout the remainder of the passage, is not accidental. It not only denotes the Divine rest as a Sabbatic rest; it links together, in a most suggestive way, the end with the beginning, the consummation with the creation. It implies too that the rest which God gives is one which He also enjoys, and it strikes the note of universalism, for the Divine rest is prior to the very existence of a chosen people. Just as in the case of salvation, the Christian rest may be viewed both as a present possession and as a future blessing. On the one hand, 'we which have believed do enter into that rest.' On the other hand, the very conception of the rest as God's rest involves fuller realization yet to come.

The word *ἀνάπαυσις* occurs now and then in the sub-apostolic writings with reference to the heavenly rest. 2 Clem. v. 5 speaks of the *ἀνάπαυσις τῆς μελλούσης βασιλείας καὶ ζωῆς αἰωνίου*, and in vi. 7 we read, *ποιοῦντες γὰρ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Χριστοῦ εὑρήσομεν ἀνάπαυσιν*. The verb *καταπαύω* occurs throughout an interesting passage (*Ep. Barn.* 15) in which the hallowing of the Sabbath is discussed as something which will find its fulfilment in Christianity (as opposed to Judaism) in the impending Messianic Age. It is quite possible that the treatment here may be influenced by the thought and language of He 4^{1-11}.

In 2 Th 1^{7} the RV agrees with AV in using 'rest' to translate *ἄνεσις*. This word is used in the NT only by St. Paul, always with a contrast to *θλίψις* expressed (as here) or implied. That the idea of rest here has an eschatological reference is seen from the following words: *ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ μετ' ἀγγέλων δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ*.

Literature.—*HDB*, art. 'Rest'; H. B. Swete, *Apocalypse*^{2}, London, 1907, p. 187; A. B. Bruce, *Hebrews*, do., 1889, pp. 92–100; G. Milligan, *Thessalonians*, do., 1908, p. 89.

Dawson Walker.

RESTITUTION.—1. The term.—The word 'restitution' is the AV rendering (RV 'restoration') of the Gr. *ἀποκατάστασις*, which is found in the NT only in Ac 3^{21}, though the verb *ἀποκαθίστημι*, 'restore,' occurs several times (see especially Mt 17^{11}, Ac 1^{6}). In the exegesis of Ac 3^{21} two views have been taken of the relation of the phrase *ἄχρι χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων* ('until the times of restitution of all things') to the relative clause which follows, and these two views are reflected in the renderings of the AV and RV respectively. According to the AV rendering the relative pronoun *ὧν* has *πάντων* for its antecedent, so that the restitution is a restitution only of those things of which the prophets had spoken. According to the RV and the great majority of modern commentators the antecedent is *χρόνων*, so that it was the times of restoration of which the prophets spoke, and the restoration is a restoration of all things in some sense not defined in the context. The sense, however, is suggested by the passages to which the present one evidently refers. The prophet Malachi had foretold that Elijah should be sent as the Messiah's forerunner (Mal 4^{5}) and that he should effect a work of moral restoration (v.^{6}); and in the LXX this restoring work (Heb. הֵשִׁיב, EV 'turn') of Elijah is expressed by the word *ἀποκαταστήσει*. On the ground of this saying the expectation of Elijah's reappearance to herald the advent of the Messiah had become general among the Jews (Sir $48^{10.\,11}$; cf. Schürer, *HJP* II. ii. [1885] 156), and when Jesus, after His transfiguration, forbade His disciples to tell any one of their vision of Moses and Elijah on the mount, they asked Him, 'Why then say the scribes that Elijah must first come?' (Mt 17^{10}; cf. Mk 9^{11}). 'Elijah indeed cometh,' was His reply, 'and shall restore all things' (*ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα*, Mt 17^{11}; cf. Mk 9^{12}); but He immediately made them understand that Elijah had come already in the person of John the Baptist (Mt $17^{12\text{f.}}$).

The 'restoration of all things' of which St. Peter spoke was thus not a restoration in the large sense of a Universalist doctrine, but a moral and spiritual recovery of Israel such as Malachi had foretold and St. John proclaimed in preaching the baptism of repentance. That St. Peter at this stage of his career could not have entertained any idea of a universal restoration is proved by his later experiences at Cæsarea (Ac 10). And if it is suggested that the phraseology of the verse is due to St. Luke, the writer of Acts, with his much wider outlook, it has to be considered that a close fidelity of the historian to his sources is suggested by St. Peter's whole speech, embodying as it does a purely Jewish form of Christian expectation quite different from the later perspective of the Church after the door had been opened to the Gentiles and the national life of Judaism had been destroyed.

2. The idea.—A discussion of the NT doctrine of restitution or restoration, however, cannot be limited to an examination of the particular term. The idea of a 'restoration of all things' is raised not only by this speech of Peter's but by one or two of our Lord's utterances, and above all by certain striking statements and declarations in the Pauline Epistles.

(1) The saying of Jesus in Mt 17^{10} (Mk 9^{11}) has been already referred to. But in 19^{28} we find Him speaking of the 'regeneration' (*παλινγενεσία*), when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of His glory. The word *παλινγενεσία* in this passage is practically synonymous with the *ἀποκατάστασις* of Ac 3^{21} (cf. Jos. *Ant.* XI. iii. 8, 9, where the words are used interchangeably of the national restoration under Zerubbabel). Jesus is referring to that hope of a renovation of heaven and earth which formed part of the Jewish Messianic expectation (*Enoch* xlv. 4, 5; cf. 2 P 3^{13}, Rev 21^{1}) and was based on Is 65^{17} 66^{22}. No more here than in Rev 21, where we have the Apocalyptist's conception of the *ἀποκατάστασις* or *παλινγενεσία*, is there any suggestion of a universal restoration of sinful beings (see Rev 21^{8} 22^{11}). The same thing must be said of Jn 12^{32}, which is sometimes adduced in the interests of a Universalist doctrine. The context (v.$^{20\text{ff.}}$) shows the point of the verse to be that the uplifting of Jesus on the Cross (cf. $3^{14\text{f.}}$) would draw to Him Gentiles as well as Jews.

(2) It is in St. Paul's writings, however, and especially in such passages as Ro 11^{32}, 1 Co $15^{22\text{ff.}}$, Ph $2^{10.\,11}$, Eph $1^{9.\,10}$, Col 1^{20}, that support is chiefly sought for the idea of a universal restoration. But the argument of Ro 11 shows that in v.^{32}, as in Jn 12^{32}, 'all' means Jew and Gentile alike. In 1 Co 15^{22}, again, nothing more is asserted than a universal resurrection of the dead, and in vv.$^{24-28}$ what is in view is a subjugation of all forces that are hostile to the Divine Kingdom so that God may be all in all. And if we find that in Ph $2^{10.\,11}$ the adoration of the Exalted Jesus is represented as an act in which the whole creation participates, while in Eph 1^{10}, Col 1^{20} Christ appears as summing up all things in Himself and reconciling all things unto Himself, these soaring utterances cannot be interpreted apart from St. Paul's emphatic teaching that the wages of sin is death (Ro 6^{23}), and that destruction awaits the enemies of the Cross of Christ (Ph 3^{19}). In the light of such texts it seems safe to conclude that the Apostle's 'universalism' implies not a universal redemption of individuals, but a restoration of the disordered world to unity and harmony by an elimination of all discordant elements or a subdual of all hostile powers.

(3) Support for a restorationist doctrine is sometimes sought in those passages of the Pastoral Epistles where it is said that God 'willeth that all men should be saved' (1 Ti 2^{4}), that He is 'the Saviour of all men, specially of them that believe' (4^{10}), that His grace 'hath appeared, bringing salvation to all men' (Tit 2^{11}). Yet it seems hardly possible to affirm more here than that the Divine saving purpose brings salvation within the reach of all, while the realization of that purpose depends upon the attitude of the individual to the Divine grace. Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners (1 Ti 1^{15}); but to obtain mercy men must 'believe on him unto eternal life' (v.^{16}). In the same Epistle we read that destruction (*ὄλεθρος*; cf. 2 Th 1^{9}) and perdition (*ἀπώλεια*; cf. Ph 3^{19}) await those who walk in the way of their own lusts (1 Ti 6^{9}).

Attractive as it is, the idea of universal restoration finds little support in a careful exegesis. Those who advocate it usually fall back upon conjectures suggested by the hidden possibilities of the future life or general considerations with regard to the grace of Christ and the Fatherly love of God. Even when a case has been made out for Universalism from the direct utterances of the NT, it has to be admitted that the materials for a case against it are abundantly present. To Martensen it seemed that on this subject the Scriptures set before us an unresolved antinomy corresponding to the antinomy between the sovereignty of God and the free will of man. The Divine saving purpose is universal in its scope, but it is conditioned by human freedom. The one entitles us to cherish 'the larger hope'; the other suggests that in the very nature of man there lies the possibility of final condemnation (*Christian Dogmatics*, Eng. tr., 1866, pp. 474–484).

LITERATURE.—S. Cox, *Salvator Mundi*, 1877; F. W. Farrar, *Eternal Hope*, 1878; O. Riemann, *Die Lehre von der Apokatastasis*, 1889; S. D. F. Salmond, *Christian Doctrine of Immortality*, 1895, pp. 449 ff., 642 ff.; artt. 'Restoration' in *HDB*, 'Apokatastasis' in *PRE*³.

J. C. LAMBERT.

RESTORATION OF OFFENDERS.—In the discipline of the Apostolic Church the restoration of the offender was the main idea and that of punishment subordinate. Even excommunication was not final, if the expelled member, conscious of guilt, was led to repentance and reformation. The Christian Church has the right and the authority to admit, to exclude, to re-admit suitable persons to its privileges. This is seen clearly in the case of the Corinthian offender (2 Co 2^{5-11}).

A general rule is laid down in Gal 6^{1}—'Brethren, even if a man be overtaken in any trespass ('flagrante delicto'), ye which are spiritual, restore (*καταρτίζετε*) such a one in a spirit of meekness; looking to thyself, lest thou also be tempted.' Bengel, in his comment upon the word 'brethren,' says, 'a whole argument lies hidden under this one word' (cf. Gal 3^{15} 4^{12} 6^{18}). Some (*e.g.* Lightfoot) think that the Corinthian case was before the mind of St. Paul. Others (*e.g.* Ramsay) reject this idea.

καταρτίζω (to make *ἄρτιος*, 'fit,' 'sound,' 'complete') is a surgical term used of setting a broken bone or a dislocated joint. It may be used to refer to the repair of material or spiritual damage; *e.g.*, mending nets (Mt 4^{21}, Mk 1^{19}); setting up walls (Ezr 4^{12}); removing State factions (Herod. v. 28); righting spiritual calamity (Gal 6^{1}). Spiritual restoration is gradual, but it may become complete. All the powers of the sinner may be combined harmoniously, all defects supplied, all faults amended, so that the restored one is fitted perfectly for service (1 Co $1^{10\ \mathrm{Gr.}}$ 1 Th 3^{10}, He 10^{5} 11^{3} 13^{21}, 1 P 5^{10}; cf. Lk 6^{40}, Herod. v. 106. See Eph 4^{12}, *καταρτισμός*; 2 Co 13^{9}, *κατάρτισις*, Vulg. *consummatio*; cf. Ign. *Eph.* 2, *Phil.* 8, *Smyrn.* 1, *Mart. Ign.* 4). As the many members of the body in each believer must be fitly framed together, so believers themselves must be brought into harmonious relationship in Christ's body the Church, and this mainly through the duly appointed ministers of the Church (Eph $4^{11.\ 12}$). 'The enumeration is not of classes of persons or formal offices, but of classes of functions,' is Hort's comment on Eph 4^{11} (*The Christian Ecclesia*, 1897, p. 166).

This work must be carried out by the spiritual (*οἱ πνευματικοί*; cf. 1 Co $2^{13.\ 15}$ 3^{1}), believers in general as well as the ministry. It must be done 'in the spirit of meekness,' which will counteract any tendency to vainglory or feeling of superiority. Here '*πνεῦμα* seems *immediately* to refer to the state of the inward spirit as wrought upon by the Holy Spirit, and *ultimately* to the Holy Spirit as the inworking power; cf. Ro 1^{4} 8^{15}, 2 Co 4^{13}, Eph 1^{17}, in all which cases *πνεῦμα* seems to indicate the Holy Spirit, and the abstract gen. the specific *χάρισμα*' (C. J. Ellicott, on Gal 6^{1}).

The doctrine of the final restoration of all offenders cannot be based upon texts of Scripture. Upon this point there is an almost general agreement. Those who advocate this theory base it upon other foundations than biblical texts which deal with the subject of restoration in general or the restoration of offenders in particular.

H. Cariss J. Sidnell.

RESURRECTION.—*I. General considerations.*—The resurrection of Christ does not fall to be discussed in this article, the next article being devoted to it. Nevertheless it will be impossible to treat of the Pauline view of resurrection without some discussion of his attitude towards the nature of Christ's resurrection. St. Paul is practically the only NT writer who has really worked out the problem of the resurrection on the basis of the resurrection of Christ. It will be necessary to show how much he has in common with the Jewish apocalyptic writers of the 1st cent. A.D. in his attitude towards the problems of the resurrection, and also how far he has introduced new elements and developed along fresh lines. In dealing with the Fourth Gospel we have to examine the relation between that Gospel and St. Paul, how far the author is developing along the lines laid down by St. Paul and how far he is travelling on independent lines.

The principal questions that must be answered by any inquiry into the subject of the resurrection from the historical point of view are: (1) What was the place of the resurrection in the eschatology of the time? (2) Are there more than one resurrection in any of the eschatological schemes of the 1st century? (3) How is the resurrection of Christ related to the general Christian resurrection-doctrine of the period? (4) How is the question of the relation between body and spirit, flesh and spirit, worked out? (5) How far does an ethical element enter into the various views of the resurrection developed by NT writers? These questions involve ethical, metaphysical, and eschatological considerations which were not clearly distinguished in the thought of the time, and cannot be separated in our treatment of the subject; yet they must be borne in mind in examining the various systems of the period.

The roots of eschatology have been found to be far more widely spread in early civilizations than was formerly believed, and of all the conceptions of eschatology none has a more varied and complicated history than the conception of the resurrection. It is not our task to trace out its roots in the ancient past. But we have to consider and take stock of the stage of development which the conception of resurrection had reached at the beginning of our period. It was the moment when the focus of national and political consciousness was shifting from the present to the future—a movement which expressed itself in every phase of human activity, especially in religion. Hence the significance of the mystery-religions, whose emphasis was wholly on the future life. The word 'syncretism' has been much abused, but it expresses well the characteristic tendency of this period. An immense number of currents of religious and philosophic thought were meeting and influencing one another, and it is easier to distinguish the main currents than to estimate the extent to which they intermingled and modified one another. The history of the interpretation of St. Paul bears witness to the difficulty of this attempt. The main currents may be broadly distinguished as follows:

(*a*) *Neo-Platonism*, in its earliest form, representing a fusion of Platonic philosophy with Oriental mysticism, and emphasizing the superiority of the intellectual principle in man, the *νοῦς*, over the body. Hence, for our inquiry, it is an influence against the conception of a bodily resurrection. Possibly it would be more accurate to call this current, in which Philo has a place, Neo-Pythagoreanism.

(*b*) *Orientalism*, to use a broad term for the various forms in which the dualism and mysticism of the East expressed themselves in religious sects and mystery-cults, and so influenced religious thought in the Græco-Roman world of our period. The eternal antithesis between matter and spirit, the necessity of redemption from the bondage of matter, and the consequent stress on asceticism, are factors working against the conception of a bodily resurrection.

(*c*) *Judaism*, although logically coming under the head of Orientalism, yet practically stands apart. At the time under consideration Judaism presents two forms of resurrection-doctrine: (1) the doctrine of the resurrection of the righteous only, developed from ethical and spiritual interests, and probably quite independent of external influences; (2) the doctrine of a general resurrection of both righteous and wicked, possibly, but not necessarily, due to the influence of Mazdeism (cf. R. H. Charles, *Eschatology*^{2}, London, 1913, pp. 139–141). In addition to this divergence, Judaism also represents two other lines of divergent thought on this subject, lines which were not so sharply separated at this period as they became later: (i.) the Palestinian doctrine of bodily resurrection, both of the individual and of the nation, for the Messianic kingdom; (ii.) the Alexandrian doctrine, influenced by Neo-Platonic ideas, teaching only a spiritual resurrection, and tending to abandon the idea of the Messianic kingdom. These various forms of thought will be dealt with in fuller detail in the historical examination of the Jewish literature.

(*d*) *Christianity*, receiving its doctrine of resurrection from both forms of Judaistic thought, but profoundly modifying the doctrine it thus received by the conception of the nature of Christ's resurrection as interpreted by St. Paul, to be reacted on later by contact with the Hellenic and Oriental streams of thought, especially in the conflict with Gnosticism.

The fuller discussion of these various currents of conflicting and intermingling views concerning the nature of the resurrection, its time and conditions, will arise out of our examination of the various passages relating to it in the literature of the Apostolic Age.

II. THE RESURRECTION IN THE LITERATURE OF THE APOSTOLIC AGE.—**1. Jewish literature.**—The references to the subject of resurrection and the related question of body and spirit may be considered under the separate heads of Alexandrian and Palestinian, although, as already pointed out, at this time there was not a sharp line of demarcation. Palestinian Judaism was influenced by Alexandrian, and the literature of the former will show the influence of the latter in its conceptions.

(*a*) *Alexandrian Judaism.*—The principal literary sources for Alexandrian Judaism are Philo, the Book of Wisdom, 2 Enoch, and 4 Maccabees. The general attitude of this phase of Judaism towards the resurrection can only be touched on briefly, as our main inquiry lies in the Christian literature of the period. The Alexandrian and Palestinian Judaism must be touched on sufficiently to show its influence on the formation of Christian thought.

Philo holds the Neo-Pythagorean view of the evil nature of matter. The soul was once free from matter, has become united to and debased by matter, and can attain to the full knowledge of God, the supreme good, only by deliverance from matter. Hence the resurrection of the body is obviously impossible, and any doctrine of a corporate resurrection of a blessed community can have no place. Philo's mysticism is purely individualistic, like that of Plotinus, and looks to the perfection of the disembodied soul, after death, with God. The national Messianic hope is replaced by the expectation of the universal triumph of the Law. In the words of a French scholar, E. Bréhier, 'Of the whole Jewish eschatology, this idea alone retains its vitality in Philo's system, the future of the Law which is destined to attain universal sway' (*Les idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie*, Paris, 1908, p. 10).

The author of the *Book of Wisdom* also held the eternity and evil of matter, and, in spite of some objections, it is most probable that he held the pre-existence of the soul ($8^{19.\,20}$). The body, even if 'undefiled,' is nevertheless 'corruptible' (9^{15}), and clogs and imprisons the soul. Hence 'immortality' (8^{17}), 'incorruption' (2^{23} 6^{19}), are terms which belong only to the state of the soul, and do not imply any resurrection of the body. The judgment is immediately after death, for both righteous and wicked (3^{18} $4^{10.\,14}$).

In *2 Enoch* we have the conception of the millennial Messianic kingdom, at the end of which occurs the Final Judgment. There are intermediate abodes for souls (7^{1-3} 32^1). The writer holds the doctrine of the pre-existence of souls. It is not clear whether he holds a resurrection of the body, since his description of the change from the earthly to the heavenly body is curiously akin to St. Paul's doctrine of the spiritual body (cf. 22^{8-10}). His account, too, of the torments of the wicked suggests a bodily state in hell, unless the language used be taken symbolically ($10^{1.\,2}$).

In *4 Maccabees* there is no resurrection of the body. The souls of the righteous are received by Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, after death, and enjoy eternal communion with God (13^{16} 17^5).

(*b*) *Palestinian Judaism.*—The chief sources are the Assumption of Moses, 2 Baruch, and 4 Ezra for the apocalyptic literature, and such portions of the Talmud as may reflect the Rabbinical tradition of this period. The division *Sanhedrin* contains the most important of the traditional utterances on this subject.

The *Assumption of Moses* presents a temporary Messianic kingdom, without a Messiah (cf. 2 Bar.). At its close Israel, probably identified by the writer with the righteous in Israel, is exalted to heaven, and sees its enemies in Gehenna. As in Alexandrian Judaism, so here there is no resurrection of the body.

2 Baruch is a composite work, containing, according to Charles's analysis, three apocalypses written prior to A.D. 70 and three fragments belonging to a later date. In the parts of the book composed before A.D. 70 we have the following important passages: $30^{1.\,2}$, 'And it will come to pass after these things, when the time of the advent of the Messiah is fulfilled, and He shall return in glory. Then all those who have fallen asleep in hope of Him shall rise again.' Here the resurrection of the righteous is placed after the period of tribulation preceding the advent of Messiah. The form of the passage strongly suggests Christian influence or interpolation, especially the phrase 'fallen asleep in hope of Him' (cf. 1 Th 4^{13-14}). This doctrine of the bodily resurrection of the righteous seems to be characteristic of only the portions of the book composed prior to A.D. 70. In 30^{2-5}, which belongs to the sections written after A.D. 70, we have the doctrine of a general resurrection, also in chs. 50. 51. These chapters also discuss the nature of the resurrection very fully.* The personal identity of the dead is to be preserved in the resurrection in order to give force to the judgment by the recognition of identity, 'when they have severally recognized those whom they now know, then judgement will grow strong' (50^4). The bodies of the righteous will be changed into bodies of glory that they may be able to take part in the world to come; they will be made like to the angels.

The close resemblance of this teaching to that of the Pauline Epistles and of Luke 20^{34-36} is very striking.

4 Ezra is also a composite book, written partly before A.D. 70 and finally edited after that date. The doctrine of resurrection occupies a large place in it. It contains the doctrine of a Messianic kingdom of 400 years' duration, at the close of which the Messiah and His companions are to die, before the Final Judgment and end of all things. In the earlier sources, *i.e.* the Ezra-Apocalypse and the Son of Man Vision, we have the doctrine of the revelation of Messiah from heaven with the saints who had been caught up alive, prior to the establishment of the 400 years' kingdom. Then follows the death of the Messiah and all men, then the Final Judgment for which all will be raised (cf. *4 Ezr.* vi. f.). In the Salathiel-Apocalypse, the most important of the later constituents of the book, the souls of both the righteous and the wicked await the Final Judgment in a kind of intermediate state of blessing and misery respectively. The terms in which their condition is described suggest some kind of bodily state (cf. 7[75-101]). In 7[32] there is a clear reference to the resurrection of the body, but G. H. Box would assign this verse to the redactor, who, according to him, is seeking to supplement the resurrection-doctrine of the author of the Salathiel-Apocalypse. The souls of righteous and wicked are assembled for the Final Judgment which determines the full blessing and torment of each respectively. Hence the resurrection-doctrine of the Salathiel-Apocalypse lies midway between the Alexandrian doctrine of a spiritual resurrection immediately after death, and the Palestinian doctrine of an intermediate disembodied state and a resurrection of the body for the Final Judgment.

---

* It should be remarked here that the precise place of the resurrection in the general eschatological scheme depends entirely on Charles's analysis of the book in question into sources. There are signs of a reaction against this tendency to carry analysis to an extreme (cf. Burkitt, *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, Lecture III.).

The most important point, however, in these two apocalyptic works is the suggestion of the doctrine of a first resurrection which appears explicitly in the NT. This germ of the idea of a first resurrection appears especially in *4 Ezr.* vii. 28, xiii. 52 (see Charles, *Eschatology*, p. 133 ff.).

For the *Rabbinical* views on the resurrection at this period we have the second article in the *Shemoneh Esreh*, which speaks of the power of God in raising the dead. Lagrange finds no trace of a connexion between the resurrection and the Messianic kingdom earlier than R. Meir; but it must be remembered that the apocalyptic writings already quoted may well represent Rabbinical eschatology of this period, and it is not necessary to suppose that the Talmud is the only source of information as to contemporary Rabbinical belief.

The general tradition, however, is clear for a belief in the bodily resurrection of both righteous and wicked for the Final Judgment. (For an excellent account of the Rabbinical doctrine of the resurrection see Lagrange, *Le Messianisme chez les juifs*, Paris, 1909, p. 176 ff.)

2. St. Paul.—If the passages relating to the resurrection in St. Paul's correspondence be collected and compared they appear to show three distinct elements at work.

(*a*) There is his own view of the resurrection, which, as the evidence of Acts plainly indicates, he held in common with the Pharisaic party of his time. It is not very easy to determine precisely what shade of resurrection-doctrine he held, and possibly St. Luke was not clear himself on the matter, but the point must be discussed as the passages are examined. This form or shade of resurrection-doctrine may be assumed to have constituted a part of St. Paul's general eschatological belief at the time of his conversion to Christianity. (*b*) There is the distinctively Christian belief in the resurrection of Christ as a historical fact. Possibly it was afterwards interpreted in different ways according to the particular view held concerning the resurrection, but it is absolutely clear that the belief in the fact of the resurrection of Christ operated more powerfully than any other cause in transforming current beliefs in the resurrection. (*c*) There is the particular line of modification in St. Paul's view of the resurrection which can be traced out in process of development and which is due to his interpretation of what he accepted as the historical fact of the resurrection of Christ.

If the speeches in Acts may be accepted as in any degree authentic, they depict the Apostle as holding the general belief in a resurrection of just and unjust for a Final Judgment (cf. Ac 23[6] 24[15]). The passage in 17[31] does not necessarily refer to the resurrection of the dead in general, though v.[32] may imply that the Athenians understood it in that sense.

In 1 Thessalonians, where St. Paul's exposition of the resurrection clearly implies a resurrection before the Messianic kingdom in order that the dead may share in its blessings, it is possible that the idea may have been already present in his original scheme of eschatology, although he had not imparted it to his converts. But it is also clear that, whatever be the source of the idea, it receives a new setting, and is brought into organic connexion with the resurrection of Christ (see art. PAROUSIA).

In 1 Co 15 the whole argument presupposes a belief in the resurrection, not necessarily depending upon the resurrection of Christ, although the resurrection of Christ is used to support the belief in the resurrection of the dead and to modify the general outline of the eschatology.

The question of St. Paul's indebtedness to the mystery-religions for any ideas as to the resurrection belongs rather to the discussion of the development of his doctrine than to the evidence for his original stock of ideas on the subject.

(*b*) Turning to the second point, St. Paul's interpretation of Christ's resurrection, we have first of all several passages which do not call for special discussion proving the Apostle's belief in the resurrection of Christ as a historical occurrence. Indeed, the whole of his correspondence rests upon this as the most fundamental thing in his religious experience. It is well expressed in Ac 25[19]: 'a certain Jesus, who had died, whom Paul pretended to be alive.' The discussion of this point belongs to the following article. We are here concerned only with St. Paul's interpretation of the fact in so far as it bears on his view of the resurrection of believers or of a general resurrection.

The passages in 1 Thessalonians only yield the general inference that the resurrection of Christ is related to His Parousia; through His resurrection He is able to enter upon the Kingdom in power; God will bring Him again with the dead saints; it is as raised from the dead that He becomes the deliverer from the coming wrath.

In Galatians the subject of resurrection is not touched on, but it is possible that the famous passage in 2[20] may throw light on St. Paul's view of the resurrection of Christ. Taken along with other passages to be quoted later it appears certain that St. Paul, probably in common with the leaders of the primitive Church, had considered the resurrection of Christ not merely as an eschatological event, or as an article of belief, but as an event in the human experience of Christ intimately related to the experience of the believer. It is possible that we may see in such passages as Ro 1[3-4] 6[4.10], 2 Co 4[11-14] 13[4], and others, the evidence of such an attitude towards the Resurrection. Ro 1[3-4] is commonly interpreted to mean that St. Paul regarded the Resurrection as an evidence of the Messiahship of Jesus. But, while this may be implied, there appears to be much more implied as well. 'Son of God' is not used by St. Paul as a Messianic title but rather as a personal name, possibly implying moral likeness to God. Also 'according to the spirit of holiness' would seem to refer to the personal holiness of the human life of Jesus, so that the Resurrection marks out or distinguishes Jesus in virtue of His absolute holiness as Son of God, possessing that character. There was something in His life which made this special act of power possible in His case. In addition to this, another element in the experience is introduced, viz. faith. Not St. Paul only, as in 2 Co 4^{11-14}, but the early Church in general, seems to have regarded the Resurrection as a result of Christ's faith, and also as an act of necessary justice on God's part, 'by the glory of the Father.'

These factors in the interpretation of the Resurrection need to be considered in order to understand the extension of the principle to believers. Now, the passage in Galatians already cited suggests that St. Paul, in considering the death and resurrection of Christ from this point of view, had come to the conclusion that faith was the governing principle in Christ's life, and that he himself as a believer lived by virtue of the faith which Christ had exercised and which had brought Him through resurrection into a spiritual state in which He could realize and make good the purpose of God in His death by dwelling in those who believed on Him.

This is the central idea in St. Paul's view of the Resurrection—his belief in the present spiritual existence of the same Christ whose faith during His earthly life had brought about the whole possibility of resurrection, a spiritual life, and the communication of it to believers. It is a mistake to think that St. Paul separated the earthly from the heavenly Christ; the heavenly Christ was the earthly Christ in a new state of existence, but the same in experience and personal identity. Hence, by His indwelling, the principles that had been proved in His own experience could be reproduced in those who believed on Him.

(*c*) This brings us to the third set of passages, viz. those in which St. Paul develops the consequences of the indwelling of Christ for the future state of believers. The most important are Ro 8^{1-30} especially vv.$^{11.\ 30}$, 1 Co 15, 2 Co 3–5, Ph $3^{10.\ 20-21}$. The clearest exposition of this view-point is found in 2 Co 3–5, where St. Paul develops the ministry of the Spirit in its various consequences, identifying Christ with the Spirit, and reaching the climax in the passage 4^{13}–5^{10}. The dying of Jesus is at work in him, and by the same spirit of faith he is certain that God will raise him with Jesus and present him along with the other believers, clothed in a new and glorious habitation prepared by God and already existing in heaven.

In the same way, in Ro 8 the consequences of the indwelling of the Spirit of Christ, again identified with Christ, extend to the quickening of the mortal bodies of those who are thus dwelt in. In Ph 3 the Apostle desires to be completely identified with the experiences of Christ, His death and His sufferings, in order to reach the goal of resurrection and attain to the resurrection from among the dead.

In 1 Co 15 the general line of argument is: (1) the proof of the possibility of a resurrection from the resurrection of Christ accepted as a historical event; (2) the argument from analogy, based on the Rabbinical conception of 'body,' to prove the possibility of the existence of such a thing as a spiritual body; (3) the contrast between Christ and Adam as the respective sources of the incorruptible and the corruptible, the heavenly and the earthly. The Second Man, the Last Adam, is a quickening spirit; by this title St. Paul implies all that is developed at length in Ro 8 and 2 Co 3–5. Lastly, he describes the manner in which the change from the earthly to the heavenly body is effected. Hence the general line of St. Paul's development of the doctrine is clear. As a Pharisee he held the continued existence of the soul after death; as part of his Palestinian eschatology he held the necessity of a resurrection to judgment of both righteous and wicked, and probably a first resurrection of righteous to participation in the Messianic kingdom.

Into this original stock of eschatological belief there broke the new conception of a Messiah who had died and risen. It is so clear from the Pauline correspondence that this new conception was based upon what St. Paul believed to be a trustworthy historical event, supported by contemporary evidence and confirmed for himself by his Damascus experience, that it is unnecessary to discuss the question of whether he owed this conception to one of the mystery-religions.

The effect of this new element was two-fold. On the one hand, it shifted the eschatological centre of interest, almost unconsciously, to the resurrection of Christ, as 1 Co 15 shows. The resurrection of Christ assumes a catastrophic colouring, so to speak: it becomes the first act of Divine intervention in the introduction of the Kingdom, the first step of a process whose culmination also has a catastrophic character derived from the original scheme of eschatology. On the other hand, it introduced into the eschatological scheme the doctrine of the Spirit of Christ with its new ethical implications and a special theory of the way in which the presence of the Spirit operated to transform the whole personality of the believer into the likeness of the Glorified Christ.

The tendency of this double working of the interpretation of the death and resurrection of Christ was to disturb the outline of the old eschatology. We can see in 1 Thess. the stress laid on the first resurrection, that of believers to the likeness of Christ; then in 1 Cor. the outline of the eschatological scheme is adjusted to this new emphasis: first Christ's resurrection, then the resurrection of those that are Christ's at His Parousia—clearly the first resurrection—then the end, when the Kingdom is delivered to the Father. No mention is made of what happens in this third stage, whether another resurrection takes place or not.

Thus St. Paul's doctrine of the resurrection, as far as it can be reconstructed from the Epistles, becomes limited to a resurrection of believers only, in the likeness of Christ; and further, this likeness is conceived of more and more as ethical and spiritual, and the whole ensuing state of blessing as a spiritual state rather than as a concrete kingdom on earth. But the latter never wholly disappeared from St. Paul's thinking; it only fell into the background. It is difficult to believe that St. Paul ever reached the point of abandoning entirely the resurrection of the body, although his conception of the doctrine was extremely spiritual. But the difference between a mere life of the spirit after death, even in full communion with God, and St. Paul's doctrine of a spiritual body is much more than a difference of words. It involves two fundamentally different views of redemption. The Oriental view, which influenced Alexandrian eschatology, regarded redemption as the separation of matter from spirit, the dissolution of an evil and unnatural union. The Pauline view, which was based on the Palestinian, and which ultimately passed into the distinctively Christian point of view, was the deliverance of the body from corruption, the corruptible and mortal element in it due to sin, and its true union with the spirit in an incorruptible form. No doubt metaphysical speculation may find practically no difference between a spirit preserving personal identity and a spiritual body, but it is more than doubtful whether St. Paul ever reached such a point of view.

Before leaving the subject of the Pauline doctrine of resurrection it may be of interest to add a note on the special doctrine of the spiritual body. The Kabbala reflects a theory which goes back to very early Jewish times, possibly earlier than R. Meir, that unfallen man in the garden of Eden was clothed in a garment of light, which after the Fall changed into a covering of skin (*Zohar*, ii. 229*b*). In the Bardesanian Hymn of the Soul, contained in the Syriac Acts of Judas Thomas, we have also a full and striking account of the Light-Form, or spiritual counterpart of man, which remains in heaven during man's stay on earth, and is reunited to him when he casts off his earthly body and returns to his home in heaven. Likewise, in the recently discovered Odes of Solomon occur several references to the same belief, closely connected with the sacrament of baptism. Burkitt (*Early Eastern Christianity*, London, 1904, Lecture IV. p. 124 f.) has shown that in early Syriac Christianity the sacrament of baptism was believed to have a special efficacy in relation to complete physical resurrection, and was limited to celibates. Hence the Pauline doctrine of a spiritual body seems to have its roots in early Jewish metaphysical and cosmological speculation, although considerably modified by his views of the ethical and spiritual element in the resurrection of Christ.

There is also a remarkable resemblance between the theory of resurrection put forward in 2 Bar 49-51 and St. Paul's doctrine of the spiritual body. According to Baruch, all who have died are first raised in precisely the same physical form in which they were buried (50^{2}); they are then transformed, the righteous into the likeness of angels, and the wicked into some worse or baser aspect (51^{1-6}). In St. Paul's doctrine transformation holds good only of the living who remain until the Parousia; the dead are raised in their new and glorious form. Charles would also add that the believing dead receive their glorious form or state immediately after death, according to his view of 2 Co 5. In St. Paul's teaching there is no place for the resurrection of the wicked, or for any such change as is taught in 2 Bar 50^{1}. The only exception is Ac 23^{6}.

2 Timothy is the only one of the Pastorals that contributes anything of importance to our subject. ἀφθαρσία, 'incorruptibility,' is one of the elements of the Pauline gospel ($1^{10.11}$). The elect are to obtain salvation with eternal glory (2^{10}). Those who share the death will also share the life, those who suffer will reign (2^{11}). There were some who taught that the resurrection had already happened (2^{18}), but no answer to this heresy is deemed necessary by the author of the Epistle, showing that the belief in a future resurrection already formed a part of the orthodox faith. Christ is to judge both living and dead (4^{1}). But there is little or nothing of the distinctively Pauline teaching on the resurrection.

3. The Catholic Epistles.—(*a*) *Hebrews* is important for our inquiry. The resurrection of Christ is held firmly as a historical event. God brought Christ again from the dead (13^{20}). Yet the resurrection-state of Christ seems to be conceived of as purely spiritual, and the same term 'perfected,' τετελειωμένος, is used of Christ's present condition (7^{28}) as is used for the present state of the righteous, 'the spirits of just men made perfect' (12^{23}). 'A better resurrection' is spoken of in 11^{35} as the object of the hope of the martyrs.

The general tendency of the Epistle seems to point to what Charles calls a spiritual resurrection, the belief which, as we have already seen, was characteristic of Alexandrian Judaism. But it is impossible to draw any conclusions from this Epistle as to the place of the resurrection in the general scheme of eschatology.

(*b*) The *First Epistle of Peter* supports the contention already put forward that the early Church regarded the faith of Christ as an important element in the historical fact of His resurrection. The Epistle draws a parallel between the ark as the means of salvation for Noah and his company from the judgment of his time and Christian baptism, which by the resurrection of Christ saves the believer from the eschatological judgment which is regarded as imminent. But the manner of the salvation is left quite vague. Believers are to share the 'glory' which is to be revealed at the Parousia, but in what state is left undefined. There is also a vague reference to the future state of the wicked (4^{6}), but it is impossible to draw the implication of the resurrection of the wicked from it.

4. The Synoptic Gospels.—One or two passages in the Synoptic Gospels fall to be considered here, although, owing to the difficulty of ascertaining the original form of Christ's sayings, we can gather from them only the general nature of His attitude towards the resurrection-doctrine of His time.

In the passage containing the question raised by the Sadducees as to the resurrection (Mk 12^{18-27} = Mt 22^{23-32}), the Marcan form of the Saying of Christ, closely followed by Matthew, appears to show two elements: (1) the acceptance of the current Pharisaic belief in a future resurrection, although the position of that resurrection in the eschatological scheme is not defined, and a too materialistic view of the resurrection-state is corrected; (2) an argument, *more rabbinico*, in which it is proved from Ex 3^{6} that the resurrection follows from the nature of the relation between God and the patriarchs. The line of argument appears to imply that the relation 'God of the living' is not fully satisfied by the present state of the patriarchs in Sheol or Paradise, but requires the resurrection of the persons concerned to give its full meaning and truth. The older doctrine of Sheol, as represented in many of the Psalms, teaching that in Sheol there was no relation between God and the soul, would give more point to the argument; but that doctrine can hardly have been current in the time of Christ, nor would it have been denied by the Sadducees. The Lucan form of the Saying (Lk 20^{34-36}) either has been considerably modified by Luke, or has its source in a different tradition. The phrase τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν (v.^{35}) is Pauline, as is also the thought of attaining to the resurrection (cf. Ph 3^{10}).

The Pharisaic view of the resurrection is given in much fuller detail. The resurrection is definitely connected with the Messianic Age, τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου, but those who rise cannot die again; they enter on their eternal state, possibly as against the doctrine of the death of Messiah and His companions at the close of the Messianic Age, taught in 4 Ezra (see above). The implication that the resurrection is only for the righteous is made clearer: 'sons of God' is the equivalent of 'sons of the resurrection.' But in the second part of the argument an addition is made which implies a general resurrection—'*all* live unto Him.' This is not consistent with the older form of the Saying and its implication, and may possibly arise from the same point of view which led St. Luke to represent St. Paul as holding the doctrine of a general resurrection in Ac 23^{6}.

Although the Synoptic Gospels are outside our field of inquiry, yet they illustrate the primitive background of the Christian resurrection-doctrine, the spiritualizing tendency at work having a partial source of support in our Lord's teaching, and the possibilities of later modifications of an earlier tradition.

5. The Johannine literature.—(*a*) *The Apocalypse.*—In the Apocalypse we have the only absolutely explicit teaching of more than one resurrection. Here also the question is complicated by source-theories. The principal passage with which we are concerned is $20^{4-6.\ 11-15}$. This passage, after the account of the binding of Satan in the Abyss during the 1000 years (vv.$^{1-3}$), goes on to describe the resurrection of those who had been slain during the tribulation. They live and reign with Christ 1000 years (vv.$^{4-6}$). Then at the close come the final assault of Gog and Magog, their defeat, the general judgment and resurrection of all the dead, or, strictly speaking, of the rest of the dead (v.^{5}), for judgment.

In considering this passage we have to take several points into account: (1) The possibility of different sources. E. de Faye (*Les Apocalypses juives*, Paris, 1892, p. 171 f.), following F. Spitta's analysis (*Die Offenbarung des Johannes untersucht*, Strassburg, 1889), assigns $20^{1-3.\ 7-15}$ to a Caligula-Apocalypse of Jewish authorship, while 20^{4-6} is assigned to a Christian redactor of Trajan's time. Hence the original Apocalypse would not have contained a pre-millennial resurrection. Modern critical opinion, however, has expressed itself strongly in favour of unity of authorship, and that authorship Christian. Thus we are sufficiently justified in regarding as held in the time of Domitian, in certain Christian circles, the view that there was a pre-millennial resurrection, possibly of martyrs only, followed by a post-millennial general resurrection for judgment.

(2) There is also the possibility that the author, who seems to distinguish the Church from the remnant of Israel and the slain martyrs of the tribulation, may have regarded the rapture and resurrection which St. Paul contemplates in 1 Th 4 as having already taken place. The difficulty of interpreting the symbolic representations comes in here, but it is possible that the elders already in heaven in ch. 5 represent the Church. In this case we have a scheme of three resurrections implied: (i.) the resurrection and rapture of the Church before the pre-Messianic woes commence; (ii.) the pre-millennial resurrection at the close of the tribulations, confined by Charles to the martyrs; and (iii.) the resurrection of the rest of the dead at the end of the millennium for the general Judgment. In support of this view there is the evidence of a somewhat ambiguously expressed belief that the Church would be saved from the final tribulation, possibly due to St. Paul's teaching. Even if this be not accepted—and there are serious objections to it—it is impossible to think that the author could have confined the enjoyment of the millennial kingdom to the martyrs and survivors, shutting out all the righteous of early times, and those believers who had died, but not as martyrs, before the establishment of the kingdom. Those who have part in what the writer calls 'the first resurrection' are 'blessed and holy.' It hardly seems likely that he contemplated the omission of any who possessed this character from the first resurrection. The phrase 'the first resurrection' certainly militates against the view of three resurrections. But, as we have seen from St. Paul's earlier scheme, possibly abandoned afterwards by him, the resurrection of Christ could be considered as the commencement of a resurrection which culminates with that of the dead believers—'Christ the firstfruits; then they that are Christ's, at his coming' (1 Co 15^{23}). Possibly the author of the Apocalypse may have understood the first resurrection in such a sense, namely, as a process commencing with the resurrection of Christ, continuing with the rapture and resurrection of the Church before the tribulation, and closing with the resurrection of martyrs at the beginning of the Messianic kingdom on earth. But this is certainly a highly disputable point.*

(3) Lastly, we must note that the author's scheme is clearly a combination of non-congruent elements. It combines at least two views of the resurrection, and possibly three, if we accept the influence of the Pauline teaching as suggested above. He has combined the early Judaic and Pharisaic view of an earthly temporal Messianic kingdom, to which the righteous are raised, with the later view, partly due to Alexandrian influence and also to the failure of Messianic hopes after the destruction of Jerusalem, of a general resurrection of righteous and wicked for judgment before the establishment of an eternal kingdom in a new heaven and earth.

It is obvious that the resurrection of all the righteous and holy before the Messianic kingdom, if we accept this as the writer's intention, renders nugatory a discriminating judgment at the close of the kingdom, for none but the wicked are left to be raised. Yet the account of the final resurrection and judgment clearly implies a discriminating judgment.

Of the nature of the resurrection-condition we can gather nothing from the writer of the Apocalypse.

(*b*) *The Fourth Gospel.*—The Gospels lie outside the plan of this work. Yet the Fourth Gospel by its date belongs to our period, and a few words as to its teaching on resurrection are necessary to complete our account of the whole view of the resurrection during the Apostolic Age. See also artt. PAROUSIA and IMMORTALITY.

The principal point to be observed concerning the resurrection-doctrine of this Gospel is that it presents the completion of that process which we observed at work in the Pauline eschatology. The conception of Christ's resurrection has completely transformed the traditional doctrine of resurrection. The resurrection of Christ is the demonstration of the nature of His spiritual life, the eternal life, pre-existent, and incapable of being touched by death. Hence Christ not only rises, but is in His own Person the Resurrection and the Life. The two ideas coalesce in Him. Hence the believer in Christ, possessing eternal life, possesses the resurrection-life already, and after death merely enters into its fuller enjoyment. Hence, in consistency, an eschatological scheme of resurrection has no place in this writer's view. But such a scheme certainly had a place in Christ's teaching, and the writer could not wholly remove it from his presentation and interpretation of that teaching; and even if we allow with Charles and other scholars that $5^{28.\ 29}$ is an interpolation, we still have the repetition of the phrase 'I will raise him up at the last day.'

Like all the NT writers, the author of the Fourth Gospel presents elements which are not entirely congruent, save by a forced and artificial process of exegesis. We have the furthest and highest spiritual development of the doctrine of life, transcending the current views of eschatological events, and we have also the survival, perhaps unconscious, perhaps a conscious accommodation to the reader's point of view, of the older doctrine.

6. The Apostolic Fathers.—(*a*) *1 Clement.*—The author of 1 Clement in a curious passage (chs. 24–26) proves the doctrine of the future resurrection along the lines of St. Paul's proof in 1 Co 15. He uses the analogy of day and night, of the seed sown, and finally the myth of the phœnix, to illustrate his view. But, while a resurrection of the flesh is clearly implied, its time and nature are left undefined. The only other passage that bears on the subject is in ch. 50, where the resurrection and public manifestation of the righteous are placed at the *ἐπισκοπῇ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ*, apparently the coming of the Kingdom; but whether an earthly millennial kingdom is intended or an eternal heavenly one is not clear.

(*b*) *2 Clement.*—In this little treatise we have a good deal more definite teaching on the resurrection. In ch. 8 the future state of the believer is contingent on purity of the flesh and on baptism. In ch. 9 the resurrection of the flesh is explicitly stated, 'Let none of you say that this flesh is not judged nor rises again,' 'we shall receive the reward in this flesh.' In ch. 14 we have an apparent similarity to the mystical teaching of Ignatius. The relation between flesh and spirit is conceived of as corresponding to the relation between the Church and Christ; the abuse of the one involves the loss of the other. Life and immortality are connected with the possession of the Spirit, which is identified with Christ. In chs. 16 and 17 a physical resurrection of both righteous and wicked at the Day of Judgment is implied. In ch. 19 those who do righteousness 'gather the immortal fruit of the resurrection.'

---

* Charles has offered a reconstruction of this passage in *ExpT* xxvi. [1914–15] 54, 119.

(*c*) *Ignatius.*—The general trend of Ignatius' attitude towards the resurrection closely resembles, and has possibly been formed by, that of the Fourth Gospel. Christ is his true life. He expects to rise again to God as the immediate consequence of his martyrdom. He lays stress, however, in the Pauline way, on the salvation of both flesh and spirit by the Passion of Christ, who Himself rose both in flesh and in spirit. The possession of life and immortality is also connected with the Eucharist, 'the medicine of immortality' (*Eph.* xx. 2). In *Magn.* 9 we have a reference to the raising of the righteous dead of the OT, by the descent of Christ into Hades, possibly reflected in Mt $29^{52.\ 53}$; cf. also Hermas, *Sim.* ix. 16, and *Gospel of Peter*, 9. In *Smyrn.* 3 we have the assertion of the physical resurrection of Christ, in 7 those who have love are those who will rise again. In the *Letter to Polycarp*, 7, is the only clear reference to the resurrection as an eschatological event, 'that I may be found your disciple at the resurrection.'

From the nature of the correspondence a clear statement of eschatological views is hardly to be expected, but it is fairly clear that the older scheme of eschatological expectation has no living place in the experience of Ignatius. 'Christ our life' has for him replaced the earlier form of Jewish Christian hope.

(*d*) *Epistle of Polycarp.*—This letter contains two references (chs. 2 and 5) to the resurrection as the subject of future hope, but nothing definite as to its time and nature.

(*e*) *The Didache.*—In the last chapter of the *Didache* we have a brief summary of the kind of eschatology which was characteristic of primitive Judæo-Christian community represented by this treatise. There is the great tribulation preceded by a general apostasy, as in the little Apocalypse of Mk 13. Then come the signs of the Parousia, the third sign being the resurrection of the dead. Then the writer adds, 'but not of all the dead,' quoting Zec 14^5 in order to limit the resurrection to the righteous only.

This apparently will be the pre-millennial resurrection of Rev 20^{4-6}. But no mention is made of a final judgment and resurrection.

(*f*) *Barnabas* teaches (v. 7) the general resurrection and judgment of both wicked and righteous, and also (xi. 8) lays stress on the importance of baptism in this respect (cf. also xxi. 1. 6).

(*g*) *The Shepherd of Hermas.*—In this strange medley we have what may represent the point of view of the poorer and uneducated class of Christians in Rome about the middle of the 2nd century. Much stress is laid on baptism for the salvation of flesh and spirit to the Kingdom of Christ (*Vis.* III. iii. 5). In *Vis.* IV. iii. 5 the world is to be destroyed by blood and fire, but the righteous pass through the final tribulation in safety. The elect will dwell in the world to come, without spot and pure. In *Sim.* IV. 'the world to come is summer for the righteous, but winter for the wicked.' All are to be manifested in that world and to receive the reward of their deeds. In *Sim.* V. vii. 4 both flesh and spirit, kept pure, are to be preserved for the future life. In *Sim.* ix. 16 we have the fullest passage for the raising of the OT saints, but with considerable differences from the view that apparently became stereotyped in the Roman Creed. The apostles after their death preached to the OT saints and gave them the seal of baptism. It is remarkable that Hermas, speaking of the apostles, says, 'they went down alive and came up alive,' in contrast with the OT saints who 'went down dead and came up alive.'

It is difficult to extract much coherency from the rambling visions and parables of Hermas, but apparently he conceives of the completion of the tower, the Church, as the moment when the world to come will be ushered in. There will be judgment of wicked and righteous, a great tribulation, a resurrection of flesh and spirit for the righteous, and apparently eternal death or annihilation for the wicked.

Hence, the survey of the Apostolic Fathers shows us in the main the same lines of cleavage, represented by Ignatius and the *Didache* respectively. We have too little remaining to us of the literature of the Church of this period to form a comprehensive judgment. C. H. Turner (*Studies in Early Church History*, Oxford, 1912, p. 1 ff.) has already entered a weighty protest against regarding the *Didache* as in any way representative of the general thought and practice of the Church at the beginning of the 2nd century. Nor can we infer that the type of eschatology which it represents largely outweighed the more spiritual form of hope characteristic of the Christian experience of Ignatius.

III. CONCLUSION.—In closing this examination of the doctrine of the resurrection as held in various circles of the early Church during the 1st cent. of Christianity the same general conclusions meet us as appeared at the close of the survey of the Parousia. There are, however, some important differences in the development of the two conceptions.

The Parousia—that is, the coming of Messiah with glory to inaugurate a time of bliss—had always formed a somewhat uncertain element in Jewish eschatology. It was not bound up with the future hope of Israel by any moral necessity; hence we find it absent from various forms of Jewish eschatology, and at various periods.

The resurrection of the righteous, on the other hand, was increasingly regarded by the best Jewish thought as morally bound up with the character and faithfulness of God, and hence appears in nearly every form of eschatological construction, whether strictly Messianic or not.

Thus, when we pass into NT eschatology, we find that the two factors of the belief in the historical resurrection of Christ as the Messiah, and the connexion of this resurrection with His own moral character and God's response to it, operate much more cogently in the development of the resurrection-doctrine of the NT than in that of the Parousia, especially in St. Paul's teaching. Hence we find two lines of thought of unequal strength at work in St. Paul's treatment of the subject.

(1) On the one hand, he seeks to find a place for the resurrection of the believers in the general scheme of eschatology as he had inherited it, and to relate the resurrection of Christ and those who were vitally connected with Him to the whole scheme. The result was a disturbance of the main lines of the Palestinian eschatology and a gradual blurring of its determined sequence of events.

(2) On the other hand, St. Paul is far more interested in working out the nature of the resurrection of believers as a moral implication of the resurrection of Christ. The essential form of his resurrection-doctrine is principally determined by this factor, although his Judæo-Hellenistic psychology, his Rabbinical metaphysics, and his Pharisaic eschatology have a subordinate influence on his modes of thinking. These three last factors con-

tribute far less to the essence of St. Paul's resurrection-doctrine than has been generally supposed.

The outstanding results of the development in those circles where the historical resurrection of Christ remained the fundamental fact in the Church's belief were the gradual liberation of the belief in the resurrection of believers from any particular scheme of eschatology and an increasing spiritualization of the resurrection. The strength of the belief in the physical resurrection of Christ, however, caused the resurrection of the body or the flesh to become a fixed element in the belief of the Church as a whole, as witnessed by the early forms of creed.

The subsidiary results of development were a divergence of opinion between those circles in the Church which held to the Jewish expectation of an earthly kingdom and those which inclined to the Alexandrian view. In the former the millennial scheme prevailed, with a resurrection of the righteous preceding the Messianic kingdom, and a general resurrection and final judgment following it. This is represented in the Apocalypse and the *Didache*, and was perhaps most prevalent in the Palestinian churches and in the country districts of Asia Minor. In the latter circles the tendency was to regard the righteous as entering upon their glorified state after death, although even here the conception of a final resurrection as necessary for the full consummation was retained, and the belief in a final resurrection of both righteous and wicked for judgment kept its place.

It is not too much to say that the real inwardness, the essence, of both the Pauline and the Johannine doctrine of the resurrection failed to be apprehended by the Church as a whole, although individuals such as Ignatius show clear traces of its influence.

LITERATURE.—See Literature of art. PAROUSIA, and, in addition, F. C. Burkitt, *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (Schweich Lectures for 1914), London, 1914; R. H. Charles, *Studies in the Apocalypse*, Edinburgh, 1913; W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Books of the Apocrypha*, London, 1914.

S. H. HOOKE.

RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

- **I. The place of the Resurrection of Christ in the Apostolic Church.**
- **II. The apostolic evidence for the fact.**
  - i. The primary evidence.
  - ii. The documentary evidence.
    - 1. The witness of St. Paul.
      - (*a*) The empty grave.
      - (*b*) The appearings of the Risen Christ.
    - 2. The witness of the Gospels.
      - (*a*) The empty grave.
      - (*b*) The appearings.
- **III. The nature of Christ's Resurrection-Body.**
  - i. The Gospel witness.
  - ii. The witness of St. Paul.
- **IV. The significance of the Resurrection of Christ for Apostolic Christianity.**
  - i. Evidential significance—in respect of
    - 1. The Person of Christ.
    - 2. His work.
    - 3. The Christian hope.
  - ii. Essential or constitutive significance—for
    - 1. Christ Himself.
    - 2. Christian life and experience in all its forms.
      - (*a*) Justification.
      - (*b*) Sanctification.
      - (*c*) Bodily resurrection.
    - 3. The consummation of the Kingdom of God.
- **V. Attempted naturalistic or semi-naturalistic explanations of the apostolic belief.**
  - i. Older forms.
    - 1. The swoon theory.
    - 2. The theft or fraud theory.
    - 3. The subjective vision or mental hallucination theory.
    - 4. The objective vision or telegram theory.
  - ii. More recent forms.
    - 1. The psychological or psychical research theory.
    - 2. The mythological theory.
    - 3. The spiritual significance theory.
    - 4. The 'supernatural-without-miracle' theory.

I. *THE PLACE OF THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST IN THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH.*—The fundamental fact on which the Apostolic Church rests is the resurrection of Jesus Christ. What lies at the basis of everything else determining the whole round of apostolic thought and life is the conviction that the Jesus who was crucified was raised from the grave by the power of God and is now the Exalted and Sovereign Lord. Apart from this the very existence of Apostolic Christianity as exhibited in the NT is unintelligible and inexplicable. Three aspects of this fundamental significance of the Resurrection may here be indicated.

(*a*) It is the fontal source or spring of the apostolic faith, that which brought the Church into existence and set it moving with that wonderful vitality and power which lie before us in the NT. Much of modern historical criticism attempts to find the impulse which constitutes Christianity in the impression of the life and teaching of Jesus on His disciples. But so far as that went, and if that were all, there would have been no such thing as the Christianity of the apostles. There might have been memoirs of Him, there might have been a school of thought founded on His teaching, but there would have been no living faith, no Christian gospel, no Apostolic Church. He had spoken as no man had ever spoken; He had done many mighty works, 'works which none other man did' (Jn 15^{24}). And more than what He said and did was what He was—the unique impression of His life and personality, whereby He made men feel that in Him they were face to face with one who was none other than the great Promised One of God, 'the Christ' (Mk 8^{29}, Mt 16^{16}, Lk 9^{20}), 'the Holy One of God' (Jn 6^{69}; cf. Ac 3^{14}, 'the Holy and Righteous One').

Yet the faith called forth by the life of Christ was a faith which broke into fragments under the crash of the Cross. The creative force or dynamic of Christianity has, as a matter of history, to be found in an event that carries us beyond the limits of the earthly life. It was the Resurrection, viewed as a great declaratory act of God, the fact that God 'raised him from the dead, and made him to sit at his right hand' (Eph 1^{20}), that re-interpreted and re-established the faith evoked by the Life, and for the first time gave Him His true place as Lord and Christ in their lives. This is best seen by reference to the reports of St. Peter's speeches in the Acts, in which, by general consent, we have a true representation of the earliest Christian preaching. In these speeches St. Peter starts indeed from the historical Person of Jesus and from facts well known to his hearers regarding His life on earth: 'Jesus of Nazareth, a man accredited to you by God through miracles and wonders and signs which God performed by him among you, as you yourselves know' (Ac 2^{22}); 'anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him' (10^{38}).

This Divine approval of Jesus on earth, as certified by His works, was, however, apparently contradicted and denied by His death on the Cross, which to the Jew was the symbol of Divine rejection (5^{30} 10^{39}; cf. Dt 21^{23}). But the difficulty thus presented to faith by His death was removed or annulled by the Resurrection on 'the third day' (10^{40}), which is represented as a great historical act on the part of God, who thereby reversed Israel's act of rejection and vindicated the claim of Jesus to be the Christ, 'whom ye crucified, whom God raised' (4^{10}; cf. $2^{24.\,32.\,36}$ 3^{15}).

Thus through the Resurrection Jesus is proclaimed not only as 'Messiah' ($3^{18\text{-}20}$ $4^{25\text{-}28}$), but as 'Lord' (1^{21} $2^{21.\,33.\,36}$ $3^{13.\,21}$ 5^{31} 10^{36}), 'Saviour' (5^{31} 4^{12}, 'In none other is there salvation'), 'Prince of life' (3^{15} 5^{31}), and 'Judge of quick and dead' (10^{42}, represented as in accordance with the teaching of Jesus Himself). So men are called to repentance and to be baptized in the name of Christ for the remission of sins and receiving of the gift of the Holy Spirit (2^{38} 10^{43}).

(*b*) Not only is the resurrection of Christ the fontal source or spring of Apostolic Christianity, so that from it the apostolic gospel dates; it is itself the very centre and substance of His gospel. So far from being a mere accessory or appendage to the apostolic message, a detached event added on to the life and teaching of Jesus to assure the disciples of His survival of death and of the truth of His claim, in it lay germinally and as in a kernel the whole gospel they had to preach; so that the preaching of Christ is for the apostles the preaching of His resurrection, and their primary function is to be witnesses of the fact (Ac $1^{8.\ 22}$, etc.). St. Paul but represented the common apostolic mind when, writing to the Corinthians, he said: 'If Christ hath not been raised, then is our preaching vain' (κενόν, there is nothing in it, it has no real content); and 'your faith is vain (ματαία, it is futile, to no purpose, fruitless of effect); ye are yet in your sins' (1 Co $15^{14.\ 17}$). If Christ died and in that 'lorn Syrian town' lies in His grave like other men, then the whole gospel of the apostles falls to the ground, for the good news they have to declare is that God hath raised up Jesus from the dead and made Him the Exalted Lord to whom all power is given in heaven and on earth. 'This Jesus whom ye crucified God hath made both Lord and Christ' (Ac 2^{36})—this is the concentrated essence of the gospel they proclaim. There is nothing else in it except what comes out of this, and belongs to this, and is illumined by this.

The resurrection of Christ, viewed not as a mere revivification of His earthly body but as His entrance on a state of exalted power and Lordship, is the key which unlocks the inner meaning and significance of His earthly life and ministry. The earthly life of Jesus, with its amazing memories, is seen to be a very incarnation of God, a 'sending forth' of His Son by the Father, the event to which all else in the world's history had been moving (Gal 4^{4}). The Death on the Cross, the very symbol of shame, which had seemed to wipe out for them the meaning of the Life, becomes in the light of the Resurrection full of Divine meaning and significance, the central disclosure of redeeming self-sacrificing Love.

But more than this; the revelation of the life and death of Christ attained its end and became an effective reality only through the Resurrection. For only through His being raised from the dead and His exaltation to supreme power and sovereignty with the redeeming virtue of His life and death in Him, did Christ enter fully on His career as Prince and Saviour (Ac 5^{31}), and become the life-giving principle of a new humanity (1 Co 15^{22}), the second Adam (Ro $5^{12f.}$, 1 Co 15^{45}), inaugurating a new era in the process of Divine creative evolution. The religion of the apostles is communion with a Risen Lord. Only 'in Him,' 'in Christ,' in union with a living Saviour, have we redemption and renewal of life (Eph 1^{7}, Col 1^{14} 2^{13}, Ro 3^{24}).

(*c*) As the entrance of the crucified and buried Jesus on a state of exalted power and glory in which He is Lord both in grace and in nature, the Resurrection is, further, the fundamental determinative principle of the whole apostolic view of the world and life. It pervaded and revolutionized their whole universe of thought, controlling and governing their interpretation of existence and creating a new intellectual perspective so that all things—God, the world, man—came to be viewed *sub specie Resurrectionis*. The characteristic apostolic title for God becomes 'God the Father who raised Jesus Christ from the dead' (*e.g.* Ro 4^{24} 6^{4} 8^{11}, Col 2^{12}, 1 P 1^{21}). The God in whom they believe is One whose character is once for all made manifest in that He raised up Jesus Christ. The Cross and the Burial had seemed to be the triumph of evil in the world, the final defeat of holy love. But by the Resurrection and Exaltation God had vindicated the holiness of Jesus, and by thus vindicating Jesus had vindicated and authenticated Himself. At the great crucial moment in the world's moral history, in the case of a perfectly holy life, the omnipotence of God—in apostolic language the 'working of the strength of his might' (Eph 1^{19})—was shown to be on the side of goodness and righteousness. Through the resurrection of Christ, too, as no merely spiritual resurrection—'the survival of personality beyond death'—but a rising from the grave and from the power of death, God has convincingly manifested the supremacy of spirit over the strongest material forces.

The long struggle between nature and spirit was concentrated climactically in the body of Jesus, and by His bodily resurrection from death and the grave—and what other kind of resurrection from the grave could there be?—victory is shown to remain with spirit. Death itself, the crowning manifestation of the seeming victory of material forces over spirit, has been vanquished and overcome; and this supreme and crucial revelation of the power and character of God sheds its transfiguring light over all other revelation in nature and history, illuminating the mysteries of life here and of destiny hereafter. By the Resurrection assurance of personal immortality is given to men, and the present life in the fullness of its embodied existence is lifted above the vicissitudes of time and invested with infinite meaning and eternal value. 'Wherefore'—such is the conclusion of St. Paul's great argument in the Resurrection chapter in 1 Cor.—'be ye stedfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord' (15^{58}). In a word, the resurrection of Christ was for the apostolic mind the one fact in which the world and history arrived at unity, consistency, coherence; the pledge and the guarantee of 'the gathering together in one of all things in Christ' (Eph 1^{10}). It was the breaking in upon human life of a new world of triumph and hope, in which were contained at once the pledge and the ground of the consummation of God's purpose for the world. Hence the vitalizing and energizing optimism of the apostolic outlook on life—'born anew to a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead' (1 P 1^{3}).

That the Resurrection holds this place of centrally determinative importance in the Apostolic Church is a fact which, if not always sufficiently realized by the friends of Christianity in subsequent centuries, is at all events acknowledged by her opponents. D. F. Strauss, *e.g.*, the most trenchant and remorseless of her critics in dealing with the Resurrection, acknowledges that it is the 'touchstone not of lives of Jesus only, but of Christianity itself,' that it 'touches all Christianity to the quick,' and is 'decisive for the whole view of Christianity' (*New Life of Jesus*, Eng. tr., 2 vols., London, 1865, i. 41, 397). If this goes, all that is vital and essential in Christianity goes; if this remains, all else remains. And so through the centuries, from Celsus onwards, the Resurrection has been the storm centre of the attack upon the Christian faith. The character of this attack has varied from age to age. To-day it differs in important respects from what it was even fifteen or twenty years ago. The application of new and more stringent methods of criticism to the evidence, the rich store of new material provided through recent researches in comparative religion and mythology, the re-discovery of Judaistic apocalyptic literature, and the new interest in the psychology of religion—all this has given 'a new face' to the critical attack.

It is not, indeed, that the apostolic belief in the resurrection of Christ, or the centrality of this belief to Apostolic Christianity, is denied. These are admitted on all sides as incontestable. What is called in question is the validity of the belief, the historical reality of the fact or facts on which the belief was based. It is held that in the light of the new critical methods applied to the evidence, and the new knowledge made accessible to us to-day in the light of what is generally, though ambiguously, called 'modern thought,' it is no longer possible for us to believe in the Resurrection as the apostles believed in it. In particular, in much present-day discussion it is maintained that, in view of modern scientific-historical criticism of the evidence, it is impossible to believe in the resurrection of Christ in any other sense than that of a spiritual resurrection. The result is that to-day we are faced with this somewhat new situation, that not by the opponents of Christianity only, but by some of its most honoured supporters and advocates in their effort to recommend Christianity to the 'modern mind,' the bodily resurrection of Christ is denied, or minimized as forming no vital or essential part of the Christian faith.

We shall first of all examine the nature and extent of the historical evidence which is presented in the apostolic writings for the fact of the Resurrection, and thence educe the nature or character of the apostolic belief in the fact. Thereafter we shall consider the meaning or significance of the Resurrection for Apostolic Christianity—this in itself is part of the apostolic evidence for the fact, as the true nature of a cause becomes apparent only in its effects—and finally examine the main critical attempts to explain the belief without acknowledging the fact. In the course of the inquiry the conviction will be expressed and supported that the recorded evidence for the resurrection of Christ, though in many ways disappointingly meagre and when critically examined not devoid of 'contradictions,' or 'discrepancies,' is yet adequate and sufficient for the purpose in view, and that those critics who come to negative conclusions do so less because of difficulties connected with the evidence than because of presuppositions or *præjudicia* of a dogmatic or philosophical character with which they come to the examination of the subject. The evidence available for the resurrection of Christ, it is recognized, can appeal aright only to those to whom the fact has a significance altogether different from that which an ordinary fact of human history can ever possess. Mere historical evidence is of itself incompetent to generate true Christian faith in the Resurrection. This depends on anterior and prior considerations determining our religious attitude to the fact—upon our philosophy of life and, in the last resort, upon our estimate of Jesus Christ Himself.

II. *THE APOSTOLIC EVIDENCE FOR THE FACT.*—i. THE PRIMARY EVIDENCE.—In proceeding to examine the evidence for the fact it should be remarked, to begin with, that this is much wider than is often represented. The historical evidence presented in the NT narratives—upon the examination of which the truth of the Resurrection is often decided—is after all but a small part of the witness by which the fact is established. The primary evidence lies further back, in the transformation effected in the lives of the apostles, giving rise to the Christian Church; in the fullness of that energizing life and power of which the NT writings are themselves but the product. To realize the greatness of this transformation we have but to take the picture of the apostles after the event as given in the Acts, and compare it with that before as given in the Gospels. Sadness has given place to joy, weakness to strength, cowardice to courage, despair to confidence. The men who, timorous and un-understanding, had forsaken their Master in His hour of utmost need, who counted all their hopes in Him lost when He was put to death, who, disillusioned and hopeless, had for fear of the Jews shut themselves up within closed doors, now face the rulers of the land proclaiming that He whom they had condemned and crucified was indeed the Christ, the Messiah, in whom alone there was salvation (Ac 4^{12}), and summoning them to repentance and to baptism in His name for the remission of their sins and the receiving of the gift of the Holy Ghost (2^{38}).

Such a change, such a moral and spiritual transformation, with the results following, demands a sufficient cause. What the apostles' own explanation was we know—the Resurrection 'whereof we are witnesses' (Ac 2^{32} 3^{15} 5^{32} 10^{39}, etc.). They believed that the Crucified Jesus was now the Risen and Exalted Lord, raised from the dead on the third day by the power of the Father—a belief which early found institutional expression in the observance of the first day of the week as 'the Lord's Day.' Whether they were deceived or not, is not now the question. It is sufficient at present to note that this is the primary evidence in relation to which all other evidence must be seen. 'It is not this or that in the New Testament—it is not the story of the empty tomb, or of the appearing of Jesus in Jerusalem or in Galilee—which is the primary evidence for the resurrection; it is . . . the existence of the Church in that extraordinary spiritual vitality which confronts us in the New Testament' (Denney, *Jesus and the Gospel*, p. 111 f.). This is where the apostles themselves placed the emphasis. 'He hath poured forth this which ye both see and hear' (Ac 2^{33}), says St. Peter in his first sermon, referring to the gift of the Spirit at Pentecost as proof of the resurrection and exaltation of Christ; and in his second sermon or address the healing of the cripple is adduced as further proof (3^{16}). In his view the evidence of the Resurrection was not merely a past event 'on the third day,' but present religious experience. 'The Resurrection was not an isolated event. . . . It was the beginning of a new and living relation between the Lord and His people. . . . The idea may be expressed by saying that the apostolic conception of the Resurrection is rather "the Lord lives" than "the Lord was raised" . . . Christ lives, for He works still' (Westcott, *The Gospel of the Resurrection*, p. 294 f.). Thus it is that the continued existence of the Church, and of the moral miracle in which the Church consists, is a vital part of the evidence for the Resurrection. If the Resurrection were not a fact continued into the present, the historical incidents recorded would soon have faded, like all merely historical facts, into a past significance.

The remembrance of this primary evidence for the Resurrection has important consequences. (1) The Apostolic Church, the Christian society, existed before any of the NT narratives were written, and essentially is independent of them. Therefore even if the narratives were, as alleged, 'conflicting and confused'—nay, even if it could be shown that there are features in them whose historical value is doubtful, this would not of itself disprove the fact of the Resurrection. We should in that case know less than we thought we did about the mode of the Resurrection life of Christ, but our faith in the Resurrection itself, of which the existence of the Church is the primary evidence, would not be disturbed. (2) It is only in relation to this primary evidence that the 'historical evidence' presented in the narratives can be estimated aright. The narratives were written from within the Church, they were the product of the faith created by the Resurrection. Further, they relate to a fact which is no mere event of the past, but continues as a living power in the present, and so must be viewed in the context of living history and experience. Historical criticism, therefore, which isolates the narratives from this living context, and analyzes them out of relation on the one hand to the experience of which they are the outcome, and on the other to the experience in which they result, is in its nature abstract, and can give only a limited or partial view of the facts.

ii. THE DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE.—With this fundamental and primary evidence for the Resurrection before us, we pass to consider what is commonly called 'the historical evidence,' that presented in the NT documents or narratives.

1. The witness of St. Paul.—The earliest documentary evidence to the fact of the resurrection of Christ is that presented in the writings of St. Paul.

(*a*) *The empty grave.*—St. Paul is sometimes appealed to in support of a purely spiritual Resurrection, as teaching that it was the spirit of Christ which rose into new life, and his view is contrasted with the 'more materialized' representation of the Gospels. The empty tomb and the resurrection of the Body were, it is alleged, no part of St. Paul's teaching, but a later development. Schmiedel, *e.g.*, supports his contention of the unhistorical character of the evidence for the empty tomb by reference to 'the silence of Paul . . .—a silence which would be wholly inexplicable were the story true' (*EBi* iv. 4066). Weizsäcker urges that St. Paul says nothing of what happened at the grave because he knew nothing of it (*Apost. Age*^{2}, London, 1897–99, i. 5). And Harnack, while thinking it 'probable' that the Apostle knew of the message about the empty grave, holds that 'we cannot be quite certain about it.' In any case, 'certain it is that what he and the disciples regarded as all-important was not the state in which the grave was found, but Christ's appearances' (*What is Christianity?*, Eng. tr.^{3}, London, 1904, p. 164 f.). What are the facts? In the first Epistle of his which has come down to us, which is also the first extant NT writing—1 Thess.—written from Corinth about A.D. 51, St. Paul simply asserts the fact of the Resurrection without defining its nature. He recalls how the Thessalonians 'turned unto God from idols, to serve a living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus' ($1^{9f.}$); 'if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so,' etc. (4^{14}). The fact is referred to incidentally as if it were a matter unquestioned in the Church. This is St. Paul's general attitude in his Epistles, and it is an attitude even more significant as an attestation of the Resurrection than any more direct evidence.

But St. Paul's conception of the nature of the fact is plainly indicated by the more explicit reference in 1 Co 15, written about the year A.D. 55 (see Sanday, in *EBi* i. 904), *i.e.*, about twenty-five years after the Resurrection. Here St. Paul reminds the Corinthians of the fundamental facts of his preaching and of their faith—'the gospel which I preached unto you . . . by which also ye are saved' (v.$^{1f.}$). In this earliest extant narrative of the facts, which is therefore the primary document in regard to the Resurrection, St. Paul's words are: 'For I delivered unto you first of all (*ἐν πρώτοις*, 'first and foremost' [Moffatt]) that which also I received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried; and that he hath been raised on the third day according to the scriptures; and that he appeared to Cephas,' etc. (v.$^{3ff.}$). In this outline statement of the substance of his preaching in Corinth the following points of importance are to be noted:

(1) St. Paul explicitly refers to a rising 'on the third day,' which was distinct from and preparatory to the appearances. This event on the third day, as concrete an event as the death of Jesus, is set over against the burial, and is presented as the reversal of it, thus making clear what is meant by the fact. If St. Paul meant simply a spiritual resurrection, a manifestation of the spirit of Jesus from heaven, he need have said no more than that Jesus died and on the third day appeared to the disciples. The clause 'and that he was buried' not merely emphasizes the full reality of His death, but points to the grave as the state from which the Resurrection took place. 'Why mention His burial unless it was His bodily resurrection he [Paul] had in view?' (Dods, in *Supernatural Christianity*, p. 103). Who ever heard of a spirit being buried? Even Schmiedel somewhat inconsistently admits this: 'That Jesus was buried and that "he has been raised" (1 Co 15^{4}) cannot be affirmed by any one who has not the reanimation of the body in mind' (*EBi* iv. 4059). So in the other two passages in St. Paul's writings where reference is made to the burial of our Lord (Ro 6^{4}, Col 2^{12}). In both, the Resurrection is presented as relative to the burial and as the reversal of it, showing that even if St. Paul does not explicitly mention the empty grave it was the bodily resurrection he had in view. This is borne out by the whole line of the Apostle's argument in 1 Co 15. St. Paul is replying to those in Corinth who denied, not the continued spiritual existence of the Christian after death, but the possibility of his bodily resurrection, on the ground that they could not conceive how the body could rise; and he does so by setting the resurrection of Christian believers, the quickening of their mortal bodies (v.$^{42ff.}$), in closest and organic connexion with the resurrection of Christ as 'the firstfruits of them that are asleep' (v.^{20}). Here, obviously, only a reference to the bodily resurrection of our Lord would have been relevant. This is the conception of the Resurrection which permeates his Epistles (*e.g.*, Ro $6^{4ff.}$ 8^{11}, 2 Co 5^{1-5}, Ph 3^{21}), and it is reflected in the speeches of St. Paul reported in the Acts ($13^{29f.}$ 17^{31} 26^{23}). Such a conception of the Resurrection, indeed, was required by the whole context of Pauline thought on the matter. For St. Paul, as for the entire Jewish Christian community, sin and physical death stood in organic connexion with each other. Hence Christ's triumph over sin involved for them His final and complete victory over the death not only of the soul but of the body as well.

(2) The significance of the term used in reference to the resurrection of Christ has to be noted as setting forth St. Paul's conception of the nature of the event. He does not say simply, 'He rose on the third day,' but, 'He hath been raised (*ἐγήγερται*) on the third day.' The use of the perfect tense signifies that the event was of such a character as had an abiding effect on the condition of the Lord. His resurrection was not like other raisings from the dead recorded in the Scriptures, where the raising meant simply restoration to the old life and the old conditions, with the prospect of meeting death again in the future. Christ rose, St. Paul says, and remains in the risen state; He has triumphed over death: 'Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death no more hath dominion over him' (Ro 6^{9}). As risen He belongs to a new and higher mode of being. St. Paul's conception of the nature of Christ's risen body is more fully elucidated by his teaching as regards the 'spiritual' body (see more fully below, III. ii. and IV. ii. **2** (*c*)).

(3) This gospel which he had preached in Corinth, including as one of its great affirmations the fact that Christ was raised on the third day, was not, he says, peculiar or original to him. He had but 'delivered' (*παρέδωκα*, 'passed on' [Moffatt]) what he had himself 'received' (*παρέλαβον*)—received not by direct revelation from Christ, but through tra-

dition from those who were in Christ before him (see Lake, *The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, p. 38 ff.). The channel through which he received the tradition he does not here indicate. In the Epistle to the Galatians, however, an Epistle accepted with practical unanimity by NT scholars though it is difficult to date it definitely, he tells us that three years after his conversion he went up to Jerusalem expressly 'to visit Cephas' (1[18], *ἱστορῆσαι Κηφᾶν*), that he stayed there for a fortnight, and that he saw St. James also. The term *ἱστορῆσαι* 'implies a careful and searching inquiry on his [Paul's] part' (A. Edersheim, *LT*^{4}, London, 1887, ii. 625; cf. Knowling, *Testimony of St. Paul to Christ*, p. 222, and A. Sabatier, *The Apostle Paul*, Eng. tr., London, 1891, p. 81). That his knowledge of the details of the common Christian tradition may be traced to this visit and prolonged interview with two of the primary witnesses of the Resurrection is, therefore, altogether probable. As Schmiedel acknowledges, 'during his fifteen days' visit to Peter and James (Gal 1[18f.]), he had the best opportunity to perfect his knowledge on the subject in the most authentic manner' (*EBi* iv. 4057).

Through this visit, therefore, if not indeed already at his conversion, he came into possession of the facts which he had handed on to the Corinthians as the common Christian tradition. Some hold (*e.g.*, W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, Göttingen, 1913, p. 90 ff.) that the tradition which St. Paul here repeats, though indirectly derived from the older apostles, was mediated for him by the Hellenistic Christianity of Damascus and Antioch, and suffered modification accordingly. But St. Paul distinctly asserts (v.[11]) that the substance of his preaching in Corinth was identical with that of the other apostles. This is a fact of the first importance. St. Paul's conversion took place not long after the death of Christ. Lightfoot dated it six or seven years after the Crucifixion, but the trend of more recent criticism is to place it much earlier, within a year or two of this event. Harnack places it in the year following the Death, as do also McGiffert and Moffatt, while Ramsay makes it three or four and Weizsäcker five years after (see art. 'Chronology of the NT' in *HDB* i. 424). St. Paul's visit to Jerusalem, therefore, and his interview with St. Peter and St. James fall possibly within five years, but certainly well within ten years, of the Resurrection. We have, accordingly, in documents which all reasonable critics admit, the clearest evidence as to what the fundamental facts of Christianity were, as taught in the primitive community, within the first decade of the event, by those who were primary witnesses of the Resurrection. These were that 'Christ died for our sins, according to the scriptures,' that 'he was buried,' that 'on the third day he was raised from the dead according to the scriptures,' and that 'he appeared' to His disciples. If St. Paul's testimony, therefore, proves anything, it proves that the earliest apostolic witness included not only the fact of appearances of the Risen Christ, but the empty grave and the Resurrection on the third day.

(4) One other point in St. Paul's summary statement is to be noted. The atoning death of Christ ('for our sins'), and His resurrection on the third day are represented as being 'according to the scriptures' (*κατὰ τὰς γραφάς*, v.[3f.]). St. Paul's belief in the Resurrection on the third day has been represented as a deduction or inference from OT prophetic Scripture, based 'on theological rather than historical grounds' (Lake, *Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, p. 264), or as due to a 'Messianic dogmatic,' a pre-Christian sketch of the Christ-portrait derived from widespread non-Jewish myths (chiefly Babylonian in origin) and embodied in Jewish writings (see, *e.g.*, T. K. Cheyne, *Bible Problems*, London, 1904, p. 113). In answer to this it is sufficient here to note that St. Paul claims to stand in this matter precisely on the same ground as the earlier apostles. The gospel he had preached to the Corinthians in its two great affirmations—the atoning significance of the Death and the reality of the Resurrection on the third day—was not, he claims, original to him; he had but 'handed on' the tradition which he had himself 'received.' The attempt to explain the primitive apostolic belief in the Resurrection on the third day as an inference from Scripture will be considered later (below, II. ii. 3).

(*b*) *The appearings of the Risen Christ.*—St. Paul's witness to the Resurrection includes, however, not only the rising on the third day but the fact of subsequent appearings of the Risen Lord. In his outline statement in 1 Co 15 the following list of appearances is given: 'He appeared to Cephas; then to the twelve; after that he appeared to over five hundred brethren at once, the majority of whom survive to this day though some have died; after that he appeared to James, then to all the apostles, and last of all he appeared to me also—this so-called "abortion" of an apostle' (vv.[5-8]).

(1) The purpose for which St. Paul adduced this list has to be noted, for the consideration of this at once removes certain objections which have been urged against it. There were some members of the Corinthian Church (*τινές*, v.[12]) who denied the fact of the resurrection of the dead—not the resurrection of Jesus in particular, but the resurrection of the dead generally. They said, 'There is no such thing as a resurrection of dead persons' (*ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστιν*, v.[12]; cf. v.[29], 'dead men are not raised at all' [*ὅλως*]), asserting a universal negative. Who these *τινές* were St. Paul does not say, but we know that in his missionary labours among the Greeks the subject of teaching which proved the chief stumbling-block was the resurrection of the dead. In Athens, *e.g.*, we are told that, when he began to speak of the resurrection of dead men (*ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν*), they derided the very idea, and their manifest impatience and ridicule forced him to terminate his speech abruptly (Ac 17[32]; cf. 26[8]). These *τινές* in Corinth shared the prejudice of Greek culture against the idea of a bodily resurrection. They denied the possibility of the fact. They repeated the dogma 'Dead men do not rise' as the last word of philosophy, much as in modern times the similar dogma 'Miracles do not happen' has been repeated as the last word of science.

To deny the resurrection of the dead is by implication to deny Christ's resurrection, and to do this is to contravene the Gospel witness, and, further, as St. Paul shows by the *reductio ad absurdum* argument, to render the whole saving worth of the gospel ineffective (vv.[14-18]), and to show that they believed the gospel heedlessly or at haphazard (*εἰκῇ*, v.[2]) without seriously realizing the facts involved. So, before advancing to the doctrinal discussion which was the real purpose of his argument in this great chapter, St. Paul felt called to rehearse the historical evidence for Christ's bodily resurrection which he had 'received,' and which he had already 'delivered' to them by word of mouth when he was among them. In this rehearsal he recalled not only the Burial and the fact of the Resurrection on the third day, but a summary of the chief appearings of the Lord after His resurrection. Whether St. Paul is here giving his own summarized statement of the principal witnesses to the Resurrection or, as some maintain, a stereotyped or formulated summary list which he had himself received and had handed on to the Corinthians ('a selection made for purposes of preaching' [Sanday, *HDB* ii. 640[a]]) does not affect the argument. In either case the list given is a summary statement of evidence already received.

The remembrance of this supplies a complete answer to the objections drawn from St. Paul's omitting to refer to certain appearances recorded in the Gospels. Weizsäcker, *e.g.*, argues from St. Paul's silence as to the appearance to the women at the grave, recorded in the Gospels, and from his placing the appearance to St. Peter first in his list of Christophanies, to his ignorance of the fact. 'The only possible explanation is that the Apostle was ignorant of its existence' (*Apost. Age*^{2}, i. 5). And from this he proceeds to draw the inference that, since 'Paul's knowledge of these things must have come from the heads of the primitive Church, therefore it is the primitive Church itself that was ignorant of any such tradition,' which is, therefore, a 'later product' (p. 6). Such is the conclusion to which Weizsäcker comes on the supposition on which he proceeds that St. Paul is here relating the appearances 'in order to prove the fact' of the Resurrection, 'proof which he undertakes so earnestly and carries out with such precision' (p. 5). To like effect Schmiedel: 'By his careful enumeration with "then . . . next . . . next . . . then . . . lastly" (*εἶτα . . . ἔπειτα . . . ἔπειτα . . . εἶτα . . . ἔσχατον*, 15^{5-8}) he guarantees not only chronological order but also completeness' (*EBi* iv. 4058). On this ground he argues, like Weizsäcker, from St. Paul's omission of reference to the appearance to the women to his ignorance of the fact, and hence to the supposition that the Jerusalem Church, from which St. Paul derived his facts, included in its testimony to the Resurrection no such stories of the appearing of Jesus to the women as are now found in the Gospels. It is doubtless a fair inference from St. Paul's manner of expressing himself that he gives the appearances which he mentions in what he considers their chronological order. So much 'then . . . after that . . .,' etc., denotes or implies.

But there is nothing to show that he considers his enumeration exhaustive. Indeed, there is everything against it. The statement here given is almost as condensed as it could possibly be, and it is difficult to see how it could ever be mistaken for an exhaustive evidential account of the proofs of Christ's resurrection. In this list nothing more than the names or numbers of the witnesses are given. No mention is made of locality or other detail of the appearances, not from lack of knowledge but because the Corinthians themselves would be able to fill in the details from memory. The passage is but a recapitulation of oral teaching, giving in a summary fashion what he had enlarged upon in all its circumstances and significance when he was among them. For this summary purpose St. Paul selects the appearances to the leaders of the Church whose names were well known to the Corinthians and would carry weight with them, and who were, like himself, specially chosen and commissioned to be witnesses of the Resurrection (1 Co 15^{15}; cf. Ac 1^{22} 4^{33})—Cephas, the Twelve, St. James, all the apostles—mentioning, besides these, only the great crowning manifestation of the Risen Lord to 'more than five hundred brethren at once.' This in itself would explain the omission of the appearance to the women which had a more private significance and would not be of special interest to the Corinthians. It may have been on this ground too, as Sanday suggests (*HDB* ii. 639^b)—'because the two disciples involved were not otherwise conspicuous as active preachers or prominent leaders'—that the appearing on the way to Emmaus is not mentioned. In any case, the mere omission to mention this appearing or that to the women cannot be held to argue St. Paul's ignorance of the fact (though this was possible), much less warrant the conclusion that the manifestation of Jesus to the women had no place in the primitive Church tradition.

(2) Whether St. Paul means that the entire list of appearances here given (with the exception, of course, of that to himself) formed part of the original tradition which he had received has been disputed. The grammatical construction continues unbroken to the end of v.^{5} ('that he hath been raised on the third day . . . and that he appeared to Cephas, then the twelve') and then changes ('then he appeared,' etc.): and some hold that these later appearances were added to the list by St. Paul himself. But it is precarious to make the mere grammatical structure of the sentence the basis of reasoning. Such a break is not unusual with St. Paul. Certainly the implied idea would seem to be that St. Paul is here summarizing the common tradition which he had received, and it is natural to suppose that the recapitulation extends to the end of the series. Chase interprets the break in construction, if intentional, as denoting that 'the Apostle regards the appearances which he mentions as falling into two groups,' and infers that 'he places the appearance to Cephas and that to the Twelve among the events "of the third day"' (*Gospels in the Light of Hist. Criticism*, p. 41).

A detailed examination of St. Paul's summary list will show how far it is in line with the Gospel accounts and confirms the narratives there given.

(i.) 'He appeared to Cephas.' The source of St. Paul's knowledge of this appearance is scarcely open to dispute. When he went up to Jerusalem to 'visit Cephas,' who can doubt that while St. Paul had much to say of his experiences on the Damascus road St. Peter told how the Master had appeared to himself on the very day of the Resurrection. Of the Evangelists, Luke alone mentions this appearance and assigns to Peter the privilege of being the first apostle to whom the Risen Lord appeared (24^{34}). The source of Luke's knowledge is not difficult to trace.

(ii.) 'Then to the twelve.' 'The twelve' is here used as the official title of the apostolic body—a technical phrase (cf. Godet, *in loc.*; Lake, *Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, p. 37)—without exact regard to number. It is probable that the incident to which St. Paul here refers was the appearance to the Ten in the Upper Chamber on the evening of the Resurrection (Lk 24^{36}, Jn 20^{19}), or the appearance to the Eleven (Thomas being present) a week later (Jn 20^{26}); or it may be that St. Paul's reference would cover both these incidents. It is the fact of the manifestation of the Lord to the assembled company of His selected companions that is referred to, and the absence of Thomas on the day of the Resurrection is an accident. Accordingly, even if others were present on the first of these occasions, as Luke's language seems to imply ('the eleven and those that were with them,' v.^{33}), the significance of the appearance would rest in the recognition of the Lord by His chosen friends.

(iii.) 'Then he appeared to above five hundred brethren once for all' (ἐφάπαξ)—rather than 'at once' or 'simultaneously' (cf. Ro 6^{10}, Ac 7^{27} 9^{12} 10^{10})—the implication of ἐφάπαξ being that not only did they see the Lord together but 'the occasion in question was the only one on which this large company of disciples had so wonderful an experience' (*CQR* lxi. [1906] 328). The identity of this appearance with that on a mountain in Galilee recorded in Mt $28^{26f.}$—the appearance foretold in the promise of vv.$^{7.10}$ and anticipated in Mk 16^7—has been maintained by many. And certainly this appearance would seem to require location in Galilee, not in Jerusalem. 'An appearance to so large a body of disciples at one time could only have taken place on the Galilean hills' (Swete, *Appearances of our Lord after the Passion*, p. 82). Matthew, indeed, speaks only of 'the eleven disciples' in connexion with this meeting in Galilee, but in the expression 'some doubted' (*οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν*, Mt 28^{17}) there has been found an indirect indication of the presence of a larger body. 'In the small body of the eleven there is hardly room for a "some"' (Orr, *Resurrection of Jesus*, p. 190). Further, as H. Latham (*Risen Master*, Cambridge, 1901, p. 290) urges, a meeting with the Eleven only would not have necessitated an appointment in the hill country. It could have been held with perfect safety in a room at Capernaum. Matthew's speaking only of 'the eleven disciples' in connexion with the meeting may be explained by the fact that his interest lay wholly in the commission of the Risen Lord to the apostles which was given at this meeting (cf. Chase, *Gospels in the Light of Hist. Criticism*, p. 42). The identification can never indeed be more than a probability. Weiss (*in loc.*) rejects it, and E. von Dobschütz (*Ostern und Pfingsten*, Leipzig, 1903, p. 34), followed by Harnack and Lake, attempts to identify the appearance with the coming down of the Holy Spirit upon the assembled company on the Day of Pentecost. But in any case it is to be noted that St. Paul, writing twenty-five years after the Resurrection, says that the majority of those 'more than five hundred' were still living and could be interrogated by his readers for themselves as he had doubtless interrogated them. Of this appearance the Apostle makes much, including it even in a summary list; as well indeed he might, for, even if the Eleven could be deceived or deceivers, was it credible that their error or their fraud would be shared by so large a company? 'Some there must have been among them who, as the days went on, would have exposed the imposture or betrayed their doubts. But if any doubts of this kind had arisen, it would have been dangerous for the Apostle to appeal to the survivors of the five hundred in a letter written to Corinth, where he had enemies who were in frequent communication with Jerusalem' (Swete, *Appearances*, p. 83 f.).

(iv.) 'Then he appeared to James.' Of this appearance we have no notice in the Gospels. An extra-canonical account of it is found in the fragment of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* preserved by Jerome (*de Vir. Ill.* 2), a Palestinian work of the end of the 1st or beginning of the 2nd century. 'The Lord . . . went to James and appeared to him; for James had sworn that he would not eat bread from the hour in which he had drunk the cup of the Lord until he saw Him raised from the dead. . . . Bring, the Lord said, a table and bread. . . . He brought bread, and (Jesus) blessed and brake it and gave it to James the Just and said to him, My brother, eat thy bread, for the Son of Man has risen from the dead.' This cannot, however, 'with any confidence be connected with the appearance to James the Lord's brother of which S. Paul speaks' (Swete, p. 89 f.; cf. J. B. Mayor, *Epistle of St. James*^{3}, London, 1910, p. xxvii). Though not thus referred to elsewhere in the NT, corroboration of the fact may be derived from the light thrown by it on what we are told of the Lord's brethren after the Resurrection. That they did not believe in Him during the days of His public ministry is recorded in the Fourth Gospel (Jn 7^{5}; cf. Mk 3^{21}). After the Ascension, however, we find them included among the little company of believers (Ac 1^{14}); and within a short time we find St. James in particular president of the Jerusalem Church (Ac 15^{13}). The natural explanation of the change is contained in St. Paul's assertion 'He appeared to James.' It seems impossible to doubt that St. Paul derived his information direct from St. James himself during his fortnight's visit to Jerusalem (Gal 1^{18}); and this appearance is included in the summary because of the special value attached to the testimony of St. James from the fact that he was the eldest brother of the Lord and head of the Jerusalem Mother Church, as well as from the fact of his previous unbelief.

(v.) 'Then to all the apostles.' The appearances in this list being set down in chronological order, the incident to which St. Paul here refers may with a reasonable degree of probability be identified with the appearance of Christ to the Eleven before the Ascension, more circumstantially narrated by Luke ($24^{50\text{f.}}$, Ac $1^{6\text{f.}}$; cf. Mk $16^{14\text{f.}}$). Ac 1^{22}, which speaks of those who had companied with the Eleven from the beginning until 'the day that he was received up,' would support the contention of those who hold that on the occasion of this appearance others were present besides the Eleven, and that St. Paul means to convey this by distinguishing an appearance of 'all the apostles' from an appearance to 'the twelve.' St. Paul's wider usage of the term ἀπόστολος makes such an interpretation possible.

The appearances recorded by St. Paul may thus be held to correspond to appearances recorded in the Gospels, with the one exception of that to St. James, which we have seen reason to assume he obtained at first hand during his visit to Jerusalem. The further appearances of the Risen Christ recorded in the Gospels of which there is no mention in St. Paul's summary—the appearance to the women, to Mary Magdalene, to the travellers to Emmaus, to the seven at the Sea of Tiberias—may have been omitted for the reason already indicated, viz. that they were of less interest for the purpose in view, having little more than a private significance. St. Paul's list, therefore, helps us to verify, and at one or two points to supplement, the narrative of the Gospels. The significance of this has to be noted. It has often been asserted that the Gospel story of the Resurrection was not committed to writing till thirty or forty years after the events recorded, and that this period allows time for the incorporation of details which may be nothing more than tradition. But here we have written down within twenty-two or twenty-three years of the event (taking the date of 1 Cor. as A.D. 55) a list of witnesses expressly affirmed to be part of the tradition which St. Paul had received either at his conversion (A.D. 31 or 33) or, at latest, during his visit to Jerusalem three years later, from first-hand sources, thus taking us back to within a few years of the event. And how remarkable a list it is—'Cephas,' 'James,' 'the twelve,' 'more than five hundred brethren,' and 'all the apostles.' To realize the weight of this testimony it must be taken as a whole and not in its isolated parts. The number and variety of the persons to whom the manifestations were made, as well as the character and status of the witnesses and the simultaneous perception by many, make this a statement of evidence for the Resurrection which cannot be made light of by the impartial historian.

(3) The most important appearing of all, as giving St. Paul's direct evidence to the Resurrection—an addition to the traditional list 'received'—has yet to be considered. Behind St. Paul's preaching of the Resurrection there stood not only the testimony of others, but the great historical fact of the Risen Lord's appearing to himself on the way to Damascus. 'Last of all (ἔσχατον πάντων) he appeared also to me—to this so-called "abortion" of an apostle' (ὡσπερεὶ τῷ ἐκτρώματι, v.^{8}).

The AV translation 'as to one born out of due time' finds the suggestion in ὡσπερεὶ τῷ ἐκτρώματι to be that he was born too late to witness one of the normal appearings of Christ after the Resurrection and before the Ascension. But J. Weiss points out (H. A. W. Meyer, *Kommentar über das NT*, Göttingen, 1868–78, Eng. tr., London, 1873–95, *in loc.*) that ἔκτρωμα means born not too late but too early, too quickly, the suggestion being that of the suddenness and violence of St. Paul's birth into Christ. His was an unripe and violent birth (cf. G. G. Findlay, *EGT*, '1 Cor.,' London, 1900, *in loc.*, 'the unripe birth of one who was changed at a stroke from the persecutor into the Apostle, instead of maturing normally for his work'). In either case the point is the abnormality of St. Paul's birth into faith and apostleship, and probably the significance of the article is, as Weiss points out, that τὸ ἔκτρωμα was an insulting epithet flung at St. Paul by those who belittled his apostleship. In their eyes he was a real *Missgeburt*. St. Paul adopts the title and gives it a deeper meaning, arguing that, notwithstanding his abnormality and unworthiness, his apostleship was as valid as that of the older apostles.

A considerable body of negative criticism has maintained that the appearance to St. Paul was of an inward visionary character, and that, since he includes it in his list with the others without any discrimination between them except as regards time, using the same word (ὤφθη) to describe all the appearances, he must have regarded these as like his own, visionary. Weizsäcker, *e.g.*, says: 'There is absolutely no proof that Paul presupposed a physical Christophany in the case of the older Apostles. Had he done so he could not have put his own experience on a level with theirs. But since he does this, we must conclude that he looked upon the visions of his predecessors in the same light as his own' (*Apost. Age*^{2}, i. 9; cf. O. Pfleiderer, *Christian Origins*, Eng. tr., London, 1906, pp. 136 f., 160 f.). The 'more materialistic' accounts of the appearances given in the Gospels are the outcome of later 'unhistorical embellishments.' The truth, however, is, as Westcott points out (*Gospel of the Resurrection*, p. 111), that the exact converse is the proper line of argument. St. Paul, we have seen, conceived of the Resurrection as a bodily resurrection, in this believing himself to be at one with the older apostles, and his use of the same term to describe all the appearances shows that he regarded the appearance of the Risen Lord to himself on the road to Damascus as of the same kind as those granted to the others. He believed, and always acted on the belief, that he had seen the Risen Lord in the same sense as did those who saw Him during the forty days, that he was a witness of Christ's resurrection in the same sense as the others were, and the last of such witnesses; and this 'seeing' he regarded as containing the basis and justification of his apostolic mission. He claimed to be as directly commissioned by our Lord in person as any other of the apostles (Gal $1^{11\text{-}17}$). 'Am I not an apostle, have I not seen Jesus our Lord?' (οὐχι Ἰησοῦν τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν ἑώρακα, 1 Co 9^{1}) (cf. Jn 20^{18}, ἑώρακε τὸν Κύριον; v.^{25}, ἑωράκαμεν τὸν Κύριον; v.^{29}, ἑώρακάς με).

'The phrase seems to have been current in the Apostolic Church in speaking of a personal experience of the appearances of the risen Christ' (Swete, *Appearances*, p. 41 n.). That the reference here is to a risen appearance and not to a seeing of Jesus during His earthly life is obvious. For even if, as some maintain, St. Paul had so seen the Lord, what he is concerned with in this passage is his claim to be an apostle and a witness equally with the Twelve of the Lord's resurrection; and to justify this claim a 'seeing' of the Risen Lord was necessary.

The visionary character of this experience has sometimes been argued from the mere use of the term ὤφθη, but this is illegitimate. The term is, indeed, sometimes used of 'visionary' seeing (*e.g.* Ac 16^{9}); but it is used equally of seeing which is not visionary (*e.g.* Ac 7^{26}). 'What it suggests in almost every case is the idea of something sudden or unexpected; that which is seen is conceived to be so, not because one is looking at it or for it, but because it has unexpectedly thrust itself upon the sight' (Denney, *Jesus and the Gospel*, p. 116). Support for the visionary interpretation of the appearance has, however, been sought by reference to St. Paul's words elsewhere.

Two passages in particular have been adduced: 2 Co 12^{1-9}, Gal $1^{15f.}$. To take the latter first: 'When it was the good pleasure of God, who separated me even from my mother's womb, and called me through his grace, to reveal his Son in me (ἐν ἐμοί), that I might preach him among the Gentiles.' That this revelation refers to his experience near Damascus is indicated in v.^{17}; and it is urged that in these words St. Paul unequivocally asserts the inward character of the revelation granted to him, and that this meaning must in consequence be applied to all other passages in his writings where the point is spoken of.

But St. Paul's assertion here of the inward character of the revelation does not require us to resolve the whole manifestation into an inward experience and exclude an accompanying or preceding appearance vouchsafed to the senses. Lightfoot (*in loc.*) maintains that the words, 'when it pleased God to reveal his Son in me,' should be taken in close connexion with the words immediately following, 'that I might preach him among the Gentiles' (this giving the content of the inner and spiritual revelation); while the words, 'called me by his grace,' should be understood as a reference to the actual event on the Damascus road on which the inner revelation supervened. However this may be, the admission of an inner revelation does not exclude an external manifestation as well. Even such a negative critic as Meyer admits this: 'It is not therefore (because of the inward revelation) to be denied that Paul conceived the appearance of Christ to him to be objective and external' (*Die Auferstehung Christi*, p. 186). The revelation of God to him was two-fold, the inward supplementing the outward. Such an inward revelation indeed, as Knowling points out, was necessary to complete and interpret the outward. Without this 'the outward appearance could never have been recognised for what it was in its full meaning, nor could the Apostle have been assured against all suspicion of an illusion of the senses' (*Testimony of St. Paul*, p. 184). The outer revelation separated from the inner would have been valueless, and would have left St. Paul in the same bewildered state as the companions of his journey. But the outward revelation, though valueless without the inward, was a necessary condition and presupposition of it.

In the other passage referred to, 2 Co $12^{1ff.}$, St. Paul writes, 'I must needs glory, though it is not expedient; but I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord,' etc. May not the Apostle, it is urged, have 'seen' the Lord in one of these ecstatic visions, visions with regard to which he could not even affirm whether he was in the body or out of it? But this very passage, as Sabatier truly observes, 'shows that Paul, so far from comparing the manifestation of Christ to him at his conversion with the visions he afterwards enjoyed, laid down an essential difference between them' (*The Apostle Paul*, p. 65). Of the latter he speaks with the utmost reserve and reticence—'of which it is not expedient that he should glory.' But the former he places in the forefront of his preaching, as containing not only the grounds of his conversion, but, as we have seen, the basis of his claim to apostleship. Moreover, St. Paul describes the appearance of Christ here referred to as the last of a series—'last of all' (ἔσχατον πάντων). The force of the words is often overlooked. They do not mean merely that St. Paul was the last of the particular series of persons named in the previous verses; 'he does not say . . . that Christ appeared to him the last; but that He appeared to him for the last time, *i.e.* as in a series which was now closed' (Knowling, p. 182). St. Paul, we know, had many visions and revelations of the Lord after this, and he could not therefore tell us more definitely than he does by this expression 'last of all' how fully and clearly he distinguished between the Damascus vision and every other vision of the Risen Saviour (cf. Weiss, on 1 Co 15^{8}: 'All later visions of Christ belong for Paul to a different category, they cannot be viewed in the same way as proofs of the Resurrection').

This external objective character of the appearance of the Risen Christ to St. Paul is corroborated by an examination of the three accounts of it given in Acts (9^{1-22} 22^{1-16} 26^{1-18}). The first occurs in the course of Luke's own narrative of the circumstances of St. Paul's conversion. The second occurs in the report of St. Paul's defence before Lysias, when Luke was probably present (a 'we' section). The third is in the report of St. Paul's defence before Agrippa, when Luke again was probably present. Of these different accounts Schmiedel says that 'they contradict one another so violently . . . that it is difficult to imagine how it could ever have been possible for an author to take them up into his book in their present forms' (*EBi* iv. 4063). The divergences, however, relate to details, not to the essential facts. 'In the essential point there is the same impression throughout' (H. Weinel, *St. Paul*, Eng. tr., London, 1906, p. 77).

The chief variations concern (i.) the effect of the appearance upon St. Paul's companions: in the first account they are described as 'hearing the voice but beholding no man' (9^{7}, ἀκούοντες μὲν τῆς φωνῆς, μηδένα δὲ θεωροῦντες); in the second it is said, 'They beheld indeed the light, but heard not the voice of him that spake to me' (22^{9}, τὴν δὲ φωνὴν οὐκ ἤκουσαν τοῦ λαλοῦντός μοι); (ii.) the place of Ananias: in the first account Saul is bidden to arise and go into the city, where it shall be told him what he must do. So also in the second account. The instruction is then left to be given by Ananias. But in the third account the instruction is given by the Lord Himself and no mention is made of Ananias. These variations, however, are relatively unimportant. As regards (i.), in the very variation a significance has been discerned. 'They may have heard a vague sound (φωνῆς, genitive), and yet not the articulate, intelligible voice (φωνήν, accusative), which fell upon St. Paul's ear with a definite meaning' (H. A. A. Kennedy, *St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things*, London, 1904, p. 86; cf. Grimm-Thayer, *s.v.*). As regards (ii.), St. Paul's omission in Ac 26 of the part of Ananias may be sufficiently explained by the difference of circumstances. He naturally dwelt on it in his defence before a Jewish mob (Ac 22), because the mention of Ananias and his part would be reassuring to his hearers, while in speaking before Festus and Agrippa at Cæsarea such a reference would be uncalled for. In Ac 9 we have the historian's own circumstantial narrative of the course of events where we would expect Ananias to be mentioned.

In regard to St. Paul's own experience of the appearance the different accounts agree in the following details. (i.) A light from heaven suddenly shone round about him as he journeyed to Damascus (9^{3}, *περιήστραψεν φῶς*; 22^{6}, *περιαστράψαι φῶς*; 26^{13}, *περιλάμψαν . . . φῶς*). Of this light Saul's fellow-travellers also were cognizant. (ii.) From the shock of this dazzling light Saul falls prostrate on the ground. (iii.) He hears a voice (the others heard only a sound), which he discovers to be that of the Glorified Jesus speaking to him in words which he can understand. Whether, besides seeing a splendour of light and hearing a voice, St. Paul saw also the Risen Lord in bodily form the accounts in Acts do not explicitly assert—though this seems implied in what is said by contrast of the experience of his companions, who are described as hearing the voice but 'beholding no man' (*μηδένα θεωροῦντες*, Ac 9^{7}), and in Barnabas' subsequent announcement to the Church at Jerusalem that 'Saul had seen the Lord in the way' (Ac 9^{27}; cf. his announcement to St. Paul himself, 'the Lord, even Jesus, who appeared unto thee,' v.^{17}; cf. 22^{14}).

That St. Paul believed he had seen the Lord in His risen body is involved in the references to the event in his letter to Corinth which we have already considered (1 Co 9^{1} 15^{8}). In the former passage, in defending his apostleship he claims to have 'seen Jesus Christ our Lord.' The primary apostolic function was to witness to the resurrection of Christ, and in order to discharge this function it was requisite that the Apostle should with his own eyes have seen the Risen Lord. In the latter passage, in which he classes his own experience with the earlier appearances of the Risen Christ, his purpose is to prove not the continued spiritual existence of the Christian, but his bodily resurrection; and only a reference to the bodily resurrection of our Lord and a bodily appearance would have been relevant. But according to the account in Acts the aspect of the appearance which chiefly impressed him was the Divine glory of it, 'the glory of that light' (Ac 22^{11}). And this is reflected in many passages in his letters—2 Th 1^{9-11} 2^{8}, 1 Co 15^{44-49}, Ro $8^{18.\ 29}$, 1 Ti $6^{15f.}$, 2 Ti $1^{10f.}$, and especially Ph $3^{20f.}$ ('the body of his glory'). The vision he saw was of Christ glorified; but this Glorified Christ was identical with the Crucified Jesus of Nazareth (Ac 22^{8}, 'I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecutest'; 26^{15}, 'I am Jesus whom thou persecutest'). And, however the phenomena perceived by his senses were to be described, what is important to note is the immediate effect that the appearance had upon him, for St. Paul himself in his accounts of it is concerned with the significance of the fact rather than with any precise descriptive details. He became, through it, absolutely convinced that the Jesus who was crucified and whose followers he was persecuting was indeed the Risen and Exalted Lord (*Κύριος*); and this conviction revolutionized his whole thought and life, energizing in him unto a new life of absolute devotion and surrender whereby he became henceforth the property (*δοῦλος*) of a crucified but living and glorified Christ (Ro 1^{1}, Gal 1^{10}, Ph 1^{1}). His own explanation of the transformation is contained in these words, 'He appeared to me also'—words in which he claimed for himself the same kind of revelation as that made to Peter, James, and the other apostles after the Resurrection.

Various attempts have been made to explain the appearance on purely natural grounds. Any explanation, to be satisfactory, must be able to give a sufficient reason for the greatness of the revolutionary change referred to in the persecutor's experience, with its lasting moral and spiritual effects. (i.) Taken to this test, the attempt to account for the experience as a species of epileptic seizure in scorching heat, the product of excitable nerves and atmospheric effects—a view identified with the name of Renan (cf., more recently, Weinel, *St. Paul*, p. 82 f.)—is at once condemned as inadequate. (ii.) W. James speaks of a form of 'sensory automatism' which he calls a 'photism,' a 'hallucinatory or pseudo-hallucinatory' phenomenon, and represents St. Paul's 'blinding heavenly vision' as a phenomenon of this sort (*Varieties of Religious Experience*, London, 1902, p. 251 f.). The parallelism between St. Paul's experience and the modern instances quoted is hard to find, but inasmuch as James himself claims that his hypothesis does not necessarily involve a denial of the heavenly or Divine origin of the appearance to St. Paul, his hypothesis need not be considered as a purely naturalistic one. (iii.) Chief of such naturalistic attempts is that which would represent the appearance as the result of St. Paul's psychological condition (Strauss, Baur, Holsten). Doubts or misgivings, so it is represented, had been working in his mind for some time previously, scruples of conscience as to his persecuting proceedings. Such scruples were induced largely by his experience of the calm confidence and triumphant joy of the Christians in persecution, as compared with his own inner consciousness of turmoil, born of the conflict between self and the holy law of God.

Strauss's classical representation of the case may be quoted: 'They [the believers in Jesus] showed a state of mind, a quiet peace, a tranquil cheerfulness, even under suffering, which put to shame the restless and joyless zeal of their persecutor. Could *he* have been a false teacher who had adherents such as these? could that have been a mendacious pretence which gave such rest and security? On the one hand, he saw the new sect in spite of all persecutions, nay, in consequence of them, extending their influence wider and wider around them; on the other, as their persecutor he felt that inward tranquillity growing less and less which he could observe in so many ways in the persecuted. We cannot therefore be surprised if in hours of despondency and inward unhappiness he put to himself the question: "Who after all is right, thou or the crucified Galilean about whom these men are so enthusiastic?" And when he had once got as far as this the result, with his bodily and mental characteristics, naturally followed in an ecstasy in which the very same Christ whom to this time he had so passionately persecuted appeared to him in all the glory of which His adherents spoke so much, showed him the perversity and folly of his conduct, and called him to come over to His service' (*New Life of Jesus*, i. 420). Time and again—so C. Holsten represents the case in his searching analysis of St. Paul's state of mind at his conversion (*Zum Evangelium des Paulus und des Petrus*, Rostock, 1868)—the reproachful image of Jesus, as described by Stephen and other Christians, stood before his soul and made appeal so that he was half persuaded to join himself to His followers. In such a state of mind he journeyed to Damascus, when he experienced his vision. This view is supported, it is held, by the words reported in the narrative of his conversion as spoken to St. Paul by Christ Himself, 'It is hard for thee to kick against the goad' (Ac 26^{14}). 'In what else can it have consisted,' asks Pfleiderer, 'than in the painful doubt as to the lawfulness of his persecution of the Christians—in the doubt, therefore, whether the truth was really on his side, and not rather, after all, on that of the persecuted disciples of Christ?' (*Influence of the Apostle Paul on the Development of Christianity* [*HL*], Eng. tr., London, 1885, p. 35).

Now it is not necessary to deny all inward psychological preparation on St. Paul's side for the experience issuing in his conversion. Otherwise, as Pfleiderer truly enough observes, his conversion would have to be recorded as a 'magical act of God, in which the soul of Paul would have succumbed to an alien force' (*ib.* p. 34). 'Such visions do not happen in a vacuum' (Moffatt, *Paul and Paulinism*, London, 1910, p. 10; cf. P. Feine, *Theologie des NT*, Leipzig, 1910, p. 202). It was the difference in this inward or psychological preparation between Saul and his journey companions that partly explains why the occurrence meant one thing to him and another to them.

As elements in Saul's psychological preparation contributing or disposing towards the result, the two factors referred to by supporters of this theory may be admitted. (1) The wonderful demeanour of the followers of the crucified Nazarene, their triumphant joy and calm, unswerving loyalty even in persecution, could not but leave a powerful impression on such an ardent and sensitive nature as St. Paul's. In particular, the calm confidence and heroism of Stephen in face of death and his dying vision of the Lord probably sank deep into his soul. And then (2) the impression made by these would be emphasized by contrast with his own experience of inward turmoil and dispeace. The words reported in the narrative of his conversion, 'It is hard for thee to kick against the goad' (*σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν*), are no doubt full of significance in this connexion. Even if proverbial, and as such not to be pressed too closely with regard to St. Paul's state of mind before his conversion (so Knowling, in *EGT*, London, 1900, on Ac 26^{14}), taken in connexion with references in his letters they reveal a profound internal conflict going on within Saul's soul, a deep misgiving concerning his own religious position and standing before God. A Pharisee of the Pharisees, he had striven to attain peace with God through fulfilment of the Law, but already upon him the painful sense of failure and moral despair was pressing (cf. Ro 7). 'His soul had been pierced and lacerated by his sense of moral impotence in face of the Law. Like a stupid beast, Saul knew not whither this incessant goad was driving him, nor whose was the hand that plied it' (Findlay, *HDB* iii. 702^{b}). He could not but contrast his own state of mind with that of the followers of Jesus. But with all this there is in the narratives no hint of doubt on Saul's part of the rectitude of his persecuting zeal, nothing to show that he ever suspected the real truth to lie in the direction of the new sect of the Nazarenes.

St. Paul's own uniform representation of his mental condition on his way to Damascus is not that of doubtful misgiving, but of conscious rectitude undisturbed by the least shadow of doubt that in persecuting the Christians even to death, he was doing

God's will. 'I verily thought within myself that it was my duty to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth' (Ac 26^{9}). To Saul the position of the Jesus-sect was a blasphemy against God. It was not only that their so-called Messiah had been put to death. That in itself to the mind of Saul, the orthodox Jew, shattered the claim that Jesus was the Christ. The conception of a Suffering Messiah was, to quote Holsten's own words, 'so far removed from the orthodoxy of Jewish belief that a suffering Messiah, during the lifetime of Jesus, was still to His disciples an inconceivable and enigmatical representation' (*op. cit.* p. 98). But it was above all the peculiar form of the Death which disproved the claim of Jesus to be the Messiah. To a Jew, the Cross was the very emblem of Divine rejection. 'Cursed,' not merely by man but by God, 'is every one that hangeth on a tree' (Gal 3^{13}; cf. Dt 21^{23}. Hence *ἀνάθεμα* Ἰησοῦς, 1 Co 12^{3}). To the mind of Saul of Tarsus the death on the Cross appeared a Divine retribution on a blasphemous claim. God Himself had endorsed the verdict of Caiaphas and Pilate, and in proclaiming a crucified Messiah the followers of Jesus were fighting against God.

Thus to Saul the suppression of the Jesus-sect was a sacred duty and a meritorious service for the glory of God. The followers of Jesus spoke, indeed, of a resurrection of their crucified Master, but no one had seen Him save some of their own company, and to Saul's mind it was the uttermost heresy, and he simply refused to believe it. The young Pharisee was, indeed, far from being at peace within himself. Yet this very inward dispeace only fanned his anti-Christian zeal to new flame and urged him forward more fiercely than ever in loyal adherence to the traditions of his fathers, if thereby he might the better fulfil the righteousness of the Law. As he says himself, he was 'exceedingly mad against them' (Ac 26^{11}). With all the intensity of his nature he set himself to stamp out the heresy. Not content with harrying the Christians in Jerusalem, he 'persecuted them even unto strange cities.' Such was the spirit in which he started on his way to Damascus, when all at once his persecuting zeal was brought to a halt. An incident occurred which cleft his life in twain and 'drove him, in spite of himself, into a new channel' (Sabatier, *The Apostle Paul*, p. 60). The mental conditions, therefore, out of which a self-generated vision of the Glorified Jesus might conceivably have been formed were wanting in him at the time.

The whole impression conveyed to the reader of the narrative in Acts is that of the suddenness, unexpectedness, surprisingness of the change in the persecutor's psychological condition (Ac 9^{3} 22^{6}). And this is corroborated by the references in St. Paul's own letters. He always referred to the event which formed the turning-point of his life as a sudden, surprising, overwhelming experience. The very language he uses in reference to it emphasizes this. 'I was apprehended (*κατελήφθην*) by Christ Jesus' (Ph 3^{12})—a remarkable word which denotes that the persecutor was seized upon suddenly, taken hold of by Christ, and subdued as if by main force. He looks upon himself in 2 Co 2^{14} as a suddenly subdued rebel, whom God leads in triumph about the world. The same suggestion of suddenness and violence we have seen already to be implied in the term *ἔκτρωμα*. That this, and not a gradual change, is the view required by St. Paul's language is admitted by so unprejudiced a critic as H. J. Holtzmann in his edition of the *Acts*: 'It is at all events certain that the Apostle knows nothing of a gradual process which has drawn him closer to Christianity, but only of a sudden halt which he was compelled to make in the midst of an active career' (*Handkommentar zum NT*^{3}, Tübingen, 1901, ii. 70 f., quoted by Knowling, *Testimony of St. Paul*, p. 189).

2. The witness of the Gospels.—The apostles, in their preaching of Jesus and the Resurrection, would from the first be called upon to substantiate their statements by detailed historical evidence. One of the first requirements in missionary teaching of the Resurrection would be a summary of the principal witnesses. Thus arose, we may well believe, for missionary and catechetical purposes such a list of the chief appearances as that given in 1 Co 15$^{3-8}$. But, especially as time went on, more would be required than this. 'How can you believe in a crucified Messiah?' 'How can you preach the gospel of forgiveness and justification in His name?' To such challenging questions the full answer would be not merely an adducing of the evidence for the Resurrection, but an account of the life and ministry of Jesus on earth—essentially a *Passions-Geschichte*—showing that the suffering of the Death was the climax of a life of service and suffering on the part of One who claimed to be the Messiah, and who supported His claim by His works. So the main facts of Christ's life and teaching on earth would be recalled, and an oral tradition would grow up based on first-hand evidence derived from the apostles and other eyewitnesses; until, as time went on and the possibility of distorting the facts grew ever greater, it would become necessary for apologetic and practical purposes to put on record the tradition hitherto preserved in the Church only by oral means. Thus arose written narratives of our Lord's life and ministry as culminating in the Death and Resurrection, the primary aim of which was not historical or biographical, but that expressed by the word 'gospel.' 'These signs are recorded that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing you may have life through his name' (Jn 20^{31}; cf. Mark's heading of his work, 'The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God,' 1^{1}).

The generally accepted results of recent criticism with regard to the relations of the Gospels may be represented shortly as follows. Two main sources are to be recognized: (1) a collection made at a fairly early date of the sayings and discourses of Jesus, the chief object of which was, according to Sanday, 'to set before its readers (the new converts in the different Churches) some account of the Christian ideal, the character and mode of life expected of them as Christians' (*ERE* ii. 575^{a}); this original document is identified with the *Logia* mentioned by Papias (Eus. *HE* iii. 39) and usually christened 'Q' (*Quelle*, the original source); (2) a later document supplementing Q, a narrative or sketch of the Lord's public ministry which was practically, if not quite, identical with our present Second Gospel written by John Mark, the companion of Peter, and embodying the substance of that apostle's reminiscences of his Master's words and works. (The original ending of the narrative is lost, and the present ending [16$^{9-20}$] is a later appendix; but the fact that it appears in nearly all extant MSS and versions points to an early date, and perhaps to a close relation with Mark himself.) Then a little later came two fuller narratives, going behind the Ministry to the Birth. The writers, Matthew and Luke, writing for different classes of readers, with the two main sources referred to before them as basis of their narratives, arranged and edited independently the material thus supplied, sometimes interpreting it, sometimes giving it new point and fullness, and each adding information derived from his own minute investigations. This dependence of Matthew and Luke in their narrative portions on Mark is reckoned 'the one solid contribution' of literary criticism (F. C. Burkitt, *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, Edinburgh, 1906, p. 37; cf. W. C. Allen, *ICC*, 'S. Matthew'^{3}, do., 1912, p. vii).

It cannot, however, be argued that, while Mark is a primary authority, Matthew and Luke are secondary authorities. Much critical argument proceeds on this assumption, as if the narratives of the First and Third Gospels were a simple 'writing up' and embellishing of Mark's stories, and any details not found in the latter were to be rejected as unhistorical and legendary. Luke, *e.g.*, in the most important portion of his whole narrative—the Passion and the Resurrection sections—wholly deserts Mark and prefers to rely on independent information. As to the source of this information, Chase (*Gospels in the Light of Historical Criticism*, pp. 12, 62 f.) makes out a strong case for James and the elders of the Church with whom Luke was brought into personal contact in Jerusalem some twenty-five years after the Passion (see Ac 21$^{15ff.}$). Now James was a primary witness of the Resurrection, one of those who saw the Lord, so that Luke in his narrative would be in touch with first-hand information as much as Mark (cf. Lk 1^{2}). Then later still, the writer of the Fourth Gospel, having a knowledge of the Synoptic Gospels, wrote his narrative, wishing to supplement and perhaps in some details to correct them. In connexion with the narrative of the Resurrection in particular, the writer, with his more precise and consecutive account, affords valuable information. There is a growing tendency among critics to hold that, in substance at least, this Gospel represents a genuine work of the apostle John written in his old age, containing authentic reminiscences of the Lord's words and works. These reminiscences indeed have been moulded by the writer's meditation through many years on their significance, so that reminiscence and interpretation are often so interwoven that it is difficult to say where one ends and the other begins, but this does not detract from the trustworthy character of the Gospel. 'It is a blending of fact and interpretation; but the interpretation comes from one who had an unique position and unique advantages for getting at the heart and truth of that which he sought to interpret. It is the mind of Christ seen through the medium of one of the first and closest of His companions' (Sanday, *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, Oxford, 1905, p. 169). Indeed, John's account may be truest to reality. 'The history of a great movement will be told long years afterwards with the nearest approach to truth, not by the prosaic observer who noticed only what lay on the surface, but rather by one who at the time discerned something of its grandeur, and who as he recalled it instinctively idealized it. Idealization is perhaps a necessary condition for the preservation of the memory of a momentous spiritual crisis' (Chase, p. 17). (Ch. 21 is an appendix to the Gospel which closed at the end of ch. 20. Yet it must have become an integral part of the Gospel at an early period, for no trace exists of a Gospel without it. The style also is similar to the rest of the Gospel, so that on both internal and external evidence an increasing number of critics support Godet's contention: 'Either John himself composed this piece some time after having finished the Gospel, or we have here the work of that circle of friends and disciples who surrounded the Apostle at Ephesus, who had often heard him relate the facts contained in it, and who have reproduced them in his own language.')

It is often urged against the narratives of the Gospels that none of the writers were first-hand witnesses, but if the Fourth Gospel, as a growing weight of criticism encourages us to believe, is a genuine work of the apostle John, we have at least one such witness of first-rank importance. But further, Mark was the companion and interpreter of Peter, another primary witness. Besides, Luke was the companion of St. Paul, and St. Paul had direct communication with Peter, James, and other members of the original apostolic company; and Luke lays stress on the fact that the things which he relates rested on the testimony of those who were eye-witnesses. The Gospel of Matthew, if not directly the work of that Apostle—another first-hand witness—must have been written by one so closely associated with him that it ever afterwards passed as Matthew's own. We are thus, throughout, in contact with first-hand information, and all claim to be but recording a tradition well established in the Church, and derived originally from the apostles.

Approximate probable dates for the Gospels may be given as follows: Mk. A.D. 60–70, Mt. Lk. (Gospel and Acts) A.D. 70–80; Jn. A.D. 85–100—all falling probably within the 1st century. The extra-canonical Gospels, the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* and the *Gospel of Peter*, parts of which have been preserved, and both of which belong probably to the beginning of the 2nd cent., add little or nothing of a trustworthy character to the canonical accounts of the Resurrection.

The witness to the Resurrection in the Gospels may be thus exhibited: (*a*) Empty grave on the third day (Mk 15^{42}–16^{8}, Mt 27^{57}–28^{8}, Lk 23^{50}–24^{12} $^{(22-24)}$, Jn 19^{38} 20^{13}); and (*b*) post-Resurrection appearances (Mk [App.] 16$^{9-20}$, Mt 28$^{9-20}$, Lk 24$^{12-53}$, Jn 20$^{14-29}$ 21 [App.], *Gospel acc. to Hebrews*, xii. 50–57, *Gospel of Peter*, xiv. 58–60).

The historical value of the Gospel witness to the Resurrection has been called in question on various grounds, chief of which are: (1) Alleged discrepancies between the different accounts. This was already one of the chief objections to the Gospels in the earliest reasoned criticism of Christianity that has come down to us—*The True Word* of Celsus, written about the end of the 2nd cent. (see Origen, *c. Celsum*, ii. 56–63, v. 56, 58). H. S. Reimarus, writing nearly a century and a half ago, enumerated ten irreconcilable contradictions or discrepancies in the narratives (G. E. Lessing, *Wolfenbütteler Fragmente*, 1774–78). 'In reality,' says a more recent critic, 'the number is much greater' (Schmiedel, *EBi* iv. 4041). And Harnack, on the basis of examination of the various narratives, feels himself driven to an Agnostic despair of history, which regards the problem of what happened on the first Easter morning as absolutely insoluble. (2) The presence of mythical and legendary elements in the accounts. 'Even the empty grave on the third day can by no means be regarded as a certain historical fact, because it appears united in the accounts with manifest legendary features' (Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, Eng. tr., 7 vols., London, 1894–99, i. 85 n.). (3) The insufficiency of the evidence, even if allowed, to satisfy the demands of scientific historical inquiry. 'Secure evidence of the resurrection of Jesus would be the attestation of it in a decided and accordant manner by impartial witnesses. But . . . Jesus showed himself to his adherents only: why not also to his enemies, that they too might be convinced, and that by their testimony posterity might be precluded from every conjecture of a designed fraud on the part of his disciples?' (Strauss, *Life of Jesus*, Eng. tr.^{2}, London, 1892, pt. iii. ch. iv. sect. 140, p. 738). To like purpose Renan demands that the evidence for the Resurrection be such as would convince 'a commission, composed of physiologists, physicists, chemists, persons accustomed to historical criticism,' and on this basis criticizes the NT narratives as not satisfying 'scientific conditions' or 'rational principles' (*Life of Jesus*, Eng. tr., London, 1873, Introd., p. 29 f.). We shall consider the two parts of the witness separately, keeping these objections in view.

(*a*) *The empty grave.*—The narratives agree as to the following facts. (1) On the morning of the first day of the week, 'the third day' after the Crucifixion, very early, certain women went to the grave (Mt 28^{1}, Mk 16$^{1f.}$, Lk 24$^{1.\,10}$, Jn 20^{1}); (2) they found the stone rolled away and the grave empty (Mt 28$^{2-7}$, Mk 16$^{3-6}$, Lk 24$^{2-6}$, Jn 20$^{1.\,11f.}$); (3) they were informed by angelic means that Jesus had risen, and that they were bidden to convey the news to the disciples (Mt 28$^{5-8}$, Mk 16$^{6-8}$, Lk 24$^{4-11}$, Jn 20$^{11f.}$). Divergences in detail have to be acknowledged, though they are slight in comparison with the general agreement, and do not impugn the trustworthiness of the central facts in the common tradition.

Chief of these divergences are the following. (1) In regard to the number of the women, John represents the visit to the sepulchre as made by Mary Magdalene alone (20^{1}), while the others (Mt., Mk., Lk.) represent her as in company with other women, variously named. (2) As regards the purpose attributed to the women in coming to the tomb, two of the Evangelists, Mark (16^{1}) and Luke (23^{56} 24^{1}), represent this purpose as the anointing of the body of Jesus, while John records the fact that the anointing had already been done by Joseph and Nicodemus at the time of the entombment. (3) In regard to the angelic message, Matthew and Mark speak of one angel at the tomb; Mark representing him as 'a young man' arrayed in a white robe, appearing to the women on their 'entering into the tomb' (16^{15}), while Matthew has an independent story of a great earthquake, and represents the angel as rolling away the stone and sitting upon it (*i.e.* outside the tomb, 28$^{2-5}$). Luke and John, on the other hand, speak of two angels as appearing to the women (or woman), Luke representing the interview as occurring inside the tomb (24$^{3-5}$), while John represents Mary Magdalene as still remaining outside (20^{12}).

In regard to such divergences or alleged 'discrepancies' we have to remember two things. (1) The aim of the narratives is not to supply evidence or proof for a court of law, but rather to supply information regarding facts already believed, as Luke says, 'fully established' (*πεπληροφορημένων*), in the Church, concerning which they had already been 'catechetically instructed' (v.^{4}, *κατηχήθης*). This explains the often naive and informal character of the narratives. None of the Evangelists aims at giving a complete account of everything that happened on that wonderful Easter morning and day. Each selects and combines with his own special object in view. From this incompleteness arises much of the seeming contradictoriness of the different narratives. *E.g.*, John speaks only of Mary Magdalene at the sepulchre probably because he has a special story to tell of her—though the 'we' of Jn 20^{2} seems to imply the presence of others. (There is no need to suppose that the women came all together to the sepulchre. It is more probable that they came in different groups or companies.) (2) We have to remember further that the Resurrection day was necessarily one of intense excitement and agitation. This is vividly reflected in the narratives—the shock of amazement of the witnesses, their incredulity, their mingled fear and joy. So it is possible that the events of the day were told by different witnesses in a different order, and with differences in detail. The excitement of the moment may have left the memory dazed and unable to form any distinct impression of what was seen and heard, so that from the first there would be a certain confusion in the stories. But to discredit the narratives because they betray imperfections such as these is altogether unreasonable. So far from being incompatible with, they rather confirm, their historical veracity. 'The usual character of human testimony is substantial truth under circumstantial variety' (W. Paley, *Evidences of Christianity*, in J. S. Memes' *Christian Evidences*, London, 1859, pt. iii. ch. i. p. 203).

It need not be denied that some details of the narratives may possibly be unhistorical or legendary. In Matthew's story, *e.g.*, about the resurrection of many bodies of the saints, and their appearance to many after the Resurrection (27$^{51f.}$), we seem to have something akin to what we find in the Apocryphal Gospels (cf. Chase, *Gospels in the Light of Hist. Criticism*, p. 31). But the earthquake account (given only by Matthew, which is the only account of how the stone was rolled away) and that of the angelic visitation when ruled out (*e.g.* Lake, *Resurrection*, p. 251 f.) as legendary and unhistorical, are so not so much because of any insufficiency of evidence, as through prejudice against the supernatural, which, however, is of the very essence of the narratives throughout.

Luke records (24^{12}) that, on receipt of the message of the women, Peter went to the sepulchre and found it empty, with only the grave-clothes left. This verse is of doubtful authority—being absent from important Western documents — and is omitted by Westcott and Hort and by Tischendorf as a later insertion, though, as F. Blass points out (*Philology of the Gospels*, London, 1898, p. 189), Luke's account contains another reference to a visit to the grave on the part of some of the apostles (v.^{24}), the genuineness of which there is no good ground for calling in question.

John in his account—that of an eye-witness of the facts—tells us (20^{3-10}) that, on receipt of the message of the women, Peter and himself went to the grave and found the condition as the women had said. He gives a circumstantial description of the way in which the grave-clothes were found lying; in particular, that the napkin which had been round His head was found 'folded up' (v.^{7}, ἐντετυλιγμένον) by itself, apart from the other bandages, doubtless at the raised end of the chamber where the head rested (see Latham, *Risen Master*, plate 2, for an imaginary sketch of the interior of the tomb). Latham's theory is that the word implies that the head-cloth still partially retained its annular form (p. 43), and that the other grave-clothes still retained the general outline of the human form (p. 50). If this interpretation be correct, the suggestion of the careful observer (θεωρεῖ, Jn 20^{6}) would be that the Body had somehow passed out of the grave-clothes, rather than that it had been removed by human hands for burial elsewhere. In any case, the position of the clothes is noted by the Evangelist as significant.

In this connexion the significance of the incident recorded in Mt 28^{11-15} is to be noted—the attempt of the Jewish authorities to bribe the guard to misrepresent the facts and say that the disciples removed the body—a saying which is 'commonly reported among the Jews until this day.' This fraudulent transaction proceeds upon the admission by the enemies of Christianity that the grave was empty—an admission which is enough to show that the evidence for the empty grave was 'too notorious to be denied' (*Cambridge Theological Essays*, ed. H. B. Swete, London, 1905, p. 336).

The whole story of the guard at the tomb, which is narrated only by Matthew (27^{62-66}) has been called in question. But the action of the authorities in setting a watch at the tomb is altogether credible. Had not Jesus spoken repeatedly of His being put to death and rising again the third day (Mt 16^{21} $17^{22f.}$ $20^{16.19}$ and ‖s)? And may not such words have come to the ears of His enemies? Had not indeed His mysterious words about the building of the Temple in three days been quoted against Him before the chief priests and Pharisees (Mk 14^{58}; cf. Jn 2^{18-22})? And with such in their minds, was not the fact that the body of Jesus had been committed to His friends for burial enough to create the fear that His disciples might remove it and afterwards pretend that He had risen? To meet this apprehension, a watch was obtained, and to make security doubly sure, the tomb was sealed with the official seal.

Nothing, indeed, in the Resurrection-story of the narratives is more strongly attested than the fact of the empty tomb on the third day after the Crucifixion. It is not only attested by the women, and subsequently by Peter and John—'interested parties'—but also acknowledged by foes. This is the fundamental fact at the basis of the apostolic belief in the Resurrection on the third day. It is not uncommon among negative critics to represent the case as if the belief were a deduction or inference from certain prophetic references, a belief resting 'on theological rather than historical grounds' (Lake, *Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, p. 264). Strauss set the way in his endeavour to show how the belief might have originated from OT hints (*New Life of Jesus*, i. 438 f.). O. Holtzmann (*Life of Jesus*, Eng. tr., London, 1904, p. 336) lays much stress on Hos 6^{2}: 'After two days will he revive us: on the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live before him.' Schmiedel (*EBi* iv. 4067) appeals to 2 K 20^{5} as a text that has 'special relevance' in this connexion. Others combine with these OT hints the predictions of Jesus Himself (*e.g.* Meyer, *Die Auferstehung Christi*, p. 181 f.), while more recently others trace the belief primarily to a 'Messianic dogmatic,' a pre-Christian sketch of a dying and rising Messiah which found its way into Jewish writings from Oriental sources, chiefly Babylonian (see, *e.g.*, Lake, pp. 197 f., 261; Cheyne, *Bible Problems*, p. 110 ff.). The OT hints and pre-Christian Messianic belief alone or combined with the predictions of Jesus, it is represented, naturally took shape in the belief in the Resurrection on the third day, or were the predisposing cause for this belief. The belief created the Resurrection rather than the Resurrection the belief. But what are the facts? The Gospels tell us unmistakably that the disciples had no anticipation whatever of the resurrection of their crucified Master. For all that, Jesus did predict His resurrection on the third day and represent this as foreshadowed in the Scriptures (Mt 16^{21} $17^{22f.}$ $20^{16.19}$, Mk 8^{31} 9^{31} 10^{33}, Lk 9^{22} 18^{31} $24^{6.7}$; cf. Lk 24^{46}). The astonishment of the disciples at the empty tomb is explained by the reflexion that 'as yet they knew not the scripture, that he must rise again from the dead' (Jn 20^{9}). So far from the victory of the Messiah over death through a resurrection being part of the current Jewish Messianic belief, the very idea of a suffering and dying Messiah was 'to His disciples an inconceivable and enigmatical representation' (Holsten, *op. cit.* p. 98; cf. Mt 16^{21} 17^{23}). 'Suffering and death for the actual possessor of the Messianic dignity are in fact unimaginable, according to the testimony of the prophets' (Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, Eng. tr., Edinburgh, 1902, p. 265). Ps 16^{10} is the only passage which the NT writers quote as prophetic of the Resurrection, but it is clear that its Christian interpretation was by no means obvious *before* the event. The proof from Scripture prophecy of the Resurrection on the third day was thus an interpretation or confirmation *after* the event, and, under the influence of Jesus' post-Resurrection teaching, an 'afterthought,' as Lake himself admits (p. 30). It is not the prophecies which suggest the fact, but the fact which extracts and explains the prophecies. The attempt to trace the belief in the event 'on the third day' ultimately to Oriental sources will be more fully considered below (V. ii. 2). But meantime the fact is to be emphasized that no detail is better attested in connexion with the Resurrection than the discovery of the empty tomb on the third day, and any criticism which ignores this cannot justly lay claim to be 'scientific.'

It has often been pointed out that in the Gospels none of the witnesses claims to have seen our Lord leave the tomb. Of the Resurrection itself there was no eye-witness. This is sometimes adduced in disparagement of the Gospel evidence. But this very silence of the narratives is a significant corroboration of their historical trustworthiness. If the accounts of the events at the empty grave were as legendary as some recent criticism would represent, the silence is almost inexplicable. 'A faith that was capable of creating, with absolutely no basis in fact, so circumstantial an account of the emptiness of the Tomb, would assuredly not have left without a witness the one moment on which the significance of its whole creation seems to depend' (*Cambridge Theol. Essays*, p. 332). A comparison with the account given in the apocryphal *Gospel of Peter* brings into clear relief the self-restraint of the canonical Gospels (cf. Orr, *Resurrection of Jesus*, p. 260 f.).

(*b*) *The post-Resurrection appearances.*—Though the empty grave on the third day is thus adequately attested, this, according to the evidence, was not in and by itself the cause of the disciples' belief in the Resurrection. According to the Evangelists, it was not simply the fact of the empty tomb, not even this supplemented by the angelic proclamation that the Lord had risen, which produced in the disciples the conviction that their crucified Master was indeed risen from the dead. The women returned, as they were bidden, to tell the disciples what they had seen and heard at the empty grave, but 'this story of the women seemed in their opinion to be nonsense (λῆρος); they would not believe them' (Lk 24^{11} [Moffatt]; cf. Mk $16^{11.13.14}$, Jn 20^{25}, οὐ μὴ πιστεύσω. For a whole week Thomas refused to believe). Peter and John go to the grave and find the condition of things as the women had said. They stoop down and enter in and find the grave-clothes lying where the body had rested, with the head-cloth folded up by itself, instead of lying beside the other bandages, and they return home ‘wondering what had happened’ (Lk 24^{12} [Moffatt]), perplexed and unable to explain what they saw. John indeed, writing many years after, says of himself that he ‘saw and believed’ (Jn 20^{8}, *εἶδε καὶ ἐπίστευσεν*). The meaning of these words is doubtful. It has been suggested that, from the manner in which the grave-clothes lay folded, John was led not merely to believe in the emptiness of the grave, but to the idea of resurrection. So, *e.g.*, Cyril of Alexandria: ‘Ex involutis linteaminibus resurrectionem colligunt,’ as the Latin version renders it (Migne, *PG* lxxiv. 683, quoted by W. J. S. Simpson in *DCG* ii. 507^{a}); cf. Latham, *Risen Master*, and Dods, *EGT*, *in loc.* But if such was the case, it does not appear that he said anything to the others on the subject. On the other hand, to say that he ‘believed’ here means simply ‘became convinced’ that the grave was empty and the body removed may be saying too little. Probably it is nearest the truth to say with Swete: ‘There arose in his [John’s] mind at that moment a nascent confidence that in some way as yet unknown their darkness would be turned to light, and the victory of the Christ be secured. For the present, however, the mystery remained unsolved; they seemed to have exhausted their means of getting at the truth, and both men went home again’ (*Appearances*, p. 6). Even as regards the women themselves, the chief impression we receive of their mental condition from the narratives is that of terrorized amazement. The dazzling vision and the voice from the grave filled them with dismay. They fled from the sepulchre, and on their way back to the city they spoke not a word, so great was their terror. ‘They were seized with terror and beside themselves’ (Mk 16^{8} [Moffatt]). Not the empty grave, therefore, and not the angelic report merely, but these followed by and in essential connexion with the subsequent self-revelation of the risen living Lord in the shape of manifestations or appearings of Himself to them (or what were taken to be such), were what, according to the narratives, gave rise to the apostles’ belief in the Resurrection.

The list of the appearances given in the various narratives is as follows:

(1) *Mark’s* account (in the genuine portion) records none. But the abrupt way in which the narrative breaks off in the middle of a sentence at 16^{8} (‘for they were afraid of . . .’ [Moffatt]) points to the fact that the writer meant to add some account of the meeting of the Risen Lord with the disciples in Galilee referred to in v.^{7}. The probability is that such was added and that it is lost. There is good reason for believing that Matthew has worked up into his last chapter much of the matter contained in the lost ending of Mark, adding certain incidents for which he relied upon his own resources (see Chase’s art. ‘The Lord’s Command to Baptize’ in *JThSt* vi. [1904–05] 481 ff.). The Mk. App. (16$^{9-20}$) records appearances to Mary Magdalene (v.^{9}), to two disciples on the way to Emmaus (v.^{12}), and to the Eleven at meat (v.^{14}).

(2) *Matthew* records two appearances—the first to the women in or near Jerusalem on the morning of the Resurrection (28$^{9f.}$), and then to the Eleven in Galilee on a mountain ‘where Jesus had appointed them’ (vv.$^{16-20}$), the meeting referred to in forecast in Mark.

(3) *Luke* records three: to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus (24$^{13-32}$), to the ‘eleven . . . and them that were with them’ in Jerusalem (v.$^{36ff.}$), and to Peter, this preceding the last and being indirectly stated (v.^{34}; cf. 1 Co 15^{5}). Luke also refers (v.$^{50f.}$) to a meeting on the day of Ascension at Bethany (more fully reported in Ac 1$^{4-12}$).

(4) *John*, writing with knowledge of the other Gospels and filling up from his reminiscences what the others had left untold, records four: the appearance to Mary Magdalene in the garden (20$^{14-17}$); an appearance to the disciples (without Thomas) the same evening in Jerusalem (vv.$^{19-25}$); another appearance a week later to the disciples (with Thomas) in Jerusalem (vv.$^{26-28}$); and lastly, an appearance to seven disciples some time later at the Sea of Tiberias (21$^{1-14}$).

(5) *Extra-canonical Gospels.*—The *Gospel acc. to the Hebrews* tells of an appearance to James, and the *Gospel of Peter* seems on the point of narrating an incident not unlike the appearance to the seven at the Sea of Tiberias when the fragment ends abruptly. Both narratives, however, are distinctly secondary in character and add nothing of a trustworthy nature to the canonical accounts.

It is against the accounts of the appearances in the Gospels that the argument from discrepancies has most force. It has to be frankly admitted that the records present many difficulties in the way of constructing a coherent harmonized account. ‘Whichever way we turn, difficulties meet us, which the documents to which we have access do not enable us to remove’ (Sanday, *Outlines of Life of Christ*, p. 180). These difficulties concern in the main two points: (i.) the sequence or time order of the appearances, and (ii.) their place or locality.

(i.) *The sequence or time order of the appearances.*—None of the Gospels presents us with an ordered statement of the whole facts. St. Paul’s list in 1 Co 15 is no doubt given in chronological order, but it does not profess to be complete, and leaves room for other appearances to be added. By the time the Gospel accounts were written, however, it may have been too late to find out with any precision how this or that additional appearing preserved in tradition was related in time to the others. In particular the relation of the appearance to Mary Magdalene (recorded by Jn. and Mk. App.) to the appearance to the women recorded in Mt 28$^{9-10}$ is left by the narratives in uncertainty—an uncertainty connected with the seeming confusion in the First and Third Gospels, between Mary’s return to Jerusalem and the return of the other women. Again, Luke gives the impression that all the appearances took place on the day of the Resurrection, and that the Ascension itself took place on the evening of that day. But this is contrary to what we find in the other Gospel accounts, where the appearances are represented as extending over a considerable time. And it is contrary to Luke’s own account in Ac 1, where he interposes ‘forty days’ between the Resurrection and the Ascension, and assumes the appearances of Christ to be spread over the whole period (cf. Ac 13^{31}, ‘many days’). The latter ‘contradiction’ is made much of by Strauss and Keim, and, more recently, by Weizsäcker and Meyer. The explanation is to be found, however, in Luke’s highly compressed or condensed style of narrative in the closing chapter of his Gospel (cf. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, London, 1895, p. 17, ‘compressed to the highest degree’). Chase maintains that there are good grounds for thinking that the opening section of the Acts was already composed before the closing section of the Gospel (*Gospels*, p. 46), and Denney says that in all probability it was produced continuously with it (*Jesus and the Gospel*, p. 142). Having in view from the beginning to write a sequel to his Gospel, giving a more detailed account of the events leading up to the Ascension, the Evangelist ‘fore-shortens’ and compresses the narrative in the Gospel, treating two or three distinct occasions as if they were continuous, knowing that facts well known in the Church would render impossible the supposition that all the events recorded took place in a single day.

(ii.) *The scene or locality of the appearances.*—More serious is the difficulty which confronts us here. St. Paul in 1 Co 15 makes no mention of locality, but the Gospel accounts are divided between Galilee and Jerusalem. Matthew and probably Mark (original conclusion) lay the stress upon Galilee. In Mark indeed (in the genuine portion) no record is given of any appearances, but the women are bidden by the angel at the tomb to say that the Risen Lord would meet the disciples in Galilee (16^{7}). The same message of the angel is given even more emphatically in Mt 28^{7}—'Go quickly and tell'—and (unless vv.$^{9-10}$ represent, as P. Rohrbach maintains [see A. B. Bruce, *EGT*, *in loc.*], the same fact in another form) repeated by Jesus Himself when He appears to these women on their way to execute the charge of the angel (28^{10}). A promise to the same effect had already been given by Jesus to His disciples before they left the upper room for the Garden of Gethsemane, and is recorded by both Matthew and Mark (Mt 26^{32}, Mk 14^{28}).

In accordance with this message and promise is the programme of appearances given in the First Gospel. The eleven disciples departed into Galilee (28^{16}), and there saw Jesus, and there also received the great commission, Go and make disciples of all nations. No record is given of any appearance of Jesus to the apostles in or near Jerusalem. And it is probable that the original conclusion of Mark carried out the same programme. Luke and John, however, confine their account to appearances in Jerusalem and neighbourhood. Luke, who records (in ch. 24) the appearances to the two on the way to Emmaus, to Peter, and to the Eleven, all in or near Jerusalem, ends his account with a command of Jesus to the disciples to remain in Jerusalem until they were 'clothed with power from on high' (v.^{49}). But this appears definitely to exclude any departure into Galilee, and the possibility of an appearance there. In line with this is the different representation of the angelic message given in Luke from that in Matthew and Mark. The Marcan version, 'He goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him, as he said unto you' (16^{7}), becomes in Luke, 'Remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee, saying,' etc. ($24^{6f.}$). That is to say, the message as given by Luke becomes not a direction to go into Galilee, but a reminder that Christ spoke to them about His resurrection when He was yet with them in Galilee. In like manner, all the appearances mentioned in the Fourth Gospel except that in the Appendix (ch. 21) are placed in Jerusalem, and the author indicates that the disciples remained at least a week in Jerusalem after the Resurrection (20^{26}).

What are we to make of this discrepancy? Are these two versions or traditions to be regarded as contradictory and 'irreconcilable' alternatives, only one of which can be received, the other being ruled out as unhistorical? This is how, *e.g.*, Strauss and Weizsäcker represent the case (*New Life of Jesus*, i. 435, and *Apost. Age*^{2}, i. 2 f.). If so, the question is, Which is the more trustworthy? The usual course among critics has been to prefer the tradition in Matthew and Mark as the more primary, and to confine the appearances to Galilee. The appearances to the apostles at Jerusalem were, it is represented, unknown to Matthew and Mark, and form a later addition to the earliest version of the Resurrection-story which spoke only of Galilee.

This Galilæan theory, which we shall go on to discuss, is generally maintained in connexion with a naturalistic visionary theory of the Resurrection. The advantage of it for this purpose is obvious. By separating the appearances from the events of the third day and transferring them to Galilee, it gives more time for visions to develop amid scenes coloured by memory and imagination. As Strauss puts it, 'If the transference of the appearances to Galilee dis-engages us from the third day as the period of the commencement of them, the longer time thus gained makes the reaction in the minds of the disciples more conceivable' (*New Life*, i. 437). Support for this Galilæan theory has been sought in the extra-canonical *Gospel of Peter*, where in xiv. 58–60 the disciples are represented as returning to Galilee in sorrow and therefore without knowledge of the Resurrection. The difficulties of this theory have been forcibly pointed out by F. Loofs (*Die Auferstehungsberichte und ihr Wert*, Leipzig, 1898, pp. 18–25), who shows that it requires an impossible misrepresentation of the facts. To place the first appearance of our Lord in Galilee, it is of course necessary to transfer the apostles from Jerusalem. But this has no historical basis whatever. The words, 'they [the disciples] all forsook him and fled' (Mk 14^{50}), the upholders of this theory interpret as referring to a flight not from the Garden of Gethsemane, but direct home to Galilee.

This interpretation, however, is refuted by the facts recorded. It is, as J. Weiss calls it, 'a scientific legend.' The oldest tradition expressly mentions that on the very night of the flight Peter was found in the high priest's palace (Mk 14^{54}; cf. Mt 26^{5-8}) and there thrice denied his Lord. The message sent to the disciples through the women on Easter Day, according to the earliest Evangelist, was this, 'He goeth *before* you into Galilee,' implying, as Loofs points out (p. 19), that the disciples were still waiting in Jerusalem. And so John, who predicts the 'scattering' (16^{32}), yet gives detailed accounts of the meetings in Jerusalem. If Mt 28^{9-10} is accepted as genuine, the fact that the Evangelist records the appearance to the women in Jerusalem, in which the previous direction of the angels to the disciples to go into Galilee is received from Jesus' own lips, shows that the appointed meeting in Galilee was not held to exclude earlier appearances.

Further (see Chase, *Gospels*, p. 45), to argue that the silence of Matthew (probably following his source Mark) as to any appearance to the apostles in Jerusalem, means ignorance of the fact, and that, therefore, the appearances in or near Jerusalem are to be looked upon as a later addition to the earliest form of the Resurrection-story, which spoke only of Galilee, proves too much. Even as regards Galilee, Matthew mentions only one appearance to the apostles. Are we, therefore, to conclude that he and his 'source' were unaware of any other appearance? We know from St. Paul that a list of appearances was handed down in the Apostolic Church from the earliest times, and that this formed part of the catechetical instruction given in the churches. The facts about the appearances, therefore, would be familiar to his readers, and just here may be found the sufficient explanation of their silence. The Evangelists felt at liberty to make a selection of the facts, each from his own point of view.

If the theory which would confine all the appearances to Galilee is thus unsuccessful in accounting for the facts, is Loofs any more successful in transferring all the appearances to Jerusalem, as he does in arguing in favour of the tradition represented by Luke and John? To carry out his theory, Loofs is obliged to separate Jn 21 from the rest of the Gospel, treating it as having little or no connexion with it, and finding in it a combination of two incidents, one of which (the fishing scene of vv.$^{1-14}$) has been misplaced (Lk 5^{1-11}), while the other (the dialogue of vv.$^{15-23}$) was originally unconnected with Galilee. On this Sanday says: 'These are strong measures, which, however high our estimate of the tradition, Lk–Jn, are obviously not open to one who thinks that the identity of style between Jn 21 and the rest of the Gospel is too great to permit of their separation' (*HDB* ii. 640^b).

The attempt to treat the narratives as alternatives and to confine the appearances either to Galilee or to Jerusalem being thus unsatisfactory, we seem compelled to combine the traditions much as they are combined in the Fourth Gospel (with App.) and in the App. to Mark, and to recognize appearances both in Jerusalem and in Galilee. If Mt 28^{9-10} is to be treated as a later addition, the purpose of the insertion apparently, as Rohrbach suggests, was to cancel the impression otherwise produced that Jesus was seen only in Galilee. This is supported by St. Paul's list of appearances in 1 Co 15, which, though it makes no mention of place, 'suggests Galilee for the scene of the appearance to the 500 hardly less clearly than it suggests Jerusalem for the appearance to Peter and the Eleven.'

We cannot, indeed, fit the narratives into each other so as to leave no difficulties or contradictions unsolved. As regards the details of the different traditions it would seem that from the first there was a certain amount of confusion which was never wholly cleared up. But these difficulties with regard to details are discounted as serious objections when we remember—a fundamental consideration in this connexion—the aim of the Evangelists in the Gospels. 'The narratives constitute not primarily a history, but a Gospel of the Resurrection' (Westcott). They were written not to create belief in the resurrection of Jesus in the minds of men to whom the fact was unfamiliar, but to inform more fully those who had already received the general tradition of the Church, and to show the significance of the fact, both for Him and for them. 'Believing in the resurrection themselves, and writing for those who believed in it, they [the writers] aimed at giving such an account of it as should bring out its permanent significance for the Church' (Denney, *Jesus and the Gospel*, p. 153). With this in view each writer selects the facts which he considers most appropriate to his object. He is so far indifferent to their connexion with other facts which he is not concerned to relate. He may pass over a great part of the evidence, or he may mass it together in a generalized statement; and, while he will not consciously depart from historical truthfulness, he will yet so handle his materials that, in order to estimate them aright, we must keep distinctly before us his special aim.

The different interests or points of view of the Evangelists will determine the perspective in which the facts are viewed, and the different aspects of the facts emphasized. Matthew, *e.g.*, is occupied throughout his Gospel with the Galilæan ministry of Jesus as that in which he beheld the fulfilment of Jewish prophecy. So in his account of the appearances he concentrates on the meeting in Galilee with its great commission, 'Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations.' To this as his objective he hastens on without pausing on intermediate events. While Matthew concentrates on the meeting in Galilee, Luke is chiefly interested in the appearances in Jerusalem on the Resurrection day as leading up to the promise of the Spirit and the Ascension at Bethany, and ignores the appearances in Galilee. 'We do the Evangelists injustice,' therefore, 'when we regard them as witnesses in a court of law, who have been appointed to prove a fact, and who have deliberately taken it in hand to do so' (W. Milligan, *The Resurrection of our Lord*, p. 57). Not that the narratives are not evidence, but they are not put forward as presenting the complete evidence. There is not the least ground for supposing that the Evangelists told us all they knew, nor yet the least necessity that they should have done so. They recorded what was sufficient for their purpose. To bring out the meaning or significance of the appearances to the disciples, they may have condensed into a single representative or typical scene what they knew to be different appearances.

Thus we find that even so conservative a critic as Denney counts it 'not in the least improbable . . . that in the great appearing of Jesus to the eleven recorded in all the gospels (Mt 28^{16-20}, Mk 16^{14-18}, Lk 24^{36-49}, Jn 20^{19-23}) we have not the literal record of what took place on a single occasion, but the condensation into a representative scene of all that the appearances of Jesus to His disciples meant. . . . And if Jesus nevertheless had in point of fact appeared in different places, we can understand how one evangelist should put this typical scene in Galilee and another in Jerusalem. When we see what is being done we should rather say that both are right than that either is wrong' (*Jesus and the Gospel*, p. 155 f.). The main thing in all the narratives is not the details of time or place or circumstances—in regard to these a certain confusion may remain through unassimilated and unharmonized traditions—but the fact of the appearing of the Risen Christ to His disciples, together with the significance of the fact. And to establish this, to justify and sustain the faith that Jesus is risen from the dead, the narratives, though fragmentary and in no case presenting an orderly statement of the whole facts, supply sufficient evidence. So that Sanday, while recognizing to the full the difficulties in the narratives, yet maintains that 'no difficulty of weaving the separate incidents into an orderly well-compacted narrative can impugn the unanimous belief of the Church which lies behind them, that the Lord Jesus Christ rose from the dead on the third day and appeared to the disciples' (art. 'Jesus Christ' in *HDB* ii. 641^a).

This enables us also to answer the other objection brought against the apostolic narratives—that the appearances recorded were only to the circle of His disciples, to 'interested parties,' and, therefore, that the evidence presented is not of a kind to satisfy the demands of scientific historical inquiry. This objection, urged, as we have seen above, by Strauss and Renan, is one which occurs already in Celsus' criticism of Christianity written about the end of the 2nd century. 'After these points,' says Origen, taking up Celsus' objections one by one, 'Celsus proceeds to bring against the Gospel narratives a charge which is not to be lightly passed over, viz. that if Jesus desired to convince men that He was really divine He ought to have appeared to those who had ill-treated Him, and to him who had condemned Him, and to men generally (ὅλως πᾶσιν)' (*c. Cels.* ii. 63). The fact to which this criticism refers is, it should be noted, explicitly acknowledged by the apostles. 'Him,' says Peter, 'God raised on the third day, and allowed him to be seen not by all the People but by witnesses whom God had previously selected, by us who ate and drank with him after his resurrection from the dead' (Ac $10^{40f.}$ [Moffatt]).

The evidence was designed not to satisfy 'scientific experts,' but to evoke and support belief in the Resurrection on the part of those 'whom God had previously selected' that they might be 'witnesses' to others. If the fact to be testified to were the manner of the Resurrection and the exact sequence of the physical changes that accompanied it, supposing this capable of description in scientific terms, then, no doubt, the disciples were not qualified witnesses. They were born 1900 years too soon for this. But 'if the essential truth to be conveyed was the personal identity of Him who died and was buried with Him who was raised and appeared, what evidence is to be compared with that of intimate personal friends?' (*Cambridge Theol. Essays*, p. 323). To impugn their witness as not impartial is to forget what the narratives uniformly testify, that so far from being predisposed to believe in the fact, their predisposition was all the other way.

There are two other considerations which may be brought forward in support of the restriction of the appearances of the Risen Christ to His disciples. (i.) This limitation or restriction is in keeping with Christ's manifestations during His earthly life. To appear to outsiders, to His opponents or enemies or men generally, in order to convince them of His resurrection and thus turn them to belief in Him, would have been contrary to the principle whereby He consistently refused to present miraculous proofs in order to force unwilling belief. When on one occasion the Pharisees asked Him to give them a sign which should remove their unbelief, we read that 'He sighed deeply in his spirit, and said, Why doth this generation seek a sign? verily I say unto you, There shall no sign be given unto this generation' (Mk 8^{12}). Faith induced by such signs was not of the proper quality (cf. Lk 16^{31}). This is not the kind of evidence that convinces. True faith is morally and spiritually conditioned. The principle which governed the action of Jesus on earth in His manifestation of Himself still determined the action of the Risen Christ. 'Why is it that you are to appear to us and not to the world? . . . If any one loves me . . . we will come to him' (Jn $14^{22f.}$). (ii.) Especially is this the case when we remember that the purpose of the appearances was not merely to convince of identity but to reveal a new order of life. If the Resurrection were simply a return to life under normal conditions, the mere survival of death, the objection urged might have more weight. Outsiders, 'men generally,' can tell whether a man who is dead at one moment has returned the next to a normal human life. But the resurrection of Jesus was a rising to life under new and more spiritual conditions, the revelation of a new kind of life, and because of this it could appeal only to those who were capable of receiving such truth. Such a revelation could be received, its significance could be appreciated, only by those of spiritual receptiveness, who had the faculties to discern the possibilities of a new life in Him. Only they were competent witnesses.

Here we are in a realm where the scientific expert is not the expert in the case. There are those who go the length of maintaining that the Resurrection-Body of Jesus was in its very nature such as required a spiritual susceptibility to discern, making it impossible for the outward senses alone to recognize its existence. Westcott, *e.g.*, says, 'If it [the Resurrection] was a foreshadowing of new powers of human action, of a new mode of human being, then without a corresponding power of spiritual discernment there could be no testimony to its truth. The world could not see Christ, and Christ could not—there is a Divine impossibility—shew Himself to the world' (*Revelation of the Risen Lord*, p. 11; cf. *The Gospel of the Resurrection*, p. 162 f., 'Human sense alone was not capable of discerning Who He was'). But even if such a manifestation could have been made it would have been valueless for the purpose in view in the manifestations. 'Even if the world could have visibly recognised the identity of the risen with the earthly Jesus, yet it could have had no perception of what His risen life meant, seeing that the transformation in Him, which was quite as real and essential as the identity, required spiritual receptivity for the discernment of its significance' (Forrest, *The Christ of History and of Experience*^{7}, p. 156 n.).

LITERATURE.—**B. F. Westcott**, *Gospel of the Resurrection*^{6}, London, 1888, ch. i., *Revelation of the Risen Lord*^{2}, do., 1882; **W. Milligan**, *Resurrection of our Lord*, do., 1881, lect. ii.; **W. Sanday**, *Outlines of the Life of Christ*^{2}, Edinburgh, 1906, art. 'Jesus Christ,' *HDB* ii. 638–642; **R. J. Knowling**, *Witness of the Epistles*, London, 1892, *Testimony of St. Paul to Christ*, do., 1905; **A. C. McGiffert**, *A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, Edinburgh, 1897, pp. 39–44, 55 f.; **F. Loofs**, *Die Auferstehungsberichte und ihr Wert*, Leipzig, 1898; **E. von Dobschütz**, *Ostern und Pfingsten*, do., 1903; **P. W. Schmiedel**, 'Resurrection- and Ascension-Narratives' in *EBi* iv. 4039–4087, 'The Evidence for the Resurrection of Christ' in *CQR* lxi. [1906] 323 ff.; **K. Lake**, *The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, London, 1907; **H. B. Swete**, *The Appearances of our Lord after the Passion*, do., 1907; **J. Denney**, *Jesus and the Gospel*, do., 1908, pp. 107–159; **J. M. Thompson**, *Miracles in the New Testament*, do., 1911, pp. 161–205; **F. H. Chase**, *The Gospels in the Light of Historical Criticism*, do., 1914, p. 39 ff.; **T. J. Thorburn**, *The Resurrection Narratives and Modern Criticism*, do., 1910 (a criticism of Schmiedel's art. in *EBi*); **W. P. Armstrong**, 'The Place of the Resurrection Appearances of Jesus' in *Biblical and Theological Studies* (Princeton), New York, 1912, p. 307 ff.; **W. J. Sparrow Simpson**, *The Resurrection and Modern Thought*, London, 1911, bks. i. and ii.; **R. H. Hutton**, *Theological Essays*^{4}, do., 1895, Essay vi. 'Christian Evidences, Popular and Critical,' and Essay viii. 'The Incarnation and Principles of Evidence.'

III. *THE APOSTOLIC WITNESS TO THE NATURE OF CHRIST'S RESURRECTION-BODY.*—That the grave was found empty on the third day, that on the same day He appeared to His disciples, and that these appearances, succeeding upon the empty grave, had already given rise on the third day to a belief in the Resurrection, are facts historically well attested by the Gospel narratives and corroborated by St. Paul's account. But there is more than this. The appearances of the Risen Christ were, according to the apostolic witness, not mere appearances and nothing more; they were in the nature of interviews, sometimes for a considerable length of time, between Him and His disciples. 'There is no such thing in the New Testament as an appearance of the Risen Saviour in which He merely appears. He is always represented as entering into relation to those who see Him in other ways than by a flash upon the inner or the outer eye: He establishes other communications between Himself and His own than that which can be characterised in this way' (Denney, *Death of Christ*, London, 1902, p. 67). And the apostolic narratives bear witness to a certain view of the nature or mode of existence of the Risen Christ.

i. THE WITNESS OF THE EVANGELISTS.—In the picture given in the Gospel narratives we have a noteworthy combination of seemingly opposite qualities in the Risen Christ's mode of existence.

(*a*) On the one hand, Christ seemed to have resumed the form of bodily existence maintained while on earth. His mode of existence was not phantasmal or apparitional like a ghost, but embodied. He appeared in a body possessing attributes and functions which attested its physical reality and identity (or continuity) with the former earthly body.

(1) He could be seen, touched, handled, as a purely spiritual existence could not (Lk $24^{39f.}$, Jn 20^{20}). Indeed we are told that He offered Himself to their touch and handling to convince the disciples of His bodily existence: 'Feel me and see; a ghost has not flesh and bones as you see I have' (Lk 24^{39} [Moffatt]; cf. Jn 20^{20}). Or, as another report has it, coming either from the

Gospel according to the Hebrews or from the *Doctrine of Peter*: 'Take handle me and see that I am not a bodiless spirit' (Ignatius, *Smyrn.* 3, *λάβετε, ψηφαλήσατέ με, καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον*). On 'flesh and bones' Westcott says: 'The significant variation from the common formula "flesh and blood" must have been at once intelligible to Jews, accustomed to the provisions of the Mosaic ritual, and nothing would have impressed upon them more forcibly the transfiguration of Christ's Body than the verbal omission of the element of blood which was for them the symbol and seat of corruptible life' (*Gospel of the Resurrection*, p. 162 n.). We are not told that the disciples availed themselves of the test at Jesus' invitation. But in Mt 28^{9} we read, 'They [the women] took hold of his feet and worshipped him.' If the disciples did not actually touch Him it was, it would seem, because 'they were so convinced, by sight, of His reality, that they abstained out of reverence from subjecting Him to the further test' (Forrest, *The Christ of Hist. and of Exper.*^{7}, p. 148 n.).

The body was apparently capable also of partaking of food, for we are told that as they were still incredulous and 'wondered,' He took a piece of a broiled fish which remained from the evening meal and ate before them (Lk 24^{41-43}; the words 'and of a honeycomb' are omitted by the best MSS). This touch in the incident, which is mentioned only by Luke, has been called in question by Loofs and others as 'secondary' and 'representing the more realistic shape which the legend of the Resurrection ultimately took.' Even Denney shares this doubt: 'There does seem something which is not only incongruous but repellent in the idea of the Risen Lord eating,' and he finds in it one illustration of Luke's 'tendency to materialise the spiritual' (*Jesus and the Gospel*, p. 146). In support of this it has been noted that in the case of the meal with the two disciples at Emmaus (Lk 24^{30}), and in the later scene of the seven beside the Lake recorded in Jn 21^{4-13}, it is not said in either case that Jesus Himself partook of the bread which He distributed to others with His own hand. If we retain this touch, we must say with Clement of Alexandria, 'He did not eat for the sake of His body, but for their sakes with whom He conversed,' to convince them that they were not seeing a ghost. 'If there be resurrection of the body, there is no reason why such a body should not have the power of taking food without depending on it' (E. R. Bernard, *HDB* iv. 234^{a}). But even if we eliminate this detail in the picture, which admittedly is the least certain element in it, the picture in its essentials is not appreciably altered. The Risen Christ's mode of existence was such that human eyes could see and human hands could touch and feel Him.

(2) Further, the body in which He appeared was a body identical (or continuous) with the body which He had on earth, and which had suffered on the Cross and been laid in the tomb. Apart from the fact that the grave in which the body of Jesus had been laid on the Friday evening was found empty on the morning of the third day, identity (or continuity) was evidenced by the fact that the Risen Body bore the marks of the Passion, the print of the nails in the hands, and the spear-mark in the side (Lk $24^{39f.}$, Jn 20^{27}).

Lk 24^{40}, *καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας*, is called in question as omitted in some authorities, but Jn 20^{20}, where probably the same appearance is described though there is a seeming discrepancy in the number of disciples present, is undoubted. See Plummer, *ICC*, 'St. Luke'^{2}, Edinburgh, 1898, *in loc.*

The identity, it would seem, extended still further. Mary recognized Him by the familiar tone of the voice (Jn 20^{16}) and the two disciples by the familiar gesture in the breaking of bread (Lk 24^{31}).

(*b*) On the other hand, the body if the same was yet somehow not the same. It had undergone some marvellous change. If there was identity, there was yet contrast. The Risen Body had mysterious peculiarities which distinguished it from the natural earthly body. Indeed, so prominent were these distinguishing peculiarities that the Risen Lord is uniformly represented in the narratives as with difficulty persuading the disciples of the identity of the two. Chief of these peculiarities are—

(1) *The transcendence of the ordinary laws of material or physical existence.*—Matter was no longer an obstacle. The Risen Christ could pass through a closed sepulchre (apparently implied by Mt 28^{2}) and through shut doors (Lk 24^{36}, Jn 20^{19-26}). Distance could not delay His movements; He could be present in different and distant places at short intervals (Lk $24^{15.\ 34}$). Suddenly He appears without apparent physical locomotion (Lk 24^{36}, Jn $20^{19.\ 26}$, 'Jesus stood [*ἔστη*] in the midst'). As suddenly He disappears (Lk 24^{31}, 'He vanished from their sight,' *ἄφαντος ἐγένετο ἀπ' αὐτῶν*—a disappearance, not a local withdrawal). Here apparently is an emerging from and a withdrawal into complete invisibility at will. And then, finally, as illustrating this transcendence of the ordinary laws of material existence, we are told He ascended from earth to heaven in visible form (Lk 24^{51}, Ac 1^{9}; cf. Mk 16^{19}).

The words *καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν* in Lk 24^{51} and all v.^{19} in Mk 16 are regarded as doubtful by textual criticism, and, even if they be accepted, it has been contended that they do not of themselves imply a visible ascent (see E. P. Gould in *ICC*, 'St. Mark,' Edinburgh, 1896, p. 309). But such a visible ascent is directly stated in Luke's second treatise, Ac $1^{9f.}$, and the subsequent joy of the disciples (Lk $24^{52f.}$) distinctly points to some such visible representation of His final triumph over death (cf. Forrest, *The Christ of Hist. and of Exper.*^{7}, p. 413).

(2) *Difficulty of recognition from mere outward appearances.*—So great was the change that, it would seem, the mere external form and features failed to disclose who He was, even to those with whom He had had familiar intercourse on earth. Mary Magdalene mistook Him for the gardener, until He called her by her name (Jn 20^{14-16}). The two men on the way to Emmaus not only walked but conversed with Him for a considerable length of time, yet did not know who He was till He was made known to them in the breaking of bread (Lk 24^{30-32}). When He stood in the midst of the assembled disciples He seemed so strange to them that they 'imagined it was a ghost they saw' and they were 'scared and terrified' till 'he showed them his hands and feet' (Lk 24^{37-40} [Moffatt]; cf. Jn 20^{20}, 'his hands and his side'). And again, at the Sea of Tiberias, when Jesus stood on the beach, the disciples (among whom were four apostles) failed to recognize Him (Jn 21^{4}).

This is the more striking when we consider (i.) that the appearances were not momentary glimpses, but, at least in several of the cases, prolonged interviews; and (ii.) that even when He appeared to the same people a second or third time they were still at first perplexed and had their doubts as to His identity. What was the cause of this non-recognition? It may be that the failure of Mary Magdalene to recognize Jesus at the beginning was due, as some maintain, to her eyes being dimmed with tears, and her mind bewildered and perplexed—this, combined with the dimness of the early morning light. It may be that the two disciples on the way to Emmaus failed to recognize Him because of mental preoccupation with their grief, and absorption in their puzzled discussion of the story told by the women. 'Their eyes were holden (*ἐκρατοῦντο*, overpowered, spellbound) that they should not know him (*τοῦ μὴ ἐπιγνῶναι αὐτόν*),' says Luke in explanation (24^{16}).

These words need not be taken to imply any special supernatural action on their senses on the part of the Risen Christ, '"who would not be seen by them till the time when He saw fit"' (see Plummer, *ICC*, *in loc.*). They may mean simply that they did not know Him; that, through some conditions on their side, they failed to recognize Him (cf. Moffatt's translation, 'they were prevented from recognizing him'). It has to be remembered that in this case neither of the two, so far as we know, belonged to the company of the apostles, and so they may never before have come into close quarters with the Master, so that their failure to recognize Him was not surprising (cf. Swete, *Appearances*, p. 23). Once more, in the incident at the Lake of Tiberias the words of the Evangelist, 'when early morn was now arrived, *or* arriving' (πρωίας δὲ ἤδη γενομένης, other MSS γινομένης), suggest that the disciples may have been hindered from recognizing Jesus on the shore by the dimness of the dawning morning light. These and such like conditions may have contributed to the effect. Their mental condition in particular has to be taken into account as an operating factor in the case. It is altogether probable that their surprise and bewilderment, combined with their hopeless grief, made them less capable of exact observation than in ordinary circumstances. Yet the narratives convey the impression that there was something more in the case than this; that some mysterious change had occurred in Jesus' outward appearance which at least assisted non-recognition and excited awe in the beholders (Lk 24^{37}); that some change in bodily appearance had taken place corresponding to the mysterious change already referred to in Christ's relation to ordinary physical laws.

'He appeared to them in another form' (ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ), says the Mk. App. of the manifestation to the two on the way to Emmaus. That the words mean only that to the two on the way to Emmaus He presented a different appearance from that to Mary Magdalene (possibly, as Alford suggests, through His dress being changed, giving the impression not now of a gardener or labourer at work, but rather of a traveller with his loins girt, shoes on feet, and staff in hand) is altogether improbable. The natural interpretation of the words is that He appeared in a different form from that He had on earth, that some change had come over Him so that He did not look the same as when He was with them before the Passion ('μορφή always signifies a form which truly and fully expresses the being which underlies it' [H. A. A. Kennedy, in *EGT*, London, 1903, on Ph 2^6]).

This is supported by the cumulative evidence of the narratives, the uniform testimony of which is that, while the same, some mysterious change had come over His whole mode of existence. It is a change which attaches to all that we read in the Gospels of the appearances of Jesus. It was not only, as we have seen, that His risen body was no longer subject to ordinary physical laws, but the manner of His intercourse with His disciples after His resurrection was altogether changed. His appearances were occasional. He appeared only when He willed to appear. There is a strange aloofness and reserve about His attitude to them. He is no longer their companion as He used to be; He speaks of the time 'when I was yet with you' (Lk 24^{44}). Though He invites them to feel Him and see that they may be thus convinced that He was no phantasm or apparition, but indeed the Risen Jesus, He forbids Mary Magdalene to 'keep clinging to him' (Jn 20^{17}, μή μου ἅπτου) so as to hold Him in possession. The prohibition of Jesus meant that the old earthly intercourse and relations with His disciples which Mary wished to resume could not be restored, that they were for ever past, and that their place was to be taken by a new and higher kind of fellowship, to be realized only when He had completed His earthly self-manifestation, and had 'ascended unto the Father' (Jn 20^{17}, οὔπω γὰρ ἀναβέβηκα). For the present He is, in His intercourse with them, hovering between the old and the new in a transitional condition, combining the seemingly opposite qualities of the material and spiritual, embodied in another form.

This combination of two opposite sets of characteristics in the appearances of the Risen Christ Weizsäcker (*Apost. Age*^{2}, i. 9–11) makes the basis of criticism of the credibility of the Gospel accounts. They represent, he says, two different layers of tradition. The appearances were in their earliest form purely spiritual or visional; but, as time went on, the craving for external and palpable signs, combined with popular realistic ideas of a carnal Resurrection, led to a gradual materializing of the visions, and an endowing of the visional with physical attributes, thus overlaying history with legend. So Harnack and others hold that the idea of a bodily Resurrection was a form subsequently imposed on a more primary spiritual belief in the Lord's continued life. This overlaying of the Gospel representations by popular realistic conceptions was a process which history shows speedily manifested itself in the early Church. But the combination of contrasted traits—the 'dual quality' or double aspect of His appearances—is of the very essence of the Gospel accounts throughout, present in what Weizsäcker terms the earlier layers of the tradition as really as in the later. And if the Resurrection be what it is uniformly represented in the narratives as being—not the simple reanimation of His mortal body which Harnack speaks of (*Hist. of Dogma*, i. 85 n.), a resuscitation and restoration to the former conditions of existence, but the entrance on a new order of life, then the combination in the Gospel accounts of the appearances of apparently inconsistent aspects, so far from casting doubt on these accounts, is a strong evidence of their historical trustworthiness.

For such a conception of the mode of existence of the Risen Christ the disciples had absolutely no precedent. On the contrary, it was to them, as the records show, a most novel and strange idea for which they were unprepared, and which with difficulty they were persuaded to receive. It was opposed to both Jewish and Greek ideas on the subject. The Resurrection as it actually took place 'would be quite foreign to Jewish ideas, which embraced the continuance of the soul after death and the final resurrection of the body, but not a state of spiritual corporeity, far less, under conditions such as those described in the Gospels' (Edersheim, *LT*^{4} ii. 624). About the current Jewish conception of the Resurrection-Body there was little that was spiritual. 'The future body, as to material and organisation, was conceived as essentially of the same quality as the present' (F. W. Weber, *Lehren des Talmud*, Leipzig, 1880, p. 353, quoted by Kennedy, *St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things*, p. 227). In *Apoc. Bar.* (*e.g.* l. 2) it is stated that the bodies of the dead shall be raised exactly as they were when committed to the ground. After this has been done for purposes of recognition by friends, a glorious change will take place: 'they shall be made like unto the angels, and be made equal to the stars, and they shall be changed into every form they desire from beauty into loveliness, and from light into the splendour of glory' (li. 10; cf. the more spiritual ideas prominent in *Enoch*, *e.g.* l. 4, civ. 4, 6, cviii. 11, etc.). The changed body is still, however, described largely in sensuous physical terms, while here, in the case of the Risen Christ, was a body so spiritualized that they thought it was a spirit. On the other hand, the Alexandrian Greek conception was that of emancipation from the body and continued existence as pure spirit. But, besides the fact that the tomb was empty, here was a body which could be not only seen but touched and felt, and presented evident marks of identity with the body of earth. 'Feel me and see, a spirit hath not flesh and bones.' The marvel of the records is the perfect simplicity, the perfect naturalness with which the two sets of characteristics are combined in the same narratives, 'as if those who put the facts together were conscious of no difficulty in the apparent contradiction' (Westcott, *Gospel of the Resurrection*, p. ix). If we take one series of events, the Resurrection might appear to have been a mere coming back to life; if we take another, it might appear to be purely spiritual or spiritualistic. But the records combine both, and thus differentiate the apostolic representation of the resurrection of Jesus from the two current conceptions—from the sensuous conception of it held by the Pharisees, and from the spiritualistic conception of the Alexandrian or Greek philosophers.

Such a representation had no precedent, and can be explained only by the new revelation conveyed to the disciples through the appearances and intercourse of the Risen Christ, as recorded for us in the narratives. Through these appearances and self-manifestations Christ sought to impress on His disciples, on the one hand, the identity of the Risen with the Crucified Jesus, and on the other, that His resurrection was not a mere restoration to life but a triumph of His whole personality over death and His entrance on a new and higher mode of existence. So Jesus offered Himself to the senses of the disciples, even to their touch and handling, if this were needed to convince them of His identity—even, it may be, to the eating of bread, if only so the feeling that He was a phantasm or apparition could be removed. But when this was attained, when doubt of His identity was removed and the disciples thought to resume the old familiar intercourse, He manifested the characteristics of a more spiritual form of existence, and they learned the truth, that the Resurrection was the entrance on a new order of life and a higher kind of fellowship. So the Ascension is represented in the Gospel narratives as the natural and necessary sequel of the Resurrection. The visible lifting from the earth marked the close of the visible intercourse and the beginning of the more spiritual for which the disciples were gradually prepared by the teaching of the forty days (Jn 20^{17}; cf. Lk 24^{49}, Ac 1^{8}, Jn 14–16) (see Denney, art. 'Ascension,' *HDB* i. 161). The contention (*e.g.* Newman Smyth, *Old Faiths in New Light*, London, n.d., p. 156 f.) that the body of Jesus during the forty days underwent a gradual process of spiritualization or glorification, a 'process of resurrection,' which was consummated in the Ascension does not seem to be supported by the narratives. On the very day of His resurrection the spirituality of His risen body was as manifest as in the case of the appearance by the Sea of Tiberias (cf. Lk $24^{31.\ 36}$, Jn $21^{4ff.}$; see Forrest, *Christ of Hist. and of Exper.*^{7}, p. 411 f.).

With the essential nature of the Resurrection-Body the Evangelists were not concerned. But from the temporary manifestations of the Risen Body during the forty days there were two things, either of which they might have thought it to be, which they came to know it was not. It was not simply the old earthly body resumed, and it was not a mere phantasmal existence. And one thing they knew it was—it was a body no longer subject to physical limitations and restrictions, but completely under the control of the spiritual nature or will, so under control that it could manifest itself in such material form or forms, if this were necessary, for evidential purposes. Already during the earthly ministry there were, according to the Gospels, pre-glimpses of this control of body by spirit. Two of the best attested incidents in the narratives—His walking on the sea and the Transfiguration — are instances in point. The chief significance of the Transfiguration has been found by some to consist just in this, that it was meant to prepare the disciples for the Resurrection and for the appearance of the Risen Jesus in glorified form (see, *e.g.*, H. A. A. Kennedy in *JThSt* iv. [1903] 270 ff.).

ii. THE WITNESS OF ST. PAUL. — St. Paul's teaching on the nature of the Resurrection-Body as 'spiritual' is but the further carrying out of the teaching of the forty days, and is intelligible only against the background of the appearances of Christ's risen body, reports of which he would receive from first-hand witnesses. In regard to the Risen Body he holds firmly the two points borne witness to by the Gospel accounts: (1) the identity between the body which was buried and the body which rose. Some critics maintain that there is no substantial identity between the two in St. Paul's teaching; but apart from the analogy of the seed, the words 'that Christ died . . . and that he was buried and that he hath been raised on the third day' are, as Feine points out (*Theol. des NT*, p. 362), susceptible of no other interpretation than that of identity. But (2) equally with identity the difference between the two is insisted on, represented by the distinction between the seed and the perfected plant: 'Thou sowest not that body that shall be' (1 Co 15^{37}). St. Paul speaks of the risen body as a body not of flesh and blood ('flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God,' v.^{50}) but one transfigured and transformed. A distinction is drawn between the 'psychical' or 'natural' body and the 'pneumatical' or 'spiritual' body, the former the vehicle of self-manifestation under earthly conditions, the latter the organ of self-manifestation under supra-terrestrial conditions. The difference consists not in the body ceasing to be material or being changed into spirit, but in the material being entirely subjected to the dominion of the spirit. The risen body of Christ was spiritual 'not because it was less than before material, but because in it matter was wholly and finally subjugated to spirit, and not to the exigencies of physical life. Matter no longer restricted Him or hindered. It had become the pure and transparent vehicle of spiritual purpose' (Gore, *Body of Christ*, p. 127). (For the striking corroboration of St. Paul's conception of the 'spiritual body' supplied by recent science, see below, IV. ii. 2 (*c*).)

St. Paul's view has been contrasted with that of the Evangelists, as less materialistic, and the difference has been traced to the more spiritual character of the appearance of the Risen Christ to St. Paul as compared with those to the older apostles. But we have to remember the difference of relationship to the Risen Lord between St. Paul and the older disciples. That St. Paul had ever seen Jesus during His earthly life and ministry is doubtful. Ramsay, C. Clemen (*Paulus*, Giessen, 1904), and J. Weiss (*Paulus und Jesus*, Berlin, 1909), among recent critics, maintain that he had. The weight of probability, however, is against the supposition (see Feine, *Jesus Christus und Paulus*, Leipzig, 1902, pp. 93, 350) (2 Co 5^{16} cannot be cited for or against, for what St. Paul is contrasting here is the knowledge of Christ 'after the flesh' [not 'in the flesh'] with the knowledge of Him after the spirit—the difference between the estimate of Christ formed by St. Paul before his conversion and after). Recognition of identity under changed conditions was not, therefore, the primary requirement in St. Paul's case, as it was in the case of the older apostles. The aim of the appearance to him was to convince him that the Jesus who was crucified and whose followers he persecuted was indeed the Risen and Exalted Christ. To him, therefore, Christ was manifested in the majesty of His Divine glory, a Figure invested in dazzling splendour, with none of those more tangible characteristics which He manifested to the earlier apostles and which seemed necessary for evidential purposes. Though thus less tangible, however, the appearance to St. Paul was not less objective than those to the earlier apostles. In St. Paul's own judgment it was the same kind of appearance as that to Peter, James, and the others—'He appeared to me also.'

The question has been raised whether St. Paul derived his view of the resurrection-body entirely from what he had seen and heard of the Risen Lord, or was partly influenced by contemporary Jewish or Hellenistic ideas. Lake, *e.g.* (*Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, p. 23 ff.), maintains that 'the Pauline doctrine of a transubstantiation of the body at the resurrection is one which was in the main familiar to the Jews,' yet he recognizes the influence on St. Paul's doctrine of 'his knowledge of appearances of the Risen Lord in the light of which knowledge he re-formed his ideas on the Resurrection generally.' The question of the influence on St. Paul's doctrine of Christ's own teaching on the resurrection has also to be considered. Feine (*Jesus Christus und Paulus*, p. 181 f.) points out certain remarkable similarities between St. Paul's teaching in 1 Cor. and the narratives of our Lord's discussion with the Sadducees in Mk $12^{18f.}$, Lk $20^{27f.}$. The condition of the risen is described by Jesus as being 'as the angels of God in heaven' (Mk 12^{25}, *ὡς ἄγγελοι ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*), or 'like the angels' (*ἰσάγγελοι*), and as being 'sons of God, being sons of the resurrection' (Lk 20^{36}). That is to say, they possess a heavenly or spiritual organism, and are conformed to the likeness of God (see Kennedy, *St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things*, pp. 100, 234). This Christian tradition of Jesus' eschatological teaching, if received by St. Paul, was, however, illumined and defined by the manifestations of Jesus to himself and to the other apostles. Others maintain (*e.g.* Reitzenstein; see J. Weiss, on 1 Co 15^{44}) that St. Paul's contrast between the 'natural body' (*σῶμα ψυχικόν*) and the 'spiritual body' (*σῶμα πνευματικόν*) was derived from the Greek mystery-religions. But the Greek antithesis is based on a dualistic conception of human nature, and St. Paul's contrast is in quite a different category.

LITERATURE.—On the Resurrection-Body see **E. M. Goulburn**, *The Resurrection of the Body* (*BL*), London, 1850; **J. H. Skrine**, *CR* lxxxvi. [1904] 860–871; 'The Resurrection-Body: a Study in the History of Doctrine,' *CQR* lxviii. [1909] 138 ff.; **R. H. Charles**, *Eschatology, Hebrew, Jewish and Christian*, London, 1899; **R. C. Moberly**, *Problems and Principles*, do., 1904; **C. Gore**, *The Body of Christ*, do., 1901; **C. H. Robinson**, *Studies in the Resurrection of Christ*, do., 1909, ch. ii.; **W. J. Sparrow Simpson**, *The Resurrection and Modern Thought*, do., 1911, chs. xxiv.–xxix.

IV. *THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST FOR APOSTOLIC CHRISTIANITY.*—The significance of the Resurrection for the Apostolic Church may be represented under a twofold aspect, (i.) as evidential, (ii.) as essential or constitutive.

i. EVIDENTIAL SIGNIFICANCE.—In the older mode of treatment of the Resurrection, in English theology especially, main stress was laid upon its evidential value as the confirmation or proof of the truth of Christ's claims as to His person and work. To place the chief emphasis on this aspect of its significance is to give the Resurrection too abstract and external a character, and is the correlative of that view of the miracles of Jesus natural to 18th cent. theology, which lays stress on their value as credential appendages rather than as an essential part of Jesus' redemptive revelation. According to the invariable apostolic representation, however, the resurrection of Christ is not merely something consequent upon the redemptive revelation of His life and work on earth, something added on to it as the reward and guarantee of its efficacy; it is itself an essential and constitutive part of the revelation necessary to its culmination or completion. While this is so, the importance of the evidential aspect of the Resurrection is not to be minimized. This is, indeed, where we must begin in our study of the apostolic representation. For the apostles the first and primary significance of the Resurrection lay undoubtedly in the fact that it was the Divine confirmation of Jesus' entire claim as to His person and work. Thus it is—and the importance of the fact has to be noted, as it is often overlooked—that it is always God to whom the apostles impute the raising of Christ. His resurrection was the immediate act of God the Father, who by this gave His verdict concerning Jesus, thus once for all reversing Israel's act of rejection, and refuting the Jews' charge of blasphemy. 'Whom they slew, hanging him on a tree, him God raised up' (Ac $10^{39f.}$). This is the uniform apostolic representation common to St. Paul and the earlier apostles (cf. Ac $2^{24.\ 32.\ 36}$ 3^{15} 4^{10} 5^{31} 13^{30-39} 17^{31}, 1 Th 1^{10}, Ro 1^4 6^4, 1 Co 15^{15}, Gal 1^1, Eph 1^{20}, Ph 2^9, 1 P 1^{21}, He 13^{20}). So that St. Paul says, 'If Christ did not rise . . . we are detected bearing false witness to God (*κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ*) by affirming of him that he raised Christ' (1 Co $15^{14.\ 15}$ [Moffatt]). And if this affirmation or witness is false, then their whole view of the worth of Christ's person and work is without validity. Their preaching of Christ is 'empty' (v.^{14}) and faith in Him is 'vain' (v.^{17}). To develop this evidential significance of the Resurrection into its details:

1. Evidential with regard to His Person.—(*a*) Through the Resurrection conclusive proof was afforded of the *Messiahship* of Jesus. This aspect of its significance was that which was primarily emphasized in the earliest apostolic teaching as represented by the sermons of St. Peter recorded in the early chapters of Acts. That Jesus claimed to be the Messiah, the Divinely sent One in whom all the hopes of Israel were to be realized, cannot be seriously doubted. In calling Himself 'the Son of man' He adopted a title which, it is now generally recognized, involved Messianic pretensions (see Sanday, *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*, Oxford, 1907, p. 123 ff.). This claim He had already supported by His life and work. His miracles—works of God wrought through Him (cf. Jn 14^{10})—were proofs of His mission as God's accredited messenger to Israel (Ac 2^{22}, 'a man accredited to you by God through miracles, wonders, and signs which God performed by him among you'; cf. Ac 10^{38}, 'anointed of the Holy Ghost and with power he went about doing good, for God was with him'). This claim, however, was apparently contradicted and denied by His death on the Cross, which to the Jew was the symbol of Divine rejection (5^{30} 10^{39}). Through the Death on the Cross, therefore, the Jews' verdict on Jesus seemed Divinely supported. But through the Resurrection as not merely His being raised on the third day (Ac 10^{40}) but His being exalted to the right hand of God in power and glory, Israel's act of rejection was Divinely reversed, and the claim of Jesus to be the Christ was for ever vindicated. 'This Jesus has God raised up' (Ac 2^{32}). 'The God of our fathers has glorified Jesus his servant' (3^{13}; cf. 2^{33} 5^{31} 7^{55}).

'God has made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified' (Ac 2^{36}; cf. 9^{22}). 'Uplifted then by God's right hand, and receiving from the Father the long-promised holy Spirit, he has poured on us what you now see and hear' (2^{33} [Moffatt]). There could be but one conclusion—earth's rejected was God's accepted.

(*b*) Through the Resurrection the *Divinity* of Jesus was established. He was shown to be not only Messiah but the Son of God. A unique relation to God He had Himself claimed. The title 'Son of God,' indeed, is very rarely found applied by Jesus to Himself. More often it is used to describe the impression made by Him upon others (*e.g.* on the possessed, Mk 3^{11} 5^{7} and ||s; on the centurion, Mk 15^{39} and ||s). The crowning instance is the confession of Peter, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God' (Mt 16^{16}). That on this matter of His Divine Sonship our Lord maintained a great measure of reserve and reticence was quite in keeping with His whole method of self-revelation. The truth of His Divine Sonship was not one that could be taught the disciples as a dogma; it must be allowed to break naturally upon them as they increasingly divined the uniqueness of His character. But we see in the records of the Evangelists how Jesus consistently sought to guide the thoughts of His disciples concerning Himself into true and worthy lines. He uniformly claimed to stand in a unique relation to God. He habitually speaks of God as 'my Father' (Mt. 23 times), never embracing Himself with His disciples as being in the same sense sons of God. He attributes to Himself powers and prerogatives which imply essential coequality with God. He claims perfect mutuality of knowledge as well as of will with the Father, whereby He possesses an exclusive power of manifesting Him (Mt 11^{27}, Lk 10^{22}). He claims to do for men what only God can do—to grant forgiveness (Mt 9^{6}, Mk 2^{10}, Lk 5^{24}) and to bestow the Holy Spirit (Mt 10^{19}, Lk 12^{12}). And, further, He demands from men that complete surrender and utter devotion of life which can be granted only to God (Mt 10^{37}, Lk 14^{26}). So it is altogether in keeping with the Synoptic representation when the Fourth Gospel records such sayings as these: 'I and the Father are one' (thing or essence, ἕν) (10^{30}), 'He who has seen me has seen the Father' (14^{9}), 'I am in the Father, and the Father is in me' (14^{11}), 'the Jews sought the more to kill him because he said, God was his peculiar (ἴδιον) Father, making himself equal to God' (5^{18}).

The claim of Jesus to be the Son of God is thus implied in His attitude throughout, and for refusing to disown it He was counted a blasphemer and condemned to death (Mt $26^{63.\ 65f.}$ 27^{43}; cf. Jn 10^{36}). Such a death—a 'hanging on a gibbet'—seemed to be a confirmation of the judgment of His enemies, but the Resurrection was God's great declaration in action substantiating the truth of Jesus' claim: 'declared Son of God with power according to the spirit of holiness by the resurrection of the dead' (Ro 1^{4}). No blasphemer was He. The Resurrection 'declared,' defined, or marked Him out to be (ὁρισθέντος) what He always truly was—Son of God. For the Sonship thus declared 'in power' (ἐν δυνάμει—no longer in humiliation but in power, the power of exalted Lordship) by the Resurrection was 'according to' or answered to the spirit of holiness (κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης), the spirit of exceptional and transcendent holiness which was the inmost reality in the person and life of Jesus, and testified to His peculiar relation to God. Divine Sonship, that is to say, was not an honour to which for the first time Christ was exalted after His death. The Resurrection only displayed Him as being what He was inalienably from the first, and installed Him in the dignity which corresponded to His nature. 'In virtue of His resurrection . . . Christ is established in that dignity which is His and which answers to His nature' (Denney, *EGT*, on Ro 1^{4}).

For St. Paul the conviction of the Divine Sonship of Jesus dated from the appearance to him on the way to Damascus of the Glorified Christ. What was revealed to him then was that the Crucified One was the Son of God in power. So that the gospel he immediately began to preach was 'that Jesus is the Son of God' (Ac 9^{20}). It is sometimes maintained that the 'Son of God' was a recognized title of the Messiah (cf. *En.* cv. 2; *4 Ezr.* vii. 28 f., xiii. 32, 37, 52, xiv. 9), and that we cannot argue from the mere use of the phrase to His Divinity. But it is not a case of thus arguing. We have but to take the first writing of his which has come down to us—1 Thess.—to see there writ large what the assertion of the Divine Sonship of Jesus meant for St. Paul. In this first extant NT writing (written, according to Sanday, probably about A.D. 51, *i.e.* about twenty years after the Resurrection) three remarkable predictions are made of Jesus.

(1) In the first verse, the Glorified Jesus is bracketed in dignity with God the Father. St. Paul and his companions give solemn greeting to 'the Church of the Thessalonians (which is) in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ' (v.^{1}). The wonder of such a juxtaposition is realized only when we remember that St. Paul was a strict Jew, in whose blood therefore monotheism ran like a passion. Yet this Jewish apostle does not scruple to place Jesus side by side with God, and assume a like estimate of Him on the part of those to whom he writes.

(2) In this brief letter Jesus is more than twenty times referred to as 'Lord' (Κύριος). The disciples had been in the habit of addressing their Master as 'Lord' during His lifetime, using the term as a title of authority in a sense not very different from that in which any Rabbi might be addressed by his pupils (Jn $13^{13f.}$) (see Sanday in *HDB* ii. 648^{b}). But that sense is no longer adequate to the apostolic usage; the word has become filled with a deeper meaning, being used as the LXX equivalent of the OT 'Jahweh' and as signifying Divine power and sovereignty. What Jahweh was to Israel, that Jesus was to the religious consciousness of St. Paul—the One who has earned the place of Sovereign in his heart, and whom he feels constrained to worship and serve.

(3) Prayer is addressed to Jesus directly, and not merely offered in His name—'Now may our God and Father himself, and our Lord Jesus, direct our way unto you' (3^{11}). And all this, it is significant to note, is referred to by the Apostle only in the passing, without the slightest indication that it was a novel or unfamiliar attitude to his readers. In his subsequent Epistles St. Paul gives fuller and more developed doctrinal expression to his conviction of the truth of the Divine Sonship of Jesus. Personal pre-existence in the Godhead is unambiguously affirmed of Him in 2 Co 8^{9} ('ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ,' etc.) and in Ph $2^{6ff.}$ ('though he was divine by nature, he did not snatch at equality with God but emptied himself by taking the nature of a servant,' etc. [Moffatt]). In Col $1^{15\text{-}20}$ His cosmic significance is dwelt upon. As 'the image (εἰκών) of the invisible God,' He occupies a position of unique pre-eminence and sovereignty, and is agent or mediator and end in creation as well as in redemptive history ('in him were all things created . . . all things have been created through him, and with a view to [εἰς] him'; cf. 1 Co 8^{6} 10^{4}). But already in his earliest as truly as in his latest writings full, eternal, essential Divinity is ascribed to Jesus as Son of God, whereby He is placed alongside the Father in honour and worship.

St. Paul's usage of the term 'Son of God' in this transcendent sense has been traced to Hellenistic influence. While the title had been employed by the earliest Christian community 'in a very harmless sense,' St. Paul gave it the altogether new and mythical sense of a God who had descended from heaven, a sense which was intelligible enough to Greeks and heathen but not to Jews with their strict monotheism; and in so doing he 'became the creator of the new Christology, which drew its inspiration, not from history, but from something above it—from a mythical being, and which won over the heathen for this very reason' (Wernle, *Beginnings of Christianity*, Eng. tr., 2 vols., London, 1903–04, i. 250). 'Son of God,' as employed by St. Paul, is thus held to be primarily a Gentile title, one which was sometimes applied to the Emperors, like the title 'Lord' (*e.g.* it is so found in a letter of the Emperor Augustus dated A.D. 5; see *Exp*, 6th ser., vii. [1903] 114, and Knowling, *Testimony of St. Paul*, p. 44). This Imperial usage, Deissmann conjectures, may have first suggested to St. Paul the application of the title to Jesus (*Bibelstudien*, Marburg, 1895, i. 167, Eng. tr., *Bible Studies*, Edinburgh, 1901, p. 166 f.). But 'Son of God,' if a Gentile, was also a Jewish title, and, as Knowling points out, it is most significant that the first and earliest intimation which we have in Acts of St. Paul's Christian teaching is this, that 'in the synagogues'—not to Greeks or Romans, but to Jews and proselytes—'he proclaimed Jesus, that he is the Son of God' (9^{20}).

If St. Paul had interpreted 'Son of God' differently from the other apostles, and if the deification of Christ had been due to him, the surprising thing is that we do not hear of any opposition on this point between him and the other apostles. The older apostles and St. Paul differed no doubt in many things, but there is no trace that they differed in the estimate which they formed of the Person of Christ, and of His relationship to the Father. St. Paul's representation of Christ is only a more developed expression of what is present already in solution in the primitive apostolic teaching. Of this St. Peter's sermons in Acts and his First Epistle may be taken as representative.

In St. Peter's sermons in Acts, while no attempt is made at a fully developed doctrine of the Person of Christ, He is quite definitely placed on the side of God as over against man, the theme of the gospel and the object of faith. Through His resurrection and exaltation Jesus is proclaimed not only 'Messiah' (3^{18-20} 4^{25-28}), but 'giver of the Holy Spirit' (2^{23}), 'Prince of life' (3^{15} 5^{31}), 'Saviour' (4^{12} 5^{21}), and 'Judge of living and dead' (10^{42}, a prerogative which in the OT belongs to God and to God alone). Prayer is offered to Him directly (1^{24} 7^{59}), so that one mode of describing Christians in these early days was to speak of them as those that called upon the name of Jesus (9^{21}). And already in his first sermon we find St. Peter applying to Christ the term 'Lord' (*Κύριος*, Ac $2^{21.\,33.\,36}$; cf. $3^{13.\,21}$ 5^{31} 10^{36}), the same term as is used of Jahweh in the LXX, thus assigning to Him Divine sovereignty and authority. The mere use of the word *Κύριος* may not in itself necessarily involve Divinity. The Jews applied it to their Messiah (Mk $12^{36\text{f.}}$ and ||s) without thereby, it is said, pronouncing him to be God. But, as Knowling points out, 'it is not merely that the early Christians addressed their Ascended Lord so many times by the same name which is used of Jehovah in the LXX . . . but that they did not hesitate to refer to Him the attributes and the prophecies which the great prophets of the Jewish nation had associated with the name of Jehovah' (*EGT*, on Ac 2^{21}).

In his First Epistle St. Peter represents the same point of view in slightly fuller and more developed form. The Spirit of God is definitely spoken of as 'the Spirit of Christ' (1^{11}); and although the title 'Son of God' is not employed, we find the expression 'the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ' (1^{3}), with an undeniable implication of Christ's special Sonship. Christians are called to 'sanctify in their hearts Christ as Lord' (3^{15}) in words which in the OT are applied to Jahweh and His sanctification by Israel (Is 8^{13}). He is proclaimed to be Lord not only of the spiritual world but of the material as related to and subserving the spiritual, 'angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him' (1 P 3^{22}). It is a disputed question whether 1^{11} and 1^{20} do or do not imply the real pre-existence of Christ. While the language of the former seems satisfied if we take it to mean simply that the Divine Spirit, now so bound up with Christ that it can be called *His* Spirit, moved also in the prophets of old, the latter passage is more significant. 'While the word "foreknown" (*προεγνωσμένου*) in no way involves the pre-existence of Christ, since it is used even of Christians in 1^{2}, yet the unusual combination of "foreknown" with "manifested" may justly be considered as placing the matter beyond doubt. Only that can be manifested which was in being before manifestation' (H. R. Mackintosh, *The Person of Jesus Christ*, Edinburgh, 1912, p. 45 f.). With the sermons of St. Peter in Acts and his First Epistle as representing the general conception of Christ current in the earliest Apostolic Age may be coupled the Epistle of St. James, where Jesus is extolled as 'the Lord of glory' (2^{1}) and ranked with God in honour and dignity (1^{1}); and the brief Epistle of Jude, who describes Jesus as 'our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ' (v.^{4}), whose 'slave' (*δοῦλος*) he is (v.^{1}).

As representing the more developed apostolic doctrine, we have not only the Epistles of St. Paul but the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Johannine writings. In Hebrews the central thought is that of the Divine Sonship of Christ, in virtue of which He is the Mediator of the new and better covenant (12^{24} 9^{15} 8^{6}). He is announced as a 'Son' (1^{2}), transcendently related to God, the effulgence of the Father's glory and the very image of His substance (1^{3}), creator, upholder, and heir of all things ($1^{2.\,10}$), who, though thus eternal and Divine, because the children were partakers of flesh and blood, Himself likewise partook of the same and is now through His suffering and sacrifice exalted at the right hand of the majesty on high (1^{3} 8^{1} 10^{5}). In the Fourth Gospel the emphasis on the Divine Sonship, marked throughout, so that even such a critic as J. Weiss admits that in this Gospel Christ is God in the fullest sense, possessing 'those qualities which constitute the nature of the Deity' (*Christ: The Beginnings of Dogma*, Eng. tr., London, 1911, p. 148 ff.). The view of the writer is summed up in the Prologue in terms of the rebaptized Logos conception of which he predicates His eternity ('existed in the very beginning,' v.^{1} [Moffatt]), His eternal personal relation to God ('was with [*πρός*] God,' v.^{1}; 'was with God in the very beginning,' v.^{2}), His agency in creation ('through him all existence came into being, no existence came into being apart from him,' v.^{3}), giver of life and light to the whole race of mankind, the medium alike of creation and of revelation ('in him life lay, and this life was the Light for men,' v.^{4}; 'the real Light which lightens every man,' v.^{9}). In 1 Jn. such a unity between God and the Son is recognized that he who confesses the Son hath the Father also (5^{20}). In the Apocalypse Christ is represented as He whom all creation unites to worship as it worships God Almighty (1^{6}; cf. 7^{12}). God and the Lamb receive united adoration (5^{13} 7^{10}). He is the 'First and the Last,' the 'Beginning and the End' (1^{8} 21^{6} 22^{13}), the Lord of the churches, who holds their stars or guardian angels in His hand (1[16. 20]), who is Ruler of the nations and King of kings, the all-wise and almighty Judge of the nations (7[9] 15[4]).

2. Evidential with regard to His work, especially His death.—The Resurrection was not only the confirmation of Christ's claim to Sonship and Messiahship; it was through this the Divine justification of Jesus' claim as to the redemptive character of His life and work as culminating in His death, and the public declaration of its acceptance. The Messiah was looked for as coming in outward glory, but Jesus came in a way that was the very opposite of this. His life on earth had been one of humiliation and suffering, of self-denying service and sacrifice for others, until at last the culminating point of His sacrifice was reached in His death. All were 'offended' in Him. He needed to be justified, and the Resurrection was His Divine justification or vindication. In the Epistle to the Philippians His resurrection (and exaltation) is connected with His 'making himself of no reputation' and taking upon Him the form of a servant (2[6-11]). In Romans (1[4]) it is in contrast with His having been made of the seed of David according to the flesh that He is said to have been declared Son of God with power. Above all, His death needed justification. Jesus had Himself while on earth proclaimed the necessity of His suffering and death. But this was so contrary to Jewish conceptions of the Messiah that the first disciples had difficulty in attaining to it. 'The idea of the Messianic sufferings and death is one that wakes no echo in the heart of any Jewish contemporary of our Lord, not excepting even His disciples' (L. A. Muirhead, *Eschatology of Jesus*, London, 1904, p. 206), and the Death on the Cross when it came was fatal, in Jewish eyes, to Messianic claims. This was the great *σκάνδαλον*. It was His resurrection, and the fact that by it He had been 'declared' the Son of God with power, that showed the peculiarity and importance of His death. So St. Paul represents the case. If Jesus was indeed both Lord and Christ, as through his experience on the Damascus road he had come to know, the death which He died could not be what it seemed to be, a curse, the death of a malefactor and blasphemer, but a Divine appointment for the salvation of men. There must be in it a Divine virtue. 'God was in Christ,' even Christ the crucified, reconciling the world unto Himself (2 Co 5[19]; cf. 1 Co 15[17], Ro 4[25] 6[4-7]). It was a vicarious death; He was delivered up for our transgressions (Ro 4[25]), and the Resurrection was the assurance that God had accepted Christ's atoning work, and that the foundation of perfect reconciliation between God and man had been laid. In the light of the revelation of the Resurrection, the Death on the Cross lost its shame and became a spring of blessing, the central 'commendation' or proof of Divine love (Ro 5[8]).

Already in the primitive Christian community, following hints of the Lord Himself in His earthly and then in His post-Resurrection teaching, we have the atoning significance of the Death represented. That Jesus 'died for our sins according to the scriptures'—not only the fact of the Death but its atoning significance—was part of the tradition which St. Paul had received and which, he claimed, was common to himself and the older apostles (1 Co 15[3. 11]). 'The inference,' Weizsäcker acknowledges, 'is indisputable; the primitive Church already taught, and proved from Scripture, that the death of Jesus exerted a saving influence in the forgiveness of sin' (*Apost. Age*^{2}, i. 130 f.).

This is borne out by the reports of St. Peter's speeches in the Acts, where the death of Jesus is represented as a Divine necessity, taking place 'by the determined counsel and foreknowledge of God' (2[23]; cf. 4[28]), and as in accordance with prophecy (3[18]; cf. Christ's post-Resurrection teaching, Lk 24[2]. Is 53 seems to have been the special passage in the Apostle's mind—the Suffering Messiah being frequently identified in these early speeches with the Servant of the Lord in Isaiah, *e.g.* 3[13] 4[27]; cf. 8[35]). So, although represented as a crime on the part of the Jews (2[23] 3[13-15] 5[30]), the death of Jesus is viewed as a fact Divinely foreordained and Divinely necessary. This Divine necessity of the Death has reference to its saving or redemptive significance in virtue of which the great blessing of the gospel, offered in the name of Jesus, is the forgiveness of sins (2[38] 3[19] 5[31] 10[43]). In these early sermons or discourses the redemptive significance of the Death is not developed. We have to remember that 'the Petrine speeches in the Acts were called forth by special circumstances and (except the speeches recorded in Ac 10[30-43] 15[7-11]) were all addressed to non-Christian Jews at Jerusalem. We have no right, therefore, to look to them for the full cycle of Christian doctrine which even in the beginning of the Gospel Peter had apprehended' (Chase, *HDB* iii. 793^{b}). In the First Epistle of Peter we have a somewhat more developed doctrine; the atoning efficacy of the suffering and death of Christ being described in varied language—covenant blood (1[2]), ransom (1[18f.]), sin-bearing (2[20ff.]), substitution, the sacrifice of the righteous for the unrighteous (3[18]).

In St. Paul the redemptive significance of the Death is further developed. He died 'for our sins' (1 Co 15[3], 2 Co 5[21]); a 'ransom' (*λύτρον*, 1 Ti 2[6]); through His death there is inaugurated a New Covenant (1 Co 11[28]), in which the Divine purpose of 'salvation' is realized: deliverance from wrath (Ro 5[9]), from the curse of the Law (Gal 3[13]), and the imparting of eternal life (1 Th 5[9f.]). The shedding of His blood was a sacrifice which had propitiatory value (Ro 3[25f.] 5[9], 1 Co 5[9]), in virtue of which men are brought into a new relation to God, treated as righteous (Ro 3[24]), 'accepted in the Beloved' (Eph 1[6]). This sacrificial significance of the Death is specially emphasized by the writer to the Hebrews, who finds in the sacrifices of the Old Covenant types and shadows of the sacrifice of Christ. Through its propitiatory efficacy the Death is viewed as a crown of glory (2[9]; cf. 5[8f.]). In the Johannine writings 'Jesus Christ the righteous' is represented as 'the propitiation for our sins' (1 Jn 2[2] 4[10]; cf. Rev 1[5] 5[6. 9. 12]), in the Gospel the suffering and death being viewed, as in Heb., as a glorification (13[31]). 'He [St. John] . . . does not ever, like St. Paul (*e.g.* Ph 2[8. 9]), separate it [the Passion] as a crisis of humiliation from the glory which followed' (Westcott, on Jn 12[32]; cf. Milligan, *Resurrection*, p. 314).

3. Evidential with regard to man's eternal destiny.—Another aspect of the evidential significance of the resurrection of Christ for the Apostolic Church is that which concerns the eternal destiny of those 'who through him do believe in God.' Already in the OT we have foreshadowings of the belief in a continued personal life with God after death. The religious relation of the soul to God was felt to carry with it the pledge of such a continued life. Fellowship with God constitutes a bond which death cannot sever. 'Immortality is the corollary of Religion. If there be religion, that is, if God be, there is immortality' (Davidson, *Job*, Cambridge, 1884, p. 296). As Jesus Himself put it, interpreting and supporting this fundamental OT source of the faith in immortality, God is 'not a God of dead people but of living' (Mt 22[32], Mk 12[27], Lk 20[38]). And this immortality was for the Hebrew an immortality of the whole personal being of man, body as well as soul. The conception of a disembodied future life was entirely foreign to the OT—belonging to ethnic not to Hebrew thought. Such a destiny, indeed, could be for the

OT believer but a hope, a faith, a faith venture, though involved in the very nature of religion as fellowship with God. If certainty, if assured confidence of such a full personal immortality, was to be attained, some more 'sure word' of God must be spoken; and such a sure word the Apostolic Church found in the resurrection of Jesus. As the crowning example of a life lived in fellowship with God, and trusting God for the future, Jesus supplied the test case, the crucial instance, of God's love.

Since therefore Jesus—the man Jesus—was raised from the grave, the faith in the Resurrection grounded in the life of fellowship with God has received its final seal and assurance. The resurrection of those who are His is guaranteed—'For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also that are fallen asleep in Jesus will God bring with him' (1 Th 4^{14}). The empty grave therefore, as Harnack admits with some inconsequence, is 'the birthplace of the indestructible belief that death is vanquished, that there is a life eternal' (*What is Christianity?* ^{3}, p. 165).

St. Paul puts this evidential significance of the Resurrection first negatively: 'If Christ be not risen, then they also which have fallen asleep in Christ have perished (ἀπώλοντο)' (1 Co 15^{18}). They have 'perished' not in the sense of suffering annihilation or extinction of conscious existence, but of undergoing deprivation of continued existence, in any sense in which it is worth having—deprivation of 'life' through separation from God, the Sheol state of existence. (For St. Paul's use of ἀπόλλυσθαι and ἀπώλεια as the antithesis of σώζεσθαι and σωτηρία see Kennedy, *St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things*, p. 119 ff.) 'But now hath Christ been raised and become the first fruits (ἀπαρχή) of them that are asleep' (v. ^{20}). This is the more positive statement of it. As the first ripe sheaf is the earnest and guarantee of the coming harvest, so the resurrection of Christ is the pledge and guarantee of the resurrection of those who are His (cf. Col 1^{18}, Rev 1^{5}, πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, 'the first born from the dead'). So St. Peter speaks of Christians being 'born anew to a life of hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, born to an unscathed, inviolate, unfading inheritance' (1 P $1^{3f.}$ [Moffatt]).

The resurrection of Christ is not only the assurance or pledge of the full personal immortality of believers; it is also the revelation of the nature of this immortal life. It 'has brought life and immortality to light' (2 Ti 1^{10}); it has displayed it to our view. He has risen in possession of a body like ours, only glorified and made free from the law of sin and death, a body 'spiritual' in the sense of being the perfect instrument of the purposes of spirit. In this glorified embodied state of the Risen Christ we have a look at the nature of the future state of believers. At present we are pent up in a body which is but an imperfect medium of our will or spirit. It is 'a body of death' (Ro 7^{24}), full of weakness and corruption, limiting our powers of service. But 'this body that belongs to our low estate' shall be transformed 'till it resembles the body of his Glory' (Ph 3^{21} [Moffatt]). For 'if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, he that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall quicken also your mortal bodies through his Spirit that dwelleth in you' (Ro 8^{11}). (On the connexion between the resurrection of Christ and the resurrection of believers, whereby the former is not only the pledge or guarantee but the ground of the latter, and the moral significance of the doctrine, see, further, below, IV. ii.)

ii. ESSENTIAL OR CONSTITUTIVE SIGNIFICANCE.—The heart of the apostolic representation is not reached until it is perceived that the Resurrection is not simply an external seal or evidential appendage added to guarantee certain truths about Christ and His work, but an essential or constitutive element in the work itself, an integral part of His redemptive revelation. Such a view as that of Herrmann already referred to, which lays the chief stress on the impression produced by Christ's life, making the Resurrection at most a deduction of faith without vital relation to redemption, fails to do justice to the inner meaning of the fact. This more inner vital significance of the Resurrection for apostolic thought and life as the necessary sequel of the Incarnation and Crucifixion, and essential to the completion of the work of redemption, may be presented under the following heads:

1. What it meant for Christ Himself.—The Resurrection was essential to Christian faith, because of what it meant for Christ Himself. As the transition from a state of humiliation to a state of exaltation, the entrance in His risen manhood on a new life of exalted power and sovereignty, whereby He became Lord over all, the Resurrection formed a new beginning in the life of Christ Himself. This is the central significance of the Resurrection insisted on by St. Peter in his sermons recorded in Acts: 'God hath made him both Lord (Κύριον) and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified' (2^{36}); 'Him hath God exalted at his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour' (5^{31}); 'therefore being by the right hand of God exalted . . . he hath poured forth this' (2^{33}), and the healing of the lame man is pointed to as further evidence of His exalted sovereignty (4^{10}). Κύριος, the LXX name for Jahweh and the characteristic apostolic title for the Exalted Jesus, defines Him as One who is sovereign in the spheres both of grace and of nature, Lord not only over the Church but over all creation. This too is the connotation or significance of the phrase 'at the right hand of God'—a phrase borrowed from Ps 110^{1} and oftener used in the NT than any other words of the OT. It defines Christ's exaltation as a sharing in the universal sovereignty and almighty power of God. So in 1 P 3^{22} the statement that 'angels and authorities and powers' are 'made subject unto him' is the affirmation of His personal participation in the universal sovereignty of God, whose servants the angels and authorities and powers are.

This is most strikingly expressed by St. Paul, for whom the greatness of the Resurrection, as the supreme manifestation of Divine power ('the surpassing greatness of his power,' Eph 1^{19} [Moffatt]), consisted in the fact that it was not merely the raising of Jesus from the dead, but His exaltation and enthronement 'in the heavenly sphere (ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις) . . . the sphere of spiritual activities . . ., which lies behind the world of sense, . . . the sphere of all the ruling forces of the universe' (J. Armitage Robinson, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, London, 1903, pp. 21, 20), 'above all the angelic Rulers, Authorities, Powers, and Lords'—above all powers whether of the natural sphere or of the spiritual—and all this for redemptive ends, that He might be 'head over everything for the church, the church which is his Body' (Eph 1^{20-22} [Moffatt]). As he puts it in the Epistle to the Philippians, 'God raised him high and conferred on him a Name above all names [Κύριος], so that before the Name of Jesus every knee should bend in heaven, on earth, and underneath the earth, and every tongue confess that "Jesus Christ is Lord," to the glory of God the Father' (2^{9-11} [Moffatt]). The Resurrection thus constituted a 'crisis' in the experience of Christ Himself. Through it His activity was raised to a new level, whereby He became clothed with absolute might to carry out the issues of His saving work on earth.

The frequency with which St. Paul speaks of Jesus as 'Lord' (Κύριος) is remarkable. The word occurs some 131 times in his writings (see Feine, *Theol. des NT*, p. 344). In his first Epistle, 1 Thess., the title is applied to the Risen Christ more than 20 times. The peculiar significance of St. Paul's use of the term is sometimes minimized on the ground that it was used in ancient times to express the relation of a king to his subjects—cf. Ac 25^{26}, where it is applied to the Roman Emperor—and in Oriental religions to express the relation between a god and his worshippers. So Deissmann maintains that the Pauline title 'the Lord' is 'a genuinely Oriental predicate,' and that St. Paul uses it as a silent protest against the acknowledgment of any other Lord, even the Roman Emperor, as a rival to the Lordship of Christ (see Feine, *Jesus Christus und Paulus*, p. 38). So Heitmüller and Bousset claim that St. Paul's view of Jesus as Κύριος was determined by the Hellenistic Christianity which he found in Damascus and Antioch. But if it was a Gentile it was also a Jewish title, being the LXX name for Jahweh, and this for St. Paul as a Jew was its nearer context. And St. Paul's application of the term to the Exalted Jesus was in line with the usage of the early Christian community (see above, IV. i. 1). To say, as Pfleiderer does, that the common faith of St. Paul and the early disciples in Jesus as Lord was due to a pre-Christian conception of Messiah which came ultimately from Oriental sources, is to cut it off from its origin in apostolic experience and to leave unexplained what is the central and essential fact to be explained—how Lordship came to be predicated of One who died on a Cross of shame.

When we ask in what ways the Risen Lord exercises His sovereignty and power, we find the apostolic writers dwelling especially upon two manifestations of it: (*a*) the giving of the Holy Spirit, and (*b*) the intercession of Christ at the Father's right hand.

(*a*) The giving of the Spirit is represented by the apostles as the gift of the Exalted Lord by which He carries on His work on earth, and secures the ends for which He lived and died. 'Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted,' says St. Peter, connecting the fact with the exaltation of Christ, 'and having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he has poured forth on us what you now see and hear' (Ac 2^{33}). So intimately was the giving of the Spirit connected with the exaltation and glorification of Christ that St. John can say that there was no gift of the Spirit before the Ascension. 'Spirit was not yet, because Jesus was not yet glorified' (Jn 7^{39}). He was anointed with the Holy Spirit Himself, and by the power of the Spirit accomplished the work given Him to do; but not till His work on earth was done and His glory entered did He possess the Spirit in such wise as to be able to bestow it on men. It was the promise of the Father—part of Christ's reward for His work on earth—and, as such, a sure proof of God's acceptance of that work.

Thus it is that the characteristic apostolic name for the Spirit is 'the Spirit of Christ' or 'the Spirit of the Lord [Jesus]' (Ac 16^7 RV, Ro 8^9, 2 Co 3^{17}, Gal 4^6, Ph 1^{19}, 1 P 1^{11}), not only as having dwelt in Christ Himself, but as being the gift of Christ as Christ was the gift of the Father (cf. Jn 14^{26} 15^{26}). Further, the Spirit is called the Spirit of Christ as having Christ for His theme, His office being to witness to, interpret, and glorify Christ, and thus carry on His work on earth (cf. Jn $15^{26f.}$ 16^{14}). As such the Spirit is characterized chiefly in three ways: (1) as the Spirit of *truth*, to lead men into the truth as it is in Jesus, to take of the things of Christ and show us their meaning (Jn 14^{26} 15^{26} $16^{13f.}$, Ac 2^4 6^{10} *et passim*, 1 Co 2^{10} 12^3, etc.); (2) as the Spirit of *holiness*, to convince of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment (Jn 16^8), to help our infirmities (Ro 8^{26}), to set free from the power of sin and death (Ro $8^{2.\ 10.\ 13}$, Gal 5^{25}, etc.), to produce the virtues of the Christian character which are the fruits of the Spirit (Gal 5^{22}, Eph 5^9), and to conform us in body and in spirit into the likeness of the Risen Christ (Ro $8^{29f.}$ 10^{13}, 1 Co 3^{16} 6^{19} 15^{42-44}, 2 Co 3^{18}, Gal 2^{20}, etc.); (3) as the Spirit of *power*, to enable men to be effective witnesses in word and life to the Risen Christ (Ac 1^8 3^{12} 4^7, etc.).

The function of the Spirit was thus to realize a new kind of fellowship between Christ and His followers—a spiritual fellowship with a living, everywhere present Lord—in and through which they were led into new truth and holiness and power. The coming of the Spirit, therefore, is not to be looked upon as a compensation or substitute for an absent Christ; it is the higher mode of Christ's own presence, to which He pointed forward when He said, 'I will be with you all the time, to the very end of the world' (Mt 28^{20}). On Christ's own life, the promise 'the Comforter will come' is interchangeable with 'I will come to you' (Jn 14^{18} 15^{26}).

St. Paul in more than one passage expressly identifies the Risen Christ with the Holy Spirit (*e.g.* 2 Co 3^{17}, 'the Lord is the Spirit,' and v.^{18}, 'we are changed into the same image by the Lord the Spirit'). And on this ground it is sometimes argued that for St. Paul the Risen Exalted Christ and the Holy Spirit are really one and the same (*e.g.* von Dobschütz, *Ostern und Pfingsten*, p. 34). To identify the Risen Lord and the Spirit, however, without qualification in the face of the three-fold benediction in the same Epistle (13^{14}) is unwarranted. What St. Paul meant was that between the Spirit and the power of the Risen Christ no experimental distinction could be made. 'The truth of the passage is the same as that of Ro $8^{9ff.}$: "If any man have not *the Spirit of Christ* he is none of His. And if *Christ is in you*," etc. Here, so far as the practical experience of Christians goes, no distinction is made between the Spirit of Christ and Christ Himself; Christ dwells in Christians through His Spirit' (Denney, *Expositor's Bible*, 'The Second Epistle to the Corinthians,' London, 1894, p. 134). 'What the Apostle means by his form of verbal identification ["the Lord is the Spirit"] is rather the religious certainty that Jesus Christ, in whom God redeems men, and the Spirit, in whom He communicates Himself to men, are so indissolubly bound up in one, act so absolutely for the same end and through the same means, that from the standpoint of the practical issue they are seen as merged in each other. They are one as the fountain and the stream are one. "Christ in you, or the Spirit of Christ in you; these are not different realities; but the one is the method of the other" (Moberly)' (H. R. Mackintosh in *SDB*, p. 708^b; cf. the same writer's *The Person of Jesus Christ*, p. 374).

(*b*) While thus through the Spirit the Exalted Christ carries on His work on earth, by His intercession at the Father's right hand He Himself carries on His work in heaven. This aspect of the Risen Christ's activity is specially emphasized in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where it is represented as the culmination of His high-priestly functions, the entering 'through his own blood,' *i.e.* with the virtue of His atoning sacrifice in Him, into the holiest of all 'to appear in the presence of God for us' (He 9^{24}), and the guarantee of the full effectiveness of His redemptive work, 'wherefore also he is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession (ἐντυγχάνειν) for them' (7^{25}). But in the other apostolic writings, both Pauline and Johannine, His intercession at God's right hand is equally represented as the culminating aspect of Christ's work, and 'with a kind of adoring awe which is quite peculiar even in the New Testament' (Denney, *Studies in Theology*, London, 1894, p. 162). 'It is Christ Jesus that died, yea rather, that was raised from the dead, who is at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession (ἐντυγχάνει) for us' (Ro 8^{34}, 'who actually pleads for us' [Moffatt]). 'These things write I unto you that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous' (1 Jn 2^1).

It would no doubt be misleading to represent

His heavenly intercession as oral or vocal, as taking place in words or spoken entreaty. 'Words imply distance and duality of a kind incongruous with the identity of life subsisting between Christ and the Father. Theirs is a unity that needs no language' (Mackintosh, *The Person of Jesus Christ*, p. 377). When the apostles speak of His 'making intercession for us,' they are not speaking of 'specific acts done or words spoken by Christ in His glory. His glorified presence is an eternal presentation; He pleads by what He is' (R. C. Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood*, London, 1897, p. 246). On the other hand, it would seem to be doing less than justice to the apostolic thought to represent His intercession as nothing more than His appearance and constant presence before God for us, with the virtue of His atoning life and death in Him, God being thus continually reminded, as it were, at once of the efficacy of Christ's atoning work and of the needs of humanity.

Apparently we should interpret the apostolic language (*e.g.* He 4^{16}, 'that we may find grace to help in time of need,' grace for timely succour) as implying that the intercession of Christ is not a continuous unvarying representation to God on behalf of men on the part of the Exalted Christ, but an intercession which relates itself sympathetically to the varying needs and exigencies of the believer's life. This direct personal representation to God on our behalf is not to be conceived as limited to prayer. The verb ἐντυγχάνειν translated 'intercede' means to deal or transact with one person for another, and, when it stands alone without any limiting expressions, ought to be understood in a much wider sense than petition or prayer, viz. as 'including the whole series of transactions in which one person may engage with another on behalf of a third' (Milligan, *The Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood of our Lord*, p. 151). Christ's intercession is the whole action or transaction in the presence of God of the Exalted Christ, whereby, on the ground of His atoning work, the full blessings of salvation are made over to those 'who come to God through him' (He 7^{25}; cf. Ro 8^{34}).

2. What it meant for humanity.—In virtue of its being thus the entrance on a new life of exalted power and Lordship in which He exercises His full redemptive activity, the resurrection of Jesus constitutes a new beginning in the life of humanity, ushering in a new creative epoch. The Risen Jesus becomes a new life-principle in men, a 'life-creating Spirit' (1 Co 15^{45}, πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν) introducing men into a new world of spiritual experience. This epochal significance of the Resurrection St. Paul represents by saying that in and by His resurrection Christ became the 'second Adam,' the Founder and Head of a new humanity, so that the resurrection of Christ represents as real a crisis in the history of man as his creation (Ro $5^{12\text{ff.}}$, 1 Co $15^{45\text{ff.}}$). 'The first Adam became a living soul' (1 Co 15^{45}, ψυχὴ ζῶσα, a person possessing a principle of life)—this marks the crisis of man's creation. 'The second Adam became a life-creating spirit' (*ib.*)—this marks the crisis of man's redemption whereby he becomes a 'new creation' (καινὴ κτίσις) and henceforth walks 'in newness of life' (Ro 6^{4}, ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς).

This new life into which believers are introduced through union by faith with the living Lord St. Paul can describe only by saying that he possesses the Spirit (πνεῦμα) of Jesus Christ (Ro 9^{9}), that the Spirit of Christ or the Spirit of God mediated through the Exalted Christ dwells in him (9^{11}) or that Christ lives in him, so that he can say, 'I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me' (Gal 2^{20}; cf. Ro $8^{9\text{-}11}$). The life He now lives as a human being has, as its central determining principle, not himself but Christ. Christ is 'our life' (Col 3^{4}, ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν). The ζωή of the believer is the very ζωή of the Exalted Christ (cf. Ro 8^{10}, 2 Co $4^{10\text{f.}}$). Christianity for St. Paul is the condition of being 'in Christ' (ἐν Χριστῷ). A man 'in Christ'—that is his definition of a Christian. The new dispensation or epoch inaugurated by the Resurrection is the dispensation of the Spirit predicted by Christ Himself (Jn $14^{16.\ 26}$ 15^{26} 16^{7}).

By those who, like Pfleiderer and Beyschlag, trace St. Paul's view of Christ as 'the second Adam,' the man 'from heaven' (1 Co 15^{47}), to the influence of Philo's Jewish-Hellenic conception of a pre-existent heavenly Man, the *Urmensch* or archetypal model of man's creation, St. Paul is represented as conceiving of Christ in His pre-incarnate state merely as Man in heaven, the prototype of humanity (see J. Weiss, on 1 Co 15^{47}, and Feine, *Theol. des NT*, p. 353). Even if we assume, however, that St. Paul borrowed the contrast in the first place from current Hellenic thought, using the *schema* lying to his hand, he filled it with a content determined not by the speculations of Alexandrian philosophy but by his own experience of the Risen Christ. He seems, indeed, expressly to contrast his own point of view with that of Philo, by designating the man 'from heaven' not the 'First Man' as in Philo, but the 'Second Man.' 'That is not first which is spiritual but that which is natural' (1 Co 15^{46}). It is only at His resurrection that Christ is represented by St. Paul as becoming the 'second Adam,' the life-giving head of a new humanity.

For the apostles, accordingly, *Christian life and experience in all its forms depends upon the Resurrection.*

(*a*) Our *justification* depends upon it. The great passage here is Ro 4^{25}: 'He was delivered up for our trespasses (διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν) and was raised for our justification (διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν).' The latter clause is sometimes taken to mean that the Resurrection is necessary to our justification in the sense of being the great proof that the sacrifice of the Death was Divinely accepted, thus evoking faith in us. 'He was delivered up [to death] because of our trespasses [to make atonement for us]: and He was raised because we were justified by His death.' On this interpretation the significance of the Resurrection for our justification becomes reduced to a 'divine declaration that we are accepted with God' (G. B. Stevens, *Pauline Theology*, London, 1892, p. 254; cf. B. Weiss, *Biblical Theology of the NT*, Eng. tr., Edinburgh, 1882, i. 437). Its purpose is evidential; it is little more than a certificate or testimonial to the validity of the Death. That the Resurrection has this evidential significance we have seen. But this is only a partial statement of the apostolic view. If this were all, no inner or essential connexion is to be traced between the Resurrection and our justification, but one which is purely external and temporary; and the Resurrection would be a matter which can be dispensed with as soon as faith is gained, or is unnecessary if faith is gained in some other way (see, *e.g.*, Pfleiderer, *Paulinism*, Eng. tr., London, 1877, i. 119).

But this is not adequate to the Pauline thought. The Resurrection is necessary to our justification, not merely because of the difference it makes to us as certifying the atoning efficacy of the Death and thus evoking faith in us, but also because of the difference it makes to Christ Himself. It marks the point at which His sovereign power as Lord is made effective. Our justification, the basis for which has been laid in the Death, becomes an accomplished fact and effective reality only through Christ's rising again, with the virtue of His atoning life and death in Him, to apply His atonement in those who are united with Him by faith. That which redeems is not Christ's atoning death apart from His living Person into union with whom we are brought by faith. Nearly every error in theories of the Atonement may be traced ultimately to separating the propitiatory work of Christ from Christ Himself. The very ABC of Apostolic Christianity is that we are saved not by believing the fact that Christ died for our sins but by union with the Crucified and now Risen Exalted Saviour. Only through union with a living Saviour who has in Him the virtue of His atoning death do justification, forgiveness, and all the blessings of redemption become ours—'In whom we have redemption through his blood' (Eph 1^{7}, Col 1^{14}). We are accepted 'in the beloved' (Eph 1^{6}); 'there is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus' (Ro 8^{1}). Justification is ours as we are 'in Christ' in such living union with Him that His life becomes identified with ours and ours with His. Because of this identification or incorporation Christ's acts are repeated in us so that in His death we die to sin, 'crucified with Christ' (Gal 2^{20}), and in His life we live to righteousness. But it is only by His risen life that Christ can come into such living union with men as thus to effect their redemption.

The apostolic thought accordingly is this: 'He was delivered up [to death] on account of our trespasses [to make atonement for them]; and He was raised on account of our justification [that it might become an accomplished fact].' 'His rising again was the necessary antecedent of His applying to His elect the virtue of that Atonement which His dying wrought for all men. . . . He died to purchase what He rose again to apply' (J. H. Newman, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*^{3}, London, 1874, p. 206). So it is that the resurrection rather than the death of Christ is spoken of as the cause of justification. It is doubtless true, as Denney urges, that 'Paul did not make an abstract separation between Christ's Death and His Resurrection, as if the Death and the Resurrection either had different motives, or served ends separable from each other' (*EGT*, on Ro 11^{23-25}). Christ's work is one and its end one. He both died and was raised for our justification. But this end was made effective only through the Resurrection; cf. Ro 8^{34}: 'Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that was raised from the dead'; 5^{10}: 'saved by his life'; and 1 Co 15^{17}: 'If Christ be not risen your faith is futile; you are still in your sins.'

In the Epistle to the Hebrews the same truth is presented from the point of view of the Priesthood of Christ. Just as in OT ritual only when the high priest took the blood within the veil and sprinkled it upon the Mercy Seat was the offering for sin completed and the covenant-fellowship with God established, so Christ's offering for sin is not completed until in the heavenly sanctuary He presents Himself 'through his own blood' (9^{12}), *i.e.* with the virtue of His atoning death in Him. Only then is the new covenant-fellowship between God and sinners established. It is in Him as the living prevailing High Priest, and not merely through something He did in the past, that we have peace with God.

(*b*) Our *sanctification*, our moral and spiritual renewal or quickening, depends upon it. This is but a further explication of (*a*). 'In Christ,' and through union with Him, we have pardon; 'in Christ,' and through union with Him, we have sanctification of life. Through His resurrection, therefore, Christ becomes 'a life-creating Spirit' (1 Co 15^{45}), the source of spiritual quickening to believers. Here and now they share in the power of Christ's risen life, whereby they become the subjects of a moral and spiritual resurrection. Through union with Christ by faith, and symbolically in baptism, they are 'crucified with Christ' (Gal 2^{20}) unto sin, 'engrafted (σύμφυτοι, united vitally) into the likeness of his death' (Ro 6^{5}), the old nature being 'annulled' by the introduction through faith into the 'in Christ' environment, the environment of the power of the exalted victorious Lord. They rise with Him and live with Him, 'engrafted into the likeness of his resurrection,' that 'like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life' (Ro $6^{4ff.}$; cf. Ro 8^{9-11}, Eph 2^{4-7}, Col 2^{12} 3^{1-3}, Ph $3^{10f.}$).

This spiritual resurrection through union with the Risen Christ St. Paul describes as being 'quickened together with him' and 'raised up with him and made to sit with him in the heavenly places, in Christ Jesus' (Eph 2^{4-6}). This renewal in which the Christian life consists is a manifestation in us of 'the power of his resurrection' (Ph 3^{10}), or, as St. Paul more often puts it, of the same mighty power of God which had effected Christ's resurrection and enthronement in the heavenly places, 'that working of the strength of his might which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead . . . and (raised) you when ye were dead through your trespasses and sins' (Eph $1^{19f.}$ 2^{1}; cf. 2 Co 4^{14}). The resurrecting energy of God in raising Christ and in raising us when we were dead in trespasses and sins is one and the same. The one act is the prolongation of the other, the manifestation in two steps or stages of the same Divine miraculous energy. 'Every conversion, every advance in the new life, is part of that great new creation which began at the open grave, which advanced at Pentecost, and which will only reach its consummation when every knee shall bow to Christ and every tongue confess that He is Lord' (Cairns, *Christ and Human Need*, p. 186). St. Paul, indeed, speaks of the Christian's resurrection and enthronement as a Divine act 'contemporaneous with the Resurrection and Ascension of Christ' (J. Armitage Robinson, on Eph 2^{6}), as if it were already achieved. It is involved in the latter ideally *in posse*, but it has to be worked out really *in esse*. But one is as much the creative work of His Spirit as the other. And the outcome of this working of the Spirit St. Paul describes as being 'transformed into the same image (εἰκόνα), passing from one glory to another, inasmuch as (this influence proceeds) from the Lord the Spirit' (2 Co 3^{18}, καθάπερ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος). 'Not mere semblance is implied in St. Paul's use of εἰκών, but semblance resting on identity of nature, community of being' (Kennedy, *Last Things*, p. 294). So that the end is nothing less than perfect assimilation to the very nature of God Himself.

(*c*) The *bodily resurrection* of believers depends upon it. Already in the Apostolic Age there were those who, under the influence of non-Christian dualistic pre-suppositions, declared that there was nothing more to hope for than a moral and spiritual rising from the dead, that 'the resurrection has taken place already' (2 Ti 2^{18}). And similar attempts are made to-day, under the influence of the dualistic pre-suppositions of modern thought, to confine the resurrection to the moral and spiritual side of our natures, and thus to exclude the physical. And sometimes the authority of St. Paul is claimed for such a position. Matthew Arnold, *e.g.*, claims that in St. Paul's teaching the expression 'resurrection from the dead' 'has no essential connexion with physical death. . . . Resurrection, in its essential sense, is . . . for Paul the rising, within the sphere of our visible earthly existence, from death in this sense [obedience to sin] to life in this sense [obedience to righteousness]. . . . Christ's physical resurrection after he was crucified is neither in point of time nor in point of character the resurrection on which Paul, following his essential line of thought, wanted to fix the believer's mind. The resurrection Paul was striving after for himself and others was a resurrection *now*, and a resurrection to *righteousness*' (*St. Paul and Protestantism*, ed. London, 1887, p. 55 ff.).

How little this represents St. Paul's point of view may be seen, not only from the argument in 1 Co 15, which we shall presently consider, but from such a passage as Ro $8^{10ff.}$ where St. Paul impressively reasons from the indwelling of the Spirit (or the Risen Christ) in believers, not only to their moral but to their bodily resurrection. 'If Christ is in you, the body is dead [consigned to physical dissolution] because of sin [of Adam]; but the spirit [the human spirit of the believer] is living as the result of righteousness [of Christ]. And,' he goes on—for the spiritual resurrection which has already taken place through the indwelling of the Spirit in the believer is not all—'if the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, then he who raised Christ Jesus from the dead will also make your mortal bodies live by his indwelling Spirit in your lives.' For St. Paul, as for Jewish thought generally, personal life was an indissoluble unity of soul and body. (On the Hebrew 'synthetic view' of life, see Kennedy, *St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things*, pp. 113, 153, 157.) There is no trace in his thinking of the Hellenic dualistic antagonism between body and spirit. And the quickening or 'making alive' which is the result of the indwelling *πνεῦμα* extends to the whole personality, physical as well as moral and spiritual.

It may be, as Matthew Arnold complains, that popular theology has confined the idea of the resurrection both of Christ and of the Christian too much to the bodily resurrection, thus losing sight of the profoundly spiritual conception of the Resurrection for apostolic thought. Jesus had already taught, according to the Johannine account (Jn $11^{25f.}$; cf. $6^{40.44}$ 5^{21} 3^{36}), that the root of the resurrection-life lay in living organic connexion with Him who is the Resurrection and the Life, and apostolic teaching is in line with this. The ground, the operating principle of the resurrection, both spiritual and physical, of the believer is the indwelling in him of the life-giving Spirit, the Spirit of the Risen Christ, or 'the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead.' The link which makes the Christian participate in Christ's resurrection is the possession of His Spirit—'Christ in you the hope of glory' (Col 1^{27}).

Not only is Christ in His resurrection a 'firstfruit (1 Co 15^{20}, *ἀπαρχή*) of them that have fallen asleep,' the promise and earnest of the resurrection of His followers; He is further the *ἀρχή* (Col 1^{18}), the 'first principle' and potency of this resurrection. As death was grounded in Adam, so life is grounded in Christ. 'As in Adam all die [all who belong to Adam's family], so also in Christ shall all be made alive [all who belong to Christ]' (1 Co 15^{22}). The new life derived from Christ, *i.e.*, includes the body as well as the soul in the sphere of its quickening. The indwelling Spirit is a regenerative principle or power for the whole personality, physical as well as moral, leading not only to a moral resurrection now but to a physical resurrection hereafter. Nay more, this physical quickening whose final fruit and issue is in the resurrection after death, is already begun here on earth, leading to a gradual inward transformation of the body (2 Co 4^{16}, 'renewed from day to day'). Through the indwelling of the Spirit, there is already going on in the believer that subjugation of matter to spirit which in its highest manifestation and outcome was exhibited in the resurrection of Christ's body, transfigured and transformed into a more glorified mode of being, and which, in its final issue in the believer, 'shall transform (*μετασχηματίσει*) the body of our humiliation into conformity with the body of his glory (*σύμμορφον τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ*), according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things to himself' (Ph 3^{21}; cf. 1 Jn 3^{2}).

How different a conception of the future life is this from the current Greek conception familiar to the Corinthians, and prevalent in Jewish-Alexandrian literature. The prospect before St. Paul (and the apostles) is not that of a bodiless state, the deliverance of the soul from its earthly 'prison house' (*σῶμα σῆμα*), but the rising to new life of the entire personality. 'We that are in the tabernacle do groan, being burdened';—St. Paul has just been emphasizing the contrast between the weariness and burden of the present earthly life and the glory which awaits the Christian in the eternal future—'for this reason (*ἐπὶ τούτῳ*), not for that we would be unclothed (*or* stripped, *ἐκδύσασθαι*), but that we would be clothed upon (*ἐπενδύσασθαι*), that what is mortal may be swallowed up of life' (2 Co 5^{4}). These words are sometimes taken as giving expression to an intense desire on St. Paul's part that Christ should come (the Parousia take place) before his death, so that he might be spared the terrifying experience of bodily dissolution, and have the corruptible put on incorruption and the mortal put on immortality without that trial. 'If Christ comes first, the Apostle will receive the new body by the transformation, instead of the putting off, of the old; he will, so to speak, put it on *above* the old (*ἐπενδύσασθαι*); he will be spared the shuddering fear of dying; he will not know what it is to have the old tent taken down, and to be left houseless and naked' (Denney, *Expositor's Bible*, '2 Cor.,' p. 175 f.; cf. Kennedy, *St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things*, p. 266). But it is equally true to the Apostle's thought to interpret the words simply as affirming the Christian conception of the future life as opposed to the Greek conception prevalent in Corinth—this in any case is implied—'We groan, not that we long for a disembodied existence, a condition of spiritual nakedness; rather our longing is for the new embodied condition, the possession of the spiritual body.'

Some verses in 2 Co 5 (esp. v.^{8}, 'We choose rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord') have been held to evidence an advance on St. Paul's part, in the interval between 1 Cor. and 2 Cor., to a more spiritual view of the Resurrection, a disembodied immortality (*e.g.* H. J. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der NT Theologie*^{2}, 2 vols., Tübingen, 1911, ii. 193; Charles, *Eschatology*, pp. 397–403). But the words do not justify such a position. St. Paul is simply asserting his confidence that the condition of the believer which is in prospect (the possession of the *σῶμα πνευματικόν*), which is guaranteed by the pledge of the *πνεῦμα*, is infinitely preferable to his present condition of being 'at home in the body' (the *σῶμα ψυχικόν*). And the supposition of a change of conception on St. Paul's part in his later Epistles—in itself very unlikely when we consider the short interval between the two Corinthian Epistles—is decisively negatived by Ph 3^{21}.

The moral significance of such a doctrine cannot be overrated. It gives a new sanction to bodily consecration and temperance. Each sin against the body is no longer, as it was on the Greek conception, a stain on that which is itself doomed to perish, but a defilement of that which is consecrated to an eternal life—'Know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Ghost?' (1 Co 6^{19}); 'the body is not for fornication, but for the Lord; and the Lord for the body . . . your bodies are members of Christ. . . . Glorify God therefore in your body' (vv.$^{13-20}$); 'let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body' (Ro 6^{12}). The nature of the resurrection-body of believers St. Paul sets forth in 1 Co 15^{35-42}, where he endeavours to answer in detail the question, 'With what kind of a body (*ποίῳ σώματι*) do they come?' This was the difficulty which perplexed the Corinthian Christians, and led some of them (*τινές*, v.^{12}) under the influences of Greek thought to deny altogether the possibility of a bodily resurrection. Like most similar present-day objections, the difficulty was based, as St. Paul shows, upon the supposition that it was the identical body laid in the grave that was raised again, that the resurrection meant a revivifying of the present material body, which, as we have seen, was the current popular Jewish idea.

The difficulty or problem of the resurrection of the body St. Paul seeks to elucidate by means of the analogy or metaphor of the sowing of seed. It was an analogy already used by Jesus Himself (Jn 12^{24}), though, as writers of the 'religious-historical' school especially maintain, the use of this analogy or metaphor from the world of vegetation may have been suggested to St. Paul by the prevalence of such nature-myth ideas in popular religious thought, in which case the analogy would appeal with peculiar force to his readers (see J. Weiss, on 1 Co 15^{36}; cf. Kennedy, *St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things*, p. 241). St. Paul's argument on the basis of this analogy is directed to remove the objection to the resurrection of the body derived from its alleged incredibility, and must not be pressed beyond its purpose.

His argument is as follows: 'What you sow (σὺ ὃ σπείρεις) is not made alive (ζωοποιεῖται) unless it dies' (v.^{36}). The seed deposited in the earth has to die before it can develop into a fuller, larger life. The apparent extinction is the condition of a higher vitality. It is not impossible therefore, nor even improbable, that our present body may through death develop into a new and more perfectly equipped body. The fact that we cannot beforehand conceive the nature of this body is no valid objection to the possibility. The same life principle can clothe itself in altered bodily semblance. Who could foretell without previous observation what would spring, *e.g.*, from a grain of wheat? The grain of wheat itself gives to the eye no token or foreshadowing of the stalk with ears and grain that is to develop out of it by God's working in the economy of nature. 'What you sow is not the body that is to be, it is a mere naked undeveloped grain (γυμνὸν κόκκον) of wheat, *e.g.*, or some other seed. But God (ὁ δὲ θεός in contrast to σὺ ὃ σπείρεις in v.^{36}) gives it a body according as He willed.' (καθὼς ἠθέλησε), not 'as He wills'—'the aor. ἠθέλησε denotes the first act of God's will determining the constitution of nature' (T. C. Edwards, *1 Corinthians*^{2}, London, 1885, p. 434; cf. Kennedy, *St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things*, p. 243). 'And to each kind of seed (he gives) a body peculiar to itself (ἴδιον),' the body best fitted to give effective expression to the life which possesses it. So the presumption is that God will find a fit body for man's redeemed nature as He does for each of the seeds vivified in the soil.

'For you must not suppose,' St. Paul argues—coming now (v.$^{39f.}$) to closer quarters with the assumption on which the objection to the resurrection was based, viz. that it is the same identical body that is laid in the grave that is raised up from it—'you must not suppose that there is no other kind of σῶμα than that consisting of σάρξ which you now possess. Even as regards earthly fleshly bodies, there are great varieties in the Divine economy of nature, bodies of men, of beasts, of birds, of fishes, each fitted to life in its own element. And there are not only earthly bodies (σώματα ἐπίγεια) but heavenly bodies (σώματα ἐπουράνια), bodies for heavenly beings just as there are for earthly, and great varieties here also, each fitted to their several distinctive ends or constitution.' 'So,' he says, summing up his discussion on this point, 'with the resurrection of the dead, the quickening of the present body through death into another body unimaginably different from it is in the inexhaustible variety of God's resources—for the secret of all is the power of God—as possible and likely as the springing up of the seed in a wholly different fuller and larger form of life. God, we may well expect, will equip the redeemed life with a body or organism as fitted to the conditions of the future life as the present body is to the conditions of earth.'

This future body or organism he describes by contrast with the present body in the following four particulars: 'The sowing is in corruption (ἐν φθορᾷ), the rising in incorruption (ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ), sown inglorious (ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ) it rises in glory (ἐν δόξῃ), sown in weakness (ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ) it rises in power (ἐν δυνάμει), sown a natural body (σῶμα ψυχικόν) it rises a spiritual body' (σῶμα πνευματικόν) (v.$^{43f.}$). In the last contrast the root cause or reason of the other contrasts is given. 'Corruption,' 'dishonour,' and 'weakness' are the characteristics of a 'natural' body; 'incorruption,' 'glory,' and 'power' are the characteristics of a 'spiritual' body. 'The ψυχή, the natural principle of being, the life-force in the individual, has by God's appointment an organism corresponding to itself, the σῶμα ψυχικόν, the body whose substance is σάρξ, with all which that, in the actual condition of human nature, implies; whose end is necessarily φθορά, decay. . . . The πνεῦμα, on the other hand, the Divine gift, the power which enters human nature in response to faith, and changes it so that henceforward it is governed by a Divine principle, will be equipped with an organism corresponding to itself, the σῶμα πνευματικόν, the "body" which has no *fleshly* element inherent in it, which therefore enters upon ἀφθαρσία, incorruption, immortality, as its necessary sphere of existence' (Kennedy, p. 252 f.).

Now there is here a difference of interpretation. The first impulse is to refer the 'sowing' here spoken of to the burial and dissolution in the grave after death, and the 'rising' to the coming forth from the grave after death. (So Bengel, *e.g.* Of σπείρεται he says, 'verbum amœnissimum pro sepultura.') But many scholars hold that this is unwarrantably to limit the Apostle's point of view and to confuse his analogy. Our present life, it is held, is for St. Paul the seed time (Gal 6$^{7ff.}$), and our mortal bodies (Ro 8$^{10f.}$) are in the germinal state, concluding with death, out of which a wholly different organism will spring. The attributes of φθορά (cf. Ro 8^{21}), ἀτιμία (cf. Ph 3^{21}), ἀσθενεία (cf. 2 Co 13^{4}) are, it is said, those that St. Paul is wont to ascribe to man's condition in his present state of existence in contrast with the ἀφθαρσία, δόξα, δύναμις of the post-resurrection state (cf. 2 Co 4$^{7. 10. 16}$ 5$^{1. 4}$, Ro 1^{4} 8$^{18-23}$; see Findlay, *EGT*, *in loc.*; Milligan, *Resurrection*, p. 168; Charles, *Eschatology*, p. 392). The difference of interpretation is important for its bearing on the question as to when the process of transformation from the one kind of body to the other takes place, and the latter interpretation is in line with what we have seen to be St. Paul's view, that through relation to Christ the resurrection-life, not only moral but physical, begins here, to be consummated after death.

What, however, St. Paul is concerned with in this passage is primarily the contrast between the two bodies, the 'natural' and the 'spiritual,' and their genetic relations. The σῶμα ψυχικόν we have in relation to Adam, the natural head of the human race, who through the Divine creative inbreathing became 'a living soul' (ψυχὴ ζῶσα). The σῶμα πνευματικόν we have in relation to Christ, the second Adam, who through the Resurrection has become a life-creating Spirit (πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν), the founder and head of a new humanity (v.^{45}). 'Man the first is from the earth earthy' (χοϊκός, 'material' [Moffatt]). 'Man the second is from heaven' (ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, v.^{47}). (On this contrast between the 'heavenly' man and the 'earthly' and its relation to current Hellenistic ideas, see Weiss, *in loc.*, and Feine, *Theol. des NT*, p. 353.) And as we have borne the likeness of the earthly man, so we are to bear (reading φορέσομεν) the likeness of the heavenly man (v.^{49}). Not the body of flesh therefore, the self-expression of the ψυχή, the natural principle of life which we have in relation to Adam the first member of the race, is that which will be raised up as the organism of our future glorious existence, for it is subject to weakness and corruption. 'This I admit, flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption' (v.^{50}). This σῶμα ψυχικόν, the body of our humiliation, shall be exchanged for a body made like unto (σύμμορφον) the body of Christ's glory, the body of the Exalted Lord, the second Adam, who in His risen 'heavenly' life possesses a σῶμα πνευματικόν, a body which is the perfect organ and instrument of the Spirit's self-expression. What the substance of this spiritual body is, is not described (is it δόξα?), only its formative principle. To call it spiritual is not to assert its immateriality or to identify it with spirit, but to affirm its complete subordination to the purposes of spirit. Just as the natural or psychical body does not consist of soul, neither does the spiritual or pneumatical body consist of spirit (cf. Simpson, *Resurrection and Modern Thought*, p. 331).

The support afforded by modern science to the apostolic view of the Resurrection-Body, in particular to St. Paul's doctrine of the 'spiritual body' and its connexion with the 'natural,' is striking and noteworthy. The whole trend of modern psychology is to draw the two sides of man's nature, the bodily and the spiritual, more closely together by emphasizing the dominance of spirit over matter, recognizing that

> '. . . of the soule the bodie forme doth take;
> For soule is forme, and doth the bodie make'
> (Spenser, *An Hymne in Honour of Beautie*, l. 132 f.).

The identity even of our present bodies is now conceived by science in a less materialistic fashion, as consisting not in identity of the particles of matter of which the body is composed, for this is continually changing, but in that which organizes them and makes them the instrument or medium of its expression, the vital organic constructive principle which in its own nature is spiritual. As Origen expressed it, drawing out the Pauline teaching, 'the "body" is the same not by any material continuity, but by the permanence of that which gives the law, the "ratio" (λόγος) . . . of its constitution,' the *ratio insita a Deo* (see Westcott, art. 'Origenes,' *DCB* iv. 138 n.). Further, the essential meaning of body, science itself is more and more insisting, is the vehicle of manifestation or expression of spirit, and this will take different forms in different conditions of existence. 'The real meaning of the bodily life is its spiritual meaning. . . . The bodily being is but vehicle, is but utterance of the spiritual, and the ultimate reality even of the bodily being is only what it is spiritually' (Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood*, p. 40). 'A human body is the necessary—is the only—method and condition, on earth, of spiritual personality. It is capable, indeed, of expressing spirit very badly . . . it is, in fact, almost always falling short of at least the ideal expression of it. And yet body is *the only* method of spiritual life; even as things are, spirit is the true meaning of bodily life; and bodies are really vehicles and expressions of spirit; . . . the perfect ideal would certainly be, not spirit without body, but body which was the ideally perfect utterance of spirit' (Moberly, *Problems and Principles*, p. 358). Admitting the scientific truth of this view of the relation of body and spirit, O. Lodge recognizes the probability of a future embodied state. 'Since our identity and personality in no way depend upon identity of material particles, and since our present body has been "composed" by our characteristic element or soul, it is legitimate to suppose that some other "body" can equally well be hereafter composed by the same agency; in other words, that the spirit will retain the power of constructing for itself a suitable vehicle of manifestation, which is the essential meaning of the term "body"' (*Man and the Universe*, London, 1908, p. 281 f.). In particular, he recognizes the reasonableness of the Christian doctrine of a bodily resurrection. 'Christianity both by its doctrines and its ceremonies rightly emphasises the material aspect of existence. For it is founded upon the idea of Incarnation; and its belief in some sort of bodily resurrection is based on the idea that every real personal existence must have a double aspect—not spiritual alone, nor physical alone, but in some way both. Such an opinion . . . is by no means out of harmony with science. Christianity, therefore, reasonably supplements the mere survival of a discarnate spirit, a homeless wanderer or melancholy ghost, with the warm and comfortable clothing of something that may legitimately be spoken of as a "body"; that is to say, it postulates a supersensually appreciable vehicle or mode of manifestation, fitted to subserve the needs of future existence as our bodies subserve the needs of terrestrial life' (*HJ* vi. [1907–08] 294 f.; cf. 'The Material Element in Christianity,' *ib.* iv. [1905–06] 314 ff., and *Substance of Faith*, London, 1907, p. 106).

To a great many questions raised by the inquiring mind in this connexion no answer is supplied by the Apostle. As to the nature of the process or method by which the 'natural' body will be changed at the Resurrection into the 'spiritual' body, St. Paul never speculates. His interest was practical, not theoretical. He was writing as a missionary, not as a dogmatic theologian, and he confines himself to positive conceptions. It is sufficient for him that he is sure of two things: (1) that the cause or operating principle (ἀρχή) is the power of the new Divine life in the believer's nature, the same power that raised Jesus; and (2) that the end or consummation of the process is the transformation into the likeness of the body of Christ's glory. We are apt to dwell more on the difference between the resurrection of Christ and that of Christians. In one respect, in particular, Christ's resurrection was different from the resurrection of believers. The body of Christ saw no corruption. If Christ's natural body had remained in the grave, no demonstration had been given in His resurrection of that continuity between the earthly body and the risen body which is implied in St. Paul's representation. So St. Paul recognizes two 'orders' (1 Co 15^{23}, *τάγματα*, groups or divisions) of the risen: the one contains none but Christ the 'firstfruit' (ἀπαρχή), who rose on the third day; the other is composed of those who belong to Christ who shall rise 'afterwards' (ἔπειτα), defined as 'at the Parousia.' But as to *how* they shall rise St. Paul does not speculate.

Again, no information is given as to the Apostle's conception of the state after death of those who had died or shall die before the Parousia. St. Paul betrays little interest in the Intermediate State. 'The influence upon his heart and mind of the crucified and risen Messiah fixed for ever the point of emphasis in his outlook upon the future. He was able to ignore many aspects of the Last Things on which Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic had set great importance. To go to Christ, to be with Christ, overshadowed all the accompaniments of the End. He knew that nothing could separate His followers from the love of Christ in time or in eternity' (Kennedy, *Last Things*, p. 312). As Wernle succinctly expresses it, the 'longing [to be with Christ] spans the chasm that lies between death and the resurrection, and proceeds straight to the desired goal, to the meeting with Jesus' (*Beginnings of Christianity*, i. 287).

So it is that even on a question apparently so central as that of a general resurrection little light is given in St. Paul's writings. His absorbing interest was in the resurrection of believers, the resurrection whose operating principle or ἀρχή is the power of the indwelling Spirit. And his description of the resurrection-body as 'spiritual,' *i.e.*, a fit organ for the spirit, is one which cannot refer to any but Christians. A resurrection of unbelievers as well as believers is involved in his recognition of a universal judgment at the Parousia of Christ (Ac 24^{15}, Ro 2$^{5ff.}$ 14$^{10.\,12}$, 1 Co 6^{2} 11^{32}, 2 Co 5^{10}), but such a resurrection occupies a subordinate place in Pauline eschatology and must proceed on different lines. What St. Paul is interested in is the resurrection of Christians, and the other though recognized is not dwelt upon or in any way elaborated—possibly he had not come to definite conclusions on the matter. A resurrection of the wicked as well as of the righteous was recognized in Jewish apocalyptic literature (cf. Dn 12^{2}, *Apoc. Bar.* xxx. 2–5 and 2 Es 7$^{32-37}$), though the more general view in apocalyptic Judaism limited the scope of the resurrection to the righteous. In the teaching of Jesus a general resurrection is presupposed. In Jn 5$^{28f.}$ He speaks of a resurrection of 'all that are in the graves,' and distinguishes a 'resurrection of life' (ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς) from a 'resurrection of condemnation or judgment' (ἀνάστασιν κρίσεως). The rejection of these verses as an interpolation on the ground that their teaching is not found in the Synoptics or elsewhere in John itself is not justified. Charles (*Eschatology*, p. 371 n.) holds that the doctrine of the resurrection of the wicked in Jn. is an intrusion due to Judaistic influence. But a general resurrection of just and unjust forms at least the background of the thought in Mt 5$^{29f.}$ 10^{28} 12$^{41f.}$ 25$^{31-46}$, Lk 11^{32}, Jn 12^{48}.

In the Fourth Gospel, it is true, a profounder view of the resurrection-life is revealed than that contained in the Synoptics. The resurrection is represented as intimately connected with the spiritual renewal or quickening which comes of organic relationship between Christ and believers (11$^{25f.}$; cf. 6$^{40.\,44}$ 5^{21} 3^{36}). So that, while the resurrection in some sense of unbelievers is affirmed (5$^{28f.}$ 12^{48}), it must have a widely different basis and meaning from that of believers. It is referred to the omnipotence of the Father: 'the Father raiseth the dead and quickeneth them' (5^{21}). But faith's primary interest is in 'the resurrection of life,' the resurrection of those who are 'in Christ,' and the apostolic writers often use language as if there were no other. So it is that scanty reference is made to a general resurrection in St. Paul's writings. Lightfoot (on Ph 3^{11}) distinguishes firmly between ἡ ἀνάστασις (or ἐξανάστασις) ἡ ἐκ νεκρῶν and ἡ ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν, the former being equivalent to ἀνάστασις ζωῆς, the latter to ἀνάστασις κρίσεως (Jn 5^{29}).

There are indeed those who hold that in 1 Co 15^{24} there is an explicit reference to the resurrection of unbelievers, interpreting τὸ τέλος as 'the last act (of the resurrection)' (Meyer) or 'the remainder,' the rest of men, those not 'in Christ,' as forming a third *τάγμα*. According to this view, a resurrection of believers takes place at the Parousia, then, after an interval of indefinite duration—between the point marked by ἔπειτα and the following εἶτα in which Christ gradually subdues all His enemies—a resurrection of the wicked (see Lietzmann and J. Weiss, *in loc.*). Such a millennarian view finds support in Rev 20$^{4f.}$, where, although there is no specific reference to the resurrection of the wicked, this is implied in the expression 'the first resurrection,' as well as in the connexion established between the Resurrection and the Judgment. But the introduction of such a thought is quite irrelevant to St. Paul's argument here where he is answering the difficulties raised as to the resurrection of those who have died in Christ. St. Paul's interest throughout is in the resurrection of Christians, and for the rest he is content to urge men to the attaining of this resurrection (Ph 3^{11}), and to warn them of the fate attendant on the rejection of Christ (Ro 2^{5}, 2 Th 1^{9}; cf. 1 Th 1^{10}, Ph 3^{19}, etc.).

3. What it means for the Kingdom of God.—The resurrection of Christ, as thus the ground not only of the moral but of the physical resurrection of believers, is further the pledge and ground of the ultimate dominance of spiritual interests, the consummation of the Kingdom of God. This is its wider cosmic significance.

(*a*) The redemption of the body from the power of death and the grave, St. Paul shows, is an essential part of the Divine world-plan, necessary to the fulfilment of God's Kingdom through Christ (1 Co 15$^{20-28}$). Without this Christ is not Lord of all; 'all things' are not subdued unto Him (v.^{27}). 'Then comes the end (τὸ τέλος, not merely the termination, but the consummation, expressing and manifesting the goal of the whole process) when he shall have abolished every rule (ἀρχήν) and every authority (ἐξουσίαν) and power (δύναμιν)'—every force or power antagonistic to the Divine dominion. 'The last enemy to be abolished is death (ὁ θάνατος).' For St. Paul, death, not the mere physical experience, but, as for Hebrew thought generally, this experience in co-relation with sin, was the supreme enemy (see Kennedy, *Last Things*, p. 113). When 'he' (ὁ θάνατος—St. Paul almost personifies it) has been vanquished, Christ's dominion is complete (cf. He 2^{14}, 'Him that had the power of death, that is, the devil,' and Rev 20^{14}). In the resurrection of Christ we have the assurance that sin and death are not the final realities in the universe, but are destined to be swallowed up in victory.

(*b*) In the redemption of the body through Christ, we have the pledge of the ultimate subjugation of the entire material order to the purposes of spirit, the revelation of the destiny of the whole material universe to be included in the transformation wrought by Christ. The material order has shared with the moral and spiritual in the consequences of sin. It has been subjected to futility (ματαιότητι, Ro 8^{20}), to vain striving; the full purpose of its existence has been defeated through man's sin. Like human life, it is 'in thraldom to decay' (v.^{21}, φθορά) and 'waits with eager longing' (v.^{19}) for 'the freedom of the glory (τῆς δόξης) of the children of God' (v.^{21}). The redemption of the body (ἡ ἀπολύτρωσις τοῦ σώματος) which is the climax of material evolution, the rescue of it from the bondage of φθορά, and the transfiguring and transforming of it so as to make it the complete instrument of the spirit—this contains the promise of the transfiguration and transformation of the entire creation, 'new heavens and a new earth' (2 P 3^{13}, Rev 21^{1}), 'all things new' (Rev 21^{5}). In the resurrection of Christ as the pledge and ground of the moral and physical resurrection of believers we have, accordingly, the assurance that the redemption of Christ involves the rectification of the material as well as of the spiritual universe. This new condition of things Jesus once names the 'regeneration' or 'new birth' (παλινγενεσία, Mt 19^{18}) of all things. (St. Peter's phrase in Ac 3^{21} [ἄχρι χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων] rendered in AV 'until the times of restitution of all things' is hardly a parallel.)

(*c*) So, finally, in the resurrection of Christ we have the pledge of the consummation of God's redeeming purpose—the 'summing up (ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι) all things in Christ, the things in heaven, and the things on earth' (Eph 1^{10}), and thus the bringing in of final world-unity, when 'Christ is all and in all' (πάντα καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν, Col 3^{11}). For 'it pleased (the Father)'—this was His aim—'through (διά) him to reconcile all things unto (εἰς) himself . . . whether things upon the earth, or things in the heavens' (Col 1^{20}; cf. Ph 2$^{9-11}$). The Resurrection, that is to say, was for the apostles not only the completion of the incarnation and atonement of Jesus; it was the fulfilment of the original purpose of God in creation, the consummation of the whole evolutionary process. This is expressed most definitely by St. Paul in Col 1$^{15ff.}$, where Christ, 'the firstborn of all creation' (πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως), its norm and type, that which sets for it its true end—'for in him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth . . . all things have been created through him, and unto [with a view to] him' (εἰς αὐτόν, v.$^{15f.}$)—is described as the beginning (ἀρχή, the first principle), the first begotten from the dead in order that He might become (ἵνα γένηται) prominent over all (ἐν πᾶσιν, 'no doubt purposely left indefinite, including every province of creation' [Kennedy, *St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things*, p. 298]). Through the Resurrection, as the culmination of the Incarnation and Atonement, by means of which Christ becomes the ἀρχή or life-giving principle of a new humanity, God's aim in the whole process of creation attains its end.

LITERATURE.—On the significance of the Resurrection see **W. Milligan**, *Resurrection of our Lord*, London, 1881, lects. iv., v., vi.; **B. F. Westcott**, *Gospel of the Resurrection*^{7}, do., 1891, chs. ii. and iii.; **S. D. F. Salmond**, *Christian Doctrine of Immortality*^{4}, Edinburgh, 1901, bks. iv., v., vi.; **J. Orr**, *Resurrection of Jesus*, London, 1908, ch. x.; **D. W. Forrest**, *Christ of History and of Experience*^{7}, Edinburgh, 1914, lect. iv.; **E. Griffith-Jones**, *The Ascent through Christ*^{6}, London, 1901, bk. iii. chs. i. and ii.; **W. J. Sparrow Simpson**, *Resurrection and Modern Thought*, do., 1911, bk. iii., art. 'Resurrection of Christ,' in *DCG* ii. 512; **B. Lucas**, *The Fifth Gospel*, London, 1907, p. 160 ff.; **D. S. Cairns**, 'The Risen Christ,' in *Christ and Human Need*, do., 1912, p. 176 f.; **H. Scott Holland**, 'The Power of the Resurrection,' in *Miracles*, do., 1911, p. 118 ff.; **S. Eck**, 'Die Bedeutung der Auferstehung Jesu für die Urgemeinde und für uns,' in *Hefte zur christlichen Welt*, xxxii. [1898]; **R. H. Grützmacher**, *Modern-positive Vorträge*, Leipzig, 1906, pp. 109–129, 'Jesu Auferstehung und der Mensch der Gegenwart.'

V. ***ATTEMPTED EXPLANATIONS OF THE BELIEF.***—The character and significance of the apostolic belief in the resurrection of Christ have been considered, and the historical evidence on which the belief was based. It remains to review the attempts which have been made to account for the apostolic belief and its consequences without acknowledging the full fact of the Resurrection, as this is represented in the apostolic writings.

i. OLDER FORMS OF EXPLANATION.—Some of the older naturalistic hypotheses may now be regarded as obsolete and abandoned. They have practically only a historical or antiquarian interest, and do not need to be re-argued at length. Yet they are not on that account to be overlooked. As monuments not only recording past history, but serving as warnings to all time of the futility of certain methods of explanation, they demand passing notice.

1. The swoon theory.—According to this theory, Jesus' supposed death on the Cross was in reality only a swoon, a case of 'suspended animation.' In the cool air of the cavern tomb He revived and again appeared among His disciples. This explanation—a favourite one in the school of 18th cent. rationalism, and associated especially with the name of Paulus—is now hopelessly discredited. To escape with His life after having been nailed to the Cross meant that the Resurrection, if resurrection it could be called, was a return to life under the same conditions as before, and this, as we have seen, is not the kind of fact with which the records deal. The practical difficulties of the theory are insuperable. If Jesus had presented Himself merely as one who had stolen half-dead out of the sepulchre, His appearance would have produced the impression of weakness and helplessness, not that of a conqueror over death and the grave. (For a trenchant statement of these practical difficulties see Strauss, *New Life of Jesus*, i. 412.)

2. The theft or fraud theory.—A second hypothesis, which may also be taken as now practically discredited, is the theory that the disciples, in order that they might still have a message, stole the body and pretended that Jesus had risen. The theory is an old one—the oldest of all indeed, if we may believe the story of Mt 25$^{11-15}$, which was still current in the days of Justin Martyr (*Dial. with Trypho*, 17). The theory thus anticipated by the Jewish authorities was urged, though with some difference of detail, by Celsus (see Origen, *c. Cels.* ii. 56). It is identified in modern times chiefly with the name of Reimarus. The theory thus stated would found Christianity on imposture or fraud. But no sober critic now challenges the good faith of the first disciples in their witness. They 'really had the impression of having seen him' (Schmiedel, *EBi* iv. 4061). A more recent form of the theory is that adopted by O. Holtzmann (*Life of Jesus*, p. 499), that the body was quietly removed by the owner of the grave without the knowledge of the disciples. Joseph of Arimathæa, feeling, on reflexion, that it would not do to have in his respectable family vault the body of a man who had been crucified, had the body of Jesus secretly removed and buried elsewhere. Another form of the theory is that suggested by A. Réville (see *Jésus de Nazareth. Études critiques sur les antécédents de l'histoire évangélique*, Paris, 1897, ii. 420 ff.), that the leaders of the Sanhedrin bribed the soldiers to remove the body lest the tomb might become an object of pilgrimage to Jesus' followers in Galilee, and fanatical outbreaks might occur in Jerusalem. Lake gives what he holds to be a more possible hypothesis. His suggestion is that the women in the dusk of the morning came to a tomb which they thought was the one in which they had seen the Lord buried. 'They expected to find a closed tomb, but they found an open one; and a young man, who was in the entrance, guessing their errand, tried to tell them that they had made a mistake in the place. "He is not here," said he; "see the place where they laid him," and probably pointed to the next tomb. But the women were frightened at the detection of their errand and fled, only imperfectly or not at all understanding what they heard' (*The Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, p. 251 f.). B. H. Streeter (in *Foundations*, London, 1912, p. 134) claims that 'with a little ingenuity it is not difficult to imagine more than one set of circumstances which might account on purely natural grounds for the tomb being found empty.'

But, apart altogether from the consideration that the theory in these different forms contradicts the historical evidence in vital points, and that to ascribe to fraud or mistake the rise of a belief with such revolutionary effects in the thought and life of the disciples is altogether improbable as an adequate explanation, there is one fact on which all such theories come to grief. Within a few weeks of the Death and the Burial the disciples were boldly proclaiming in the streets of the very city where Jesus had been crucified, and even before the authorities who were responsible for the Crucifixion, that God raised Him up on the third day, and through this public proclamation were making multitudes of converts. If their testimony was false, why did not the Jewish and Roman authorities for ever silence the disciples by pointing to where the body of Jesus still lay, or by showing how it had come to be removed from the tomb in which it had been laid after the Crucifixion? What could have been at once easier and more effective? Even after an interval of fifty days, as medical science acknowledges, the body must have been recognizable. 'The silence of the Jews is as significant as the speech of the Christians' (Fairbairn, *Studies in the Life of Christ*, p. 357). '*Did not* in this case spells *could not*, and the empty tomb remains an unimpeachable witness to the truth of the message that the Lord had risen' (Orr, *Resurrection of Jesus*, p. 213 f.).

3. The subjective vision or mental hallucination theory.—This is the most weighty of the older theories put forward to explain the apostolic belief in the Resurrection, without acknowledging the actual fact. According to this theory the so-called 'appearances' of the Risen Christ were due to the excited state of mind in which the disciples were after the death of their Master. Overwrought and mentally distraught by the shock of His death, and yearning for His presence, they saw apparitions or visions of Him. But these were purely subjective—phantasms or mental hallucinations. They longed to see Him; they expected to see Him; and they thought they did see Him. Their thought was perfectly honest, but it was nevertheless a hallucination. For persons in a state of unusual mental excitement and expectancy, especially when they are also of a highly strung nervous temperament, such visions are, it is represented, common phenomena of religious history, and are often contagious. So it was in the case of the appearances of Jesus. They began with the women, probably with Mary Magdalene, an excitable and nervous person. Her story that she had seen the Lord was eagerly embraced; it spread with lightning rapidity, and with the force of an epidemic. What she believed she had seen others believed they too must see, and they saw. The visions were the product of their dwelling in fond and affectionate memory on the personality of their Master, which, after the first shock of despair was over, they came to feel was such that He must have survived death. So it is that Renan represents the case. As he puts it, 'Ce qui a ressuscité Jésus, c'est l'amour' (*Les Apôtres*, Paris, 1866, ch. i., Eng. tr., London, 1869). With this Strauss combines reflexion upon certain passages of the OT expressing faith in the Resurrection, together with recollection of the Master's own predictions of the fact. The inadequacy of such a theory to account for a belief with such incalculably momentous results as the belief in the Resurrection has often been exposed, but because of its continued prevalence in one form or other in the present day—such recent critics as Schmiedel, Weizsäcker, Harnack, A. Meyer, and Loisy support it—the chief objections to it, in addition to the fundamental consideration referred to at the end of last section, which applies equally against all forms of the vision theory, may be briefly indicated.

(1) Such a psychological condition as is necessary to the vision theory is absent on the disciples' part. With hearts sad and hopes broken, so far from expecting a Resurrection, they could hardly be persuaded of the fact even after it occurred (Lk 24^{11}, Jn 20^{9-25}, Mk $16^{11.13}$). The women themselves who went on the third morning to the tomb went to anoint a dead body, not to behold a Risen Lord. (2) With reference to Strauss's attempt to base the expectation on certain passages of the OT, there is no evidence of any Jewish belief in Jesus' time of a resurrection from the dead before the last day, much less of such a resurrection as took place in the case of Jesus (see Edersheim, *LT*^{4} ii. 624). Even Jesus' own intimations that He would rise again, frequently as they were given (*e.g.* Mt 16^{21} 17^{9} 20^{19} 26^{32}, etc., and ‖s), seem to have made no impression upon the disciples. The thought was so strange to them that they were unable to receive it. Only after the event were these predictions understood (cf. Jn 2^{22}). (3) The tradition of 'the third day' and of the appearances already on this day of the Risen Christ in Jerusalem is set aside as affording too little time for the rise of visions. So the upholders of the vision theory feel the necessity of transferring the appearances of Jesus from Jerusalem to Galilee, thus not only giving more time for visions to develop, but transferring them to scenes where memory and imagination could more easily work. This involves the separating them from the empty tomb and the events of the Easter morn, which we have seen to be facts firmly rooted in the apostolic tradition. The inadequacy of Strauss's endeavour to show how the belief in 'the third day' may have originated from OT hints (*New Life*, i. 438 f.) has already been referred to. (4) The fact that the manifestations were made not merely to this or that individual but to companies of persons at the same time, 'the twelve,' 'all the apostles,' 'more than five hundred,' increases many-fold the difficulty of explaining as the product of subjective vision the fact to which they bear witness. There are no doubt genuine instances of 'collective' delusion, an impression received or idea conceived by one ardent soul being transmitted by a kind of electric sympathy to others ready to bear witness that they have had a like experience. Schmiedel gives some instances (*EBi* iv. 4083); but there is this fundamental difference between these and the appearances of the Risen Christ, that in the latter case, as the narratives bear distinctly on their face, the whole company was instantaneously affected in the same way. (5) The theory is inconsistent with the fact that the visions came so suddenly to an end. After the forty days no appearance of the Risen Lord is recorded, except that to St. Paul, the circumstances and object of which were altogether exceptional. It is not thus that imagination works. As Keim says, 'the spirits that men call up are not so quickly laid' (*Jesus of Nazara*, vi. 357).

4. The objective vision or telegram hypothesis.—Keim, realizing the difficulties of the last theory, advanced the hypothesis that the appearances, while essentially of the nature of visions, were not purely subjective—the result of the enthusiasm and mental excitement of the disciples—but real, objectively caused manifestations of the Risen Christ. His theory is that, while the body of the

Crucified Jesus remained in the tomb, His living spirit sent telegrams to the disciples to assure them that He still lived, telegrams or supernatural manifestations which the disciples took for *bona fide* bodily appearances of their Risen Master (*Jesus of Nazara*, vi. 364). Keim thinks that in this way he saves the truth of the Resurrection. 'Though much has fallen away, the secure faith-fortress of the resurrection of Jesus remains' (p. 365). The aim of the theory is, while acknowledging a kind of resurrection, to relieve the mind from the difficulty of believing in an actual resurrection of the body from the grave. The root of the theory is thus aversion to the recognition of the supernatural in the physical realm. In such a theory, Keim himself acknowledges, the supernatural is not altogether eliminated. 'Christian faith . . . oversteps these boundaries [of the natural order], not merely in the certain assurance that Jesus . . . took his course to the higher world of God and of spirits . . . but also in the conviction that it was he and no other who, as dead yet risen again, as celestially glorified even if not risen, vouchsafed visions to his disciples' (p. 360). The intervention of the supernatural in the normal, mental, or psychological order of the disciples' experience is thus presumed. Once we admit such an intervention, however, there is no reason why we should not proceed further to the full apostolic affirmation —for which this is a poor substitute—that Jesus burst the bands of death and came forth bodily from the tomb on the morning of the third day.

Of this theory Bruce remarks with truth that it is 'a bastard supernaturalism as objectionable to unbelievers as the true supernaturalism of the Catholic creed, and having the additional drawback that it offers to faith asking for bread a stone' (*Apologetics*, p. 393). Besides, there is the further difficulty urged by Bruce that Keim's hypothesis requires us to believe that the faith of the Christian Church is based upon a revelation from heaven which was in fact misleading. 'Christ sends a series of telegrams from heaven to let His disciples know that all is well. But what does the telegram say in every case? Not merely, My Spirit lives with God and cares for you; but, my body is risen from the grave. . . . If the resurrection be an unreality, if the body that was nailed to the tree never came forth from the tomb, why send messages that were certain to produce an opposite impression?' (*ib.*). The hypothesis really means that Christ deceives His disciples by inducing them, and through them the whole Christian Church, to believe a lie. The new turn given to the theory by psychical research will be considered below (ii. 1).

LITERATURE.—For criticism of older theories see T. Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, Eng. tr., 6 vols., London, 1873–83, vi.; A. B. Bruce, *Apologetics*, Edinburgh, 1892, pp. 383–398; W. Milligan, *Resurrection of our Lord*, London, 1881, lect. iii.; J. Orr, *Resurrection of Jesus*, do., 1908, ch. viii.; A. M. Fairbairn, *Studies in the Life of Christ*, do., 1881, ch. xviii.

ii. MORE RECENT EXPLANATIONS.—The character of the attack on the Resurrection in recent times has changed in some important respects. New knowledge and new critical methods have given rise to new ways of attempting to explain the belief in the Resurrection without accepting the full facts presented in the apostolic narratives. A close relation exists between these different theories—they are but different aspects of the same attempt to remove or minimize the supernatural in Christianity—but different forms can be distinguished according to the difference of emphasis.

1. The psychological or psychical research theory.—A new turn, and with it a new vogue, has been given to the objective vision theory in recent times by bringing the appearances of the Risen Christ recorded in the narratives into line with the phenomena of psychical research. The late F. W. H. Myers, the leader in this movement, held that psychical research had definitely established the reality of telepathic intercommunication between this world and another. 'Observation, experiment, inference, have led many inquirers, of whom I am one, to a belief in direct or telepathic intercommunication, not only between the minds of men still on earth, but between minds or spirits still on earth and spirits departed' (*Human Personality and its Survival of Bodily Death*, p. 350). And so highly did Myers estimate the worth of the evidence supplied by these psychical investigations that he predicted that 'in consequence of the new evidence, all reasonable men, a century hence, will believe the Resurrection of Christ, whereas, in default of the new evidence, no reasonable men, a century hence, would have believed it' (*ib.* p. 351). The ground of this prediction he proceeds to state: 'Our ever-growing recognition of the continuity, the uniformity of cosmic law has gradually made of the alleged *uniqueness* of any incident its almost inevitable refutation . . . and especially as to that central claim, of the soul's life manifested after the body's death, it is plain that this can less and less be supported by remote tradition alone; that it must more and more be tested by modern experience and inquiry' (*ib.*).

The position thus stated has found considerable support, among both theologians and scientists. It is to 'the type of phenomena collected by the Society of Psychical Research, and especially by the late Mr. F. W. H. Myers,' that Lake, *e.g.*, turns for help in understanding the nature of the appearances of the Risen Christ (*The Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, p. 272). As to the results already obtained in this sphere he expresses himself more cautiously than Myers. He thinks it possible that at least 'some evidence' already exists pointing to the fact of such communications having taken place. But 'we must wait until the experts have sufficiently sifted the arguments for alternative explanations of the phenomena, before they can actually be used as reliable evidence for the survival of personality after death' (p. 245). As to the value of the evidence, however, when thus sifted and substantiated, Lake has no doubt. The belief in the Resurrection even in the sense of the personal survival of Jesus after death depends on the success of the experiments and investigations of psychical research. It must remain 'merely an hypothesis until it can be shown' through these experiments and investigations 'that personal life does endure beyond death, is neither extinguished nor suspended, and is capable of manifesting its existence to us' (*ib.*). Some of the leading representatives of present-day science, too, have found in the phenomena of psychical research new support in favour of belief in the recorded appearances of Christ after His death. Lodge, *e.g.*, maintains that the narratives of the appearances are substantially accurate records of genuine psychical experiences on the part of the apostles. The appearances during the forty days are mysterious enough, but they can be accepted very much as they stand, for they agree with our experience of genuine psychical phenomena the world over (cf. *Man and the Universe*, p. 290). This relating of the appearances of the Risen Christ to psychical phenomena is held to explain some of the difficulties belonging to the narratives, in particular the apparent discrepancy in regard to the locality of the appearances (see *Resurrectio Christi*, London, 1909; *Interpreter*, vi. [1909–10] 306).

Now this branch of psychological science is still in its infancy, and it is difficult to speak yet of any definiteness of results. But already it is evident that a new chapter in the discussion of the Resurrection has opened here. The whole question of relation of body and spirit has taken on a new aspect through these investigations. The mystery of human personality and the possession of hitherto unrecognized powers, not only of mind over mind, but of mind over body, is being revealed as never before. The evidences of hypernormal mental control, especially in the hypnotic state, over bodily processes (*e.g.* the production of blisters and ecchymoses of the skin, the so-called 'stigmata' by verbal suggestion) show that mind has the power of exerting a far greater influence over body than had been generally recognized by physiologists (see, *e.g.*, MacDougall, *Body and Mind*, ch. xxv.). And the evidence produced by such investigations of the control of matter by spirit in extraordinary if not preternatural ways may aid not a little in removing prejudice to the facts recorded in the narratives as to the resurrection and ascension of Christ. 'When scientists of world-wide reputation, trained in the strictest school of scientific inquiry, such as Sir William Crookes, Sir Oliver Lodge, and Sir Alfred Wallace, declare, as they have done, that they have verified the fact by repeated experiment that ponderable bodies can be moved without physical contact by some hitherto unrecognised force which was brought into play by the action of human will, it is no longer possible to treat with scientific contempt the assertions contained in the Gospels that Christ's material body disappeared from the tomb as the result of a hitherto unrecognised force which was exerted upon it without physical contact' (Robinson, *Studies in the Resurrection*, p. 97). It is doubtful, however, how far help can be obtained from this quarter in understanding the bodily manifestations of Jesus to His disciples recorded in the narratives. The verdict of most critics will, we fancy, be at present one of non-committal.

Against the attempt to bring the resurrection of Christ into line with the phenomena dealt with by psychical research and to make belief in the Resurrection dependent on the scientific verification of these phenomena in the way that Myers and Lake suggest, various objections may be urged.

(1) It does less than justice to the apostolic claim. According to Myers, the 'essential claim' of the tradition of Christ's resurrection is taken to be 'the soul's life manifested after the body's death.' Its claim extends, that is to say, only to a spiritual Resurrection, a Resurrection in the sense of a personal survival of Jesus, an assurance that though His body was laid in the tomb and remained there He lived in spirit. 'What we mean by resurrection is not resuscitation of the material body, but the unbroken survival of personal life' (Lake, p. 265). So it is held that 'the existence of verified apparitions would substantiate all that is useful in the study of the resurrection, and make human experience in all ages akin' (J. H. Hyslop, *Psychical Research and the Resurrection*, Boston, 1908, p. 383). As for a physical resurrection, 'this must remain incredible so long as such phenomena are not now frequent, and as long as human experience does not reproduce it as a law of nature' (*ib.*). But it was not upon such spiritual apparitions or 'manifestations of a surviving personality' that the faith of the Church in the resurrection of Christ was built; it was, as we have seen, upon His victory over death and the grave, as witnessed by the empty tomb on the third day and His subsequent appearances.

(2) To place the appearances of the Risen Christ on the same level as spiritualistic apparitions of the dead—no more miraculous or significant than they—given to assure the sorrowing disciples that their Master was still living in the world of spirits, thus 'making human experience in all ages akin,' is to eliminate just that which is of distinctive worth and value in His appearances, and to fail to realize the true significance of the Resurrection for apostolic thought. The Resurrection claims to be a new beginning, a new departure in experience, a revelation *sui generis*. For the apostles the Resurrection had a significance far beyond the incidental revelation of the truth that Christ lives on after death. It was a fact of the largest moral and spiritual significance, for it meant His exaltation at the right hand of God, supreme in the material as well as in the spiritual world, and as such led to a revolution in apostolic thought and life. To compare the appearances and manifestations of the Risen Christ with their unique and far-reaching results to the spiritualistic apparitions of psychical research and alleged communications from the other world is to compare the incomparable. When any of the 'resurrections' investigated by the Society for Psychical Research has consequences of a moral and spiritual character to be compared with the NT or the Apostolic Church—then, but not till then, will we believe it is the same kind of thing as the resurrection of Jesus. So-called 'messages' or 'communications' from the other side of death we have in abundance, but they are mere inanities and platitudes which we are as well without. 'If communication is established at all with the spirit-world, it is merely with "the dregs and lees of the unseen universe"—with spirits who either have not the power or else the will to communicate anything of importance to man' (W. P. Paterson, *SDB*, p. 458^a).

(3) A scientific proof or verification of the Resurrection by experimental methods on evidence open to all alike, such as Myers and Lake desiderate, would have no religious value. The belief in the resurrection of Jesus depends on an initial appreciation of the uniqueness of His personality—it is belief in *Jesus* as risen—and this is spiritually discerned. (4) The object of the theory is to bring the resurrection of Christ into line with natural phenomena and 'our ever-growing recognition of the continuity, the uniformity of cosmic law' (Myers, *Human Personality*, p. 351), and thus to get rid of the supernatural especially in the physical realm. The empty tomb and the event on the third day become, on this theory, mistakes for which some explanation has to be found. What Lake's suggested explanation is has already been considered (V. i. 2).

Literature.—On this theory see **F. W. H. Myers**, *Human Personality and its Survival of Bodily Death*, ed. London, 1907; **K. Lake**, *Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, do., 1907; **O. Lodge**, *Survival of Man*, do., 1909, art. 'The Immortality of the Soul,' pt. ii., in *HJ* vi. [1908] 574 ff.; **F. Podmore**, *The Newer Spiritualism*, London, 1910; **W. MacDougall**, *Body and Mind*, do., 1911, ch. xxv.

2. The mythological theory.—The theory adduced from the side of the study of comparative religion and mythology is perhaps the most characteristic modern form of explanation. It is connected, in its most recent phase, with the rise of the school of thought usually called 'Neo-Babylonian' or 'Pan-Babylonian' from its attempt to account for much in Bible story through the influence of conceptions imported into Judaism from the Orient, and derived chiefly from Babylonia. The fundamental principle of this school or movement in relation to Christianity is the demand that the religion of Jesus Christ, including its OT preparation, be studied by the scientific-historical method, not as if it were something unique and apart, 'a holy island in the sea of history,' but in its place in the stream, and in essential connexion with religions chronologically and geographically adjacent to it. As applied to the NT, the attitude of the school may be represented by the thesis of H. Gunkel that 'in its origin and shaping (*Ausbildung*) in important and even in some essential points the religion of the NT stood under the influence of foreign religions, and that this influence was transmitted to the men of the NT through Judaism' (*Zum religionsgeschichtl. Verständnis des NT*, Göttingen, 1903, p. 1); or by that of Cheyne: 'There are parts of the New Testament—in the Gospels, in the Epistles, and in the Apocalypse—which can only be accounted for by the newly-discovered fact of an Oriental syncretism, which began early and continued late' (*Bible Problems*, p. 19). Among the beliefs thus accounted for is the belief in the resurrection of Jesus in the form in which this appears in the NT. Myths of the death and resurrection of gods, 'resurrection legends,' derived ultimately from Babylonia, were spread, it is represented, through the whole East, and these, entering through many channels, chiefly through the mystery-religions, became attached first to the figure of the expected Messiah in Jewish literature, and then through Judaism to Jesus of Nazareth, and had a powerful influence in moulding the NT representation of His resurrection.

It is nothing new to draw comparisons or analogies between the NT story of the resurrection of Jesus and the myths of the death and resurrection of gods in pagan religions. Celsus had already made a beginning in this direction. He compared the NT narratives of the Resurrection with similar myths in Greek story (see Origen, *c. Cels.* ii. 55 f.). What is characteristic of this new scientific school of thought is that it is no longer comparisons or analogies merely which are sought between the Gospel narratives and pagan myths, but an actual derivation the one from the other. Gunkel, *e.g.*, thus derives from Oriental, and ultimately from Babylonian, conceptions, the NT story of the Resurrection from the dead on the third day (*op. cit.* pp. 76–83; cf. pp. 31–35), the Ascension (*ib.* p. 71 f.), and the origin of Sunday as a Christian festival (*ib.* pp. 73–76). And Cheyne holds that 'the apostle Paul, when he says (1 Co $15^{3f.}$) that Christ died and that He rose again "according to the Scriptures," in reality points to a pre-Christian sketch of the life of Christ, partly . . . derived from widely-spread non-Jewish myths, and embodied in Jewish writings' (*Bible Problems*, p. 113). This is the theory of Strauss over again, with the substitution of Babylonian mythology for OT prophecy.

In criticism of such an attempted derivation of the apostolic belief in the Resurrection it has to be said: (1) that the fundamental assumption or allegation on which the application of the theory to the NT story depends, viz. the influence of Oriental conceptions on Jewish thought in the way of giving rise to a pre-Christian sketch of a dying and rising Messiah, is unjustified. That Jewish thought in the time of Christ was familiar with the idea of a resurrection of the dead—a resurrection of the body at the last day—is certain (though Gunkel's attempt to trace its origin to extra-Jewish Oriental sources must be contested; see Kennedy, *St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things*, p. 64). But that the idea of a dying and rising Messiah formed part of this thought, that the idea of a resurrection from the dead was connected with the Messiah in current Jewish beliefs, is contrary to evidence. The notion of a resurrection of the Messiah had nothing corresponding to it in the beliefs of Judaism. Even when Jesus had given repeated intimations of His death and resurrection, and had represented this as in accordance with OT prophecy, so contrary was the idea to contemporary Judaism that the disciples themselves were 'slow of heart' to believe the things that Jesus had spoken to them (Lk $24^{25f. \, 44-46}$).

(2) Not only is the fundamental assumption of the theory without support, but the analogies quoted between the NT and extra-Jewish mythological thought are altogether inadequate for the purpose in view. If God is in all history we may expect to find a preparation for the higher in the lower in the way of foreshadowings or prefigurations of Christian truths in ethnic religions. But the analogies cited to explain the Christian ideas are no real parallels. Take, *e.g.*, the mythological explanations of the Resurrection on the third day. Why was the third day fixed upon for the occurrence? Strauss maintained that it was because of OT hints. The insufficiency of such an answer Gunkel and Cheyne acknowledge, and they claim that the matter can be satisfactorily explained only from the historical-religious point of view, as due to the influence of pagan myths of solar deities on Jewish thought. 'The three days' of Jonah and 'the three and one half' of Dn. (7^{25} 12^{7}) and the Apocalypse ($11^{12. \, 14}$) are all forms of Oriental sun-god myths (Gunkel, p. 82 ff.; Cheyne, p. 110 ff.). To this influence also is due the observance of Sunday as the day of the commemoration of the Resurrection. The Lord's Day was the day of the sun-god. Easter Sunday was the day of the sun's emergence from the night of winter (Gunkel, pp. 74, 79). It is not strange that this was the day on which Jesus was said by the primitive Christian community to have risen. It is really an ancient Oriental festival which has here been taken over by the early Church. But a borrowed story ought at least to have some real likeness to its source, and there is no true analogy between the story of Christ's death and resurrection on the third day and the pagan myths of slain and risen gods, beyond the general ideas of death and survival. These myths were polytheistic in origin, and were a poetic rendering of the phenomena of the yearly death and revival of vegetation represented in ritual and personified. The death and resurrection of Christ, on the other hand, were historical facts which bore no relation whatever to these myths. The resurrection of Attis, Adonis, and Osiris was an annual affair symbolizing the sun's victory over winter in spring. The resurrection of Christ, however, was commemorated not only once a year at Easter, but also every Sunday. Had it been suggested by pagan myths and rituals, its commemoration would have shown some trace at least of the rites which suggested the belief, but nothing such is found. That Christ's death and resurrection took place at the time of such a pagan commemoration may be regarded as a coincidence and nothing more, although it may have had some influence in furthering the acceptance of the story itself among pagans. The pagan beliefs in slain and risen gods, therefore, bear no real likeness to the account of Christ's death and resurrection in the NT. Attis, Adonis, and Osiris are in no sense historical characters. They are ideal embodiments of the decay and reanimation of natural life year by year. Even if the apostles knew of such myths there is no evidence that they suggested to them the idea of a resurrection of their Master. All the evidence shows that the last thing the disciples expected was such a resurrection. The change in their attitude came about suddenly. It was not a slow growth, and it claimed to be based on an alleged occurrence which it was within the power and in the interest of many to disprove had it been but a myth—the empty grave on the third day together with His subsequent appearances. This was their own explanation of the ethical and spiritual power which differentiates their belief from that of alleged pagan counterparts, and this is the only explanation that is adequate to the facts.

LITERATURE. — On the Mythological Theory see, further, J. Orr, *Resurrection of Jesus*, London, 1908, ch. ix.; T. J. Thorburn, *Jesus the Christ: Historical or Mythical?*, Edinburgh, 1912; R. J. Knowling, *Testimony of St. Paul to Christ*, London, 1905, p. 282 ff.

3. The spiritual significance theory.—Another tendency which is dominant at the present time is that which lays emphasis on the spiritual worth or significance of the resurrection of Christ while surrendering or sitting loose to the belief in a bodily rising from the grave. A bodily Resurrection, so far from being of the essence of the Christian faith, is represented as a temporary excrescence which can be dropped without affecting it in any vital way. This is a tendency associated especially with a certain section of the Ritschlian school of theologians and 'connects itself naturally with the disposition in this school to seek the ground of faith in an immediate religious impression—in something verifiable on its own account—and to dissociate faith from doubtful questions of criticism and uncertainties of historical inquiry' (Orr, *Resurrection of Jesus*, p. 23 f.). 'The basis of faith must be something fixed; the results of historical study are continually changing' (W. Herrmann, *Communion of the Christian with God*, Eng. tr.^{2}, London, 1906, p. 76). The certainty to which Christian faith holds fast is that 'Christ lives,' but this is a 'judgment of value,' or, as Herrmann prefers to call it, a 'thought of faith' (*Glaubensgedanke*), a conviction based on the impression of religious worth produced by the earthly life of Jesus, and not affected by any view that may be held as to the historical Resurrection. The belief in the Resurrection is thus not a belief based on historical evidence in regard to an event in the past, but a faith inference from a prior judgment of His person. Foremost among representatives of this position stands Harnack, who has probably done more than any other to popularize the theory.

In his *Hist. of Dogma* (i. 85–87) Harnack contends (1) that there is no satisfactory historical evidence of the actual bodily Resurrection. 'None of Christ's opponents saw him after his death. . . . The succession and number of the appearances can no longer be ascertained with certainty. . . . The disciples, and Paul, were conscious of having seen Christ not in the crucified earthly body, but in heavenly glory. . . . Even the empty grave on the third day can by no means be regarded as a certain historical fact, because it appears united in the accounts with manifest legendary features, and further because it is directly excluded by the way in which Paul has portrayed the resurrection in 1 Co 15.' But (2) Harnack goes further, and pours ridicule on the attempt to find such evidence. He scouts the idea of faith being dependent on historical evidence at all. Faith must be independent of evidence coming to us through the testimony of others. 'To believe in appearances which others have had is a frivolity which is always revenged by rising doubts.' But the faith which is thus independent of historical evidence is, it speedily appears, a faith which is indifferent to the question of the physical Resurrection. 'Faith has by no means to do with the knowledge of the form in which Jesus lives, but only with the conviction that he is the living Lord.' The faith in the Resurrection and the belief in the empty tomb are two different things. The historical question and the question of faith must clearly be distinguished here. In his later lectures on 'What is Christianity?' Harnack gives expression to the same view in his famous distinction between what he calls the 'Easter message' and the 'Easter faith.' 'The Easter *message* tells us of that wonderful event in Joseph of Arimathæa's garden, which, however, no eye saw; it tells us of the empty grave into which a few women and disciples looked; of the appearance of the Lord in a transfigured form—so glorified that his own could not immediately recognise him; it soon begins to tell us, too, of what the risen one said and did.' But 'the Easter *faith* is the conviction that the crucified one gained a victory over death; that God is just and powerful; that he who is the first-born among many brethren still lives' (*What is Christianity?*^{3}, p. 163 f.). To found the Easter faith on the Easter message is to rest it on an 'unstable foundation.' 'What he [Paul] and the disciples regarded as all-important was not the state in which the grave was found, but Christ's appearances. But who of us can maintain that a clear account of these appearances can be constructed out of the stories told by Paul and the evangelists; and if that be impossible, and there is no tradition of single events which is quite trustworthy, how is the Easter faith to be based on them? Either we must decide to rest our belief on a foundation unstable and always exposed to fresh doubts, or else we must abandon this foundation altogether, and with it the miraculous appeal to our senses' (p. 164 f.). It must have been, he thinks, even to the disciples themselves not so much the Easter message as the impression of His personality which was the ultimate foundation of the Easter faith that He was still alive. This impression of the personality of Jesus at least is a simple matter of fact which no historical criticism can in any way alter (*ib.*).

This position is open to objection on the following grounds. (1) It is based on a view of the relation of faith and history—an attempt to make faith independent of historical evidence—which cannot be accepted. Mere historical evidence, indeed, is incompetent of itself to generate true Christian faith in the Resurrection. For this there is needed also an estimate of the moral and religious uniqueness of Jesus derived from the impression of His personality, which prepares the mind for the proper appreciation of the evidence. Only to those who have received this impression is the Resurrection truly credible. In this sense it is true to say that the belief in the Resurrection is a 'value judgment' or 'thought of faith'; and that 'no appearances of the Lord could permanently have convinced them [the disciples] of his life, if they had not possessed in their hearts the impression of his Person' (*Hist. of Dogma*, i. 86 n.). But this is not to make faith independent of historical evidence. It may be and is involved in a proper estimate of His worth that 'He could not be holden of death,' which means not merely that 'Jesus lives,' as the Ritschlians put it, but that 'He is risen from the dead.' But, if all historical evidence for the fact were either wanting or discredited at the bar of criticism, faith would be involved in insoluble contradiction. The Easter faith cannot dispense with the Easter message which is its historical attestation, an attestation which has to be judged by the principles of historical criticism. (2) When we take the position to the test of the narratives its inadequacy is further established. Harnack holds that the distinction between the Easter faith and the Easter message is one already drawn in the NT. 'The story of Thomas is told for the exclusive purpose of impressing upon us that we must hold the Easter faith even without the Easter message: "Blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed." The disciples on the road to Emmaus were blamed for not believing in the resurrection even though the Easter message had not yet reached them. The Lord is a Spirit, says Paul; and this carries with it the certainty of his resurrection' (*What is Christianity?*^{3}, p. 163 f.). But the support thus found involves a misrepresentation of the facts. The words to Thomas (Jn 20^{29}) are a rebuke to him for distrusting the testimony of his fellow-disciples and refusing to believe the Easter message without the personal verification of it by his own senses. The reproach to the two on the way to Emmaus (Lk $24^{25\text{f.}}$) is directed against their hesitation to believe the story of the women, confirmed as this was by prophetic prediction, and the previous intimations of Jesus Himself.

St. Paul's conviction that the Lord is the Spirit is the direct outcome of the appearance to him of the Risen Christ outside Damascus, which he reckons in the same category as the earlier appearances to the other apostles. The stress St. Paul lays on the appearances as evidence of the resurrection of Christ (1 Co 15^{5-8}), combined with his reference to the burial, altogether forbids the attempt to detach his Easter faith, or that of the early Christian community, with which in these matters he knew himself to be at one, from the Easter message. 'It would have conveyed no meaning to Paul or to any member of the original Christian circle to say that it was the spirit of Christ which rose into new life, or that He rose again in the faith of His devoted followers, who could not bear the thought that for Him death should end all' (Denney, *Jesus and the Gospel*, p. 113). The rising of which they speak is relative to the grave and the burial. They did not need to be assured that His spirit survived death. Not one of them doubted that. What they did need to be assured of, if their faith in Jesus was to be re-established, was His victory over death and the grave, and nothing but a bodily resurrection would have convinced them of that. It may be, as A. E. Garvie suggests (*Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus*, London, 1907, p. 439), 'that Jesus Himself would have esteemed the *Easter-faith*, the conviction that His life and work were of such infinite value to God that He must prove the conqueror of death, without the *Easter message*—the sensible evidences of the reality of His Resurrection—as much more precious than this belief which rested on the signs of sense.' As during His earthly ministry He rated low the faith that rested on His miracles (Jn 4^{48}), so the belief in His resurrection which needed sensible evidence might be less satisfactory to Him, because showing less spiritual discernment of His worth, than a humble and confident trust in His word. And for us to-day brought up within the Christian Church, the heirs of the past with the evidence of Christ's working through the centuries before us, belief in the Risen Lord may not depend so immediately or directly on the historical testimony of the empty grave and the appearances. But if one thing is made more plain and certain by the narratives than another it is that the disciples were quite incapable of the belief without the Easter message. Deeply as He had stamped Himself upon them in His earthly intercourse, the disaster of His death paralyzed their faith in Him, and this was regained and reconstituted only through the Easter message of the empty grave and the subsequent appearances.

But, it may be said, the Easter message, though thus needful, from the point of view of the early Christian community, to re-establish their faith and thus set the Church agoing—all the more so that for them as Jews a resurrection without an empty grave was unthinkable—is no longer necessary to the Christian faith, and may be dropped without affecting it in any vital way. Essential to the first disciples, so essential that as a matter of history the Apostolic Church sprang from the conviction that the body of Jesus was not left in the grave, it is no longer essential to us to-day. The Christian faith, it is urged, is not bound up with holding a particular view of the relation of the Glorified Christ to the body that was laid in Joseph's tomb. Faith, it is said, is to be exercised in the Exalted Lord, and of this faith belief in a resuscitation of the Body is no vital part. This is the position taken up in the latest outstanding illustration of the attempt to conserve a spiritual Resurrection while denying or minimizing the fact of a bodily resuscitation—that of Sanday in his pamphlet *Bishop Gore's Challenge to Criticism* (1914). Sanday is of opinion that we ought to be satisfied with a heart-felt expression of the conviction that the Risen Lord as Spirit still governs and inspires His Church, while sitting loose to the question of what became of His body. In regard to the resuscitation of the body of the Lord from the tomb, 'the accounts that have come down to us seem to be too conflicting and confused to prove this. But they do seem to prove that in any case the detail is of less importance than is supposed. Because, whatever it was, the body which the disciples saw was not the natural human body that was laid in the grave. . . . The central meaning of the Resurrection is just that expressed in the vision of the Apocalypse: "I am the first and the last, and the Living one; and I was dead, and behold, I am alive for evermore" (Rev 1^{18})' (p. 20). All else in the apostolic representation is unessential for us to-day, and can be spared. The bodily Resurrection is but a 'symbolical' representation of the essential fact, the result of the world of ideas in which the first disciples moved. Their world of ideas was one in which the Resurrection was conceived as a bodily resuscitation. Their 'minds were steeped in the Old Testament' and their 'thoughts naturally ran into the moulds which the Old Testament supplied' (pp. 24, 25), with its belief in 'nature-miracles' gathering round great personalities in a pre-scientific age—a belief which 'perpetuated itself in the New Testament' (p. 27). For the first disciples, therefore, the 'nature-miracle' of the bodily Resurrection 'seemed necessary to the completeness of the idea, but it is so no longer.' It 'has done its work and can be spared. It is like a lame man laying aside his crutches' (p. 28).

Sanday's position may be further elucidated by reference to a sermon of his published some years previously in *Miracles* (London, 1911). 'It was in Jewish circles that the belief in the Resurrection first sprang up. . . . But among the Jews the characteristic form of the belief in a life after death, or (as they expressed it) "life from the dead," was the Pharisaic doctrine of a bodily resurrection. This was the form of the belief which the first disciples had in their minds, and which naturally and inevitably shaped and coloured all their experiences. This was pre-eminently so with St. Paul, who before his conversion had been a zealous Pharisee. . . . So it was in the last resort this Pharisaic doctrine that was taken over by the Christian Church, and that from the first dictated the form of the Christian conception. It could not be otherwise. It was the one alternative open to those who believed in life from the dead at all. In that mould the belief of the first disciples was cast, and it has remained dominant in the Church down to our own time' (p. 16 f.). But it is characteristic of our time to attempt 'to go behind this form of the belief,' to show how it arose naturally in certain circumstances, and to distinguish between the question of its origin and that of its permanent validity. 'And I for one do not feel that I can condemn those attempts. I do not think that we are called upon to regard the precise form of the Pharisaic doctrine as the last word on the subject. It is . . . only the relative expression or outward clothing of a Divine revelation. . . . It was through the medium of minds possessed and dominated by these ideas, and, indeed, practically not conscious of the existence of any other, that the first announcement that Christ was alive and not dead was given to the world' (p. 17 f.). But we have to distinguish between 'what the ancients themselves really thought' and 'what we moderns should think.' Indeed this is 'the main problem before us at the present day' (p. 23).

The view of 'nature-miracle' at the root of Sanday's position will be examined in the following section, but meanwhile two considerations may be urged in criticism of this depreciation of the bodily resurrection. (1) It is no doubt true that faith to-day is to be exercised directly in the Exalted and Glorified Lord, but our faith must ultimately rest on historical fact, and it is difficult to understand how Christian faith can ever be really indifferent or 'agnostic' with regard to the facts about the empty tomb and the Risen Body, which form so essential a part of the apostolic evidence. To make the belief in the physical resurrection of merely temporary significance—to set the Apostolic Church agoing—while now it may be cast aside as 'no longer necessary,' is to spurn the ladder by which we have risen to our Christian faith and to leave this faith 'in the air.' It is difficult, if not impossible, to conceive how faith in an Exalted Lord could ever have been attained if the fact of the bodily resurrection of Jesus had not first been recognized. It is founded basally on the belief that the resurrection of Jesus was the actual raising in glory and power of that which was sown in dishonour and weakness; and faith can never be indifferent to this its historical foundation. (2) To sit loose to the bodily resurrection of Jesus is to do less than justice to the fullness of the apostolic representation of the essential constitutive significance of the Resurrection for the Christian faith (see above, IV. ii.). The rising of Jesus from the grave was for the Apostle at once the guarantee and the ground of the Christian's full redemption and immortality, body as well as spirit having its place in the renewed Kingdom of God, 'who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation that it may be conformed to the body of his glory' (Ph 3^{21}). If the body of Jesus rotted away in the grave, then what guarantee have we that material forces are not after all supreme, and that Christ is indeed Lord over all, in nature as well as in grace, Lord of life and of death? The Resurrection-Body is indeed not the same natural human body that was laid in the grave. It is this body so changed as to be described as a 'spiritual' body, but this is very different from representing it as simply dropped and lost, left behind in the grave to see corruption. The plain question to be answered is, Was the body of Jesus left lying in the tomb on the hillside of Jerusalem, or in some other tomb, or was it not? If it was, what then? Let us suppose it to be firmly established that, instead of being raised, the body of Jesus was for some reason removed from the tomb in which it was first laid, and buried elsewhere, and that this or something like this is all the ground there is, beyond the pious imaginations of the disciples, for the belief that the body of Jesus was raised from the grave. On this supposition the apostolic doctrine of redemption becomes seriously attenuated, and our Christian faith turns out to be a very different thing from what it was for the early Church.

The view under criticism is really based not so much on a scientific examination of the historical evidence as on a dogmatic or philosophical attitude which, while seeking to preserve what is essential to Christian faith, could sacrifice the supernatural in the physical realm as being what Herrmann explicitly calls it, 'a great hindrance to men today' (*Communion*^{2}, p. 80) in the way of accepted Christianity. That this is so is recognized with characteristic frankness by Sanday in this pamphlet. It is professedly because he finds the evidence on behalf of the bodily Resurrection unsatisfactory that he ranges himself with the 'modernists' in doubting the fact. But this denial or minimizing of the bodily Resurrection is made, he recognizes, in an apologetic interest, viz. of commending Christianity to the 'modern mind' by removing what he calls 'the greatest of all stumbling-blocks' in the way of its acceptance, the admission of miracle in the physical realm. 'I know,' he says, 'that the suggestions I have made will come with a shock to the great mass of Christians; but in the end I believe that they will be thankfully welcomed. What they would mean is that the greatest of all stumbling-blocks to the modern mind is removed, and that the beautiful regularity that we see around us now has been, and will be, the law of the Divine action from the beginning to the end of time' (*Bishop Gore's Challenge to Criticism*, p. 30). The ground of this repugnance to the recognition of the physical supernatural or 'nature-miracle' will be considered in the following section.

LITERATURE.—On the Spiritual-Significance Theory see J. H. Skrine, *Miracle and History*, London, 1912; J. Orr, *The Christian View of God and the World*, Edinburgh, 1893, lect. vi. note C (p. 512 ff.); D. W. Forrest, *Christ of History and of Experience*^{7}, do., 1914, p. 158 ff.; B. Lucas, *Fifth Gospel*, London, 1907, p. 160.

4. The 'supernatural-without-miracle' theory.—The real *motif* of all theories which attempt to explain the apostolic belief in the Resurrection without accepting the full apostolic representation of the fact is the repugnance to the admission of the supernatural in any specific or unique sense in the physical realm. This is the presupposition or *præjudicium* lying behind and determining the attitude of modern thought to the evidence; so that the fundamental apologetic problem to-day in connexion with the Resurrection is, as it has been in all ages, the problem of the supernatural. The latest evidence of this is the attitude of Sanday to the bodily Resurrection as definitely elicited by his controversy with Gore. His 'entire and strong belief in the central reality of the . . . Supernatural Resurrection' Sanday affirms (*Bishop Gore's Challenge*, p. 28); but he claims that this need not involve the admission of the 'nature-miracle' of the resuscitation of the Body from the tomb. Sanday adopts the old distinction between *contra naturam* and *supra naturam* miracles. The latter, the 'healing-miracles' of the Gospels, 'were abundantly accounted for by the presence in the world of a unique Personality, and by that wave of new spiritual force which flowed from it in ever-increasing volume. They involved no real breach in the order of nature' (p. 24). The 'nature-miracles' of the Gospels, however, with the bodily resurrection of Jesus as the supreme instance, are represented as not merely thus *supra naturam* but as *contra naturam*, involving a 'definite reversal of the natural physical order' (p. 23). The conception of 'nature-miracles' 'took its rise in the region of the Old Testament' through the influence of myths or legends gathering round great personalities in a pre-scientific age and 'perpetuated itself in the New Testament' (p. 27). But the admission of such miracles is contrary to the postulate of modern science, the uniformity of nature, 'the beautiful regularity that we see around us . . . the law of the Divine action from the beginning to the end of time' (p. 30), and must be dropped. So the watchword of much current Christian apologetic in its attempt to recommend Christianity to the 'undetermined' is 'the supernatural without miracle.' This is the point of view represented in an extreme form by J. M. Thompson's *Miracles in the New Testament* (London, 1911).

At the root of this modern repugnance to the supernatural in the physical region lies the conception of miracle as a 'violation of natural law,' or 'a breach in the order of nature.' This is the view of miracle which, *e.g.*, controls Schmiedel's negative criticism. 'By miracle we here throughout understand an occurrence that unquestionably is against natural law' (*EBi* iv. 4040). This is the view which already underlay Hume's famous argument in his essay 'On Miracles' (*Essays, Moral, Political and Literary*, 2 vols., ed. London, 1907) as to the insufficiency of evidence for the alleged Gospel miracles in face of our experience of the regularity of nature, and of the notorious fallibility of human testimony to extraordinary events. 'A miracle is a violation of the laws of nature; and as a firm and unalterable experience has established these laws, the proof against a miracle, from the very nature of the fact, is as entire as any argument from experience can possibly be imagined' (ii. 93). He takes the Resurrection as his typical example. 'It is no miracle that a man . . . should die on a sudden: because such a kind of death . . . has yet been frequently observed to happen. But it is a miracle, that a dead man should come to life; because that has never been observed, in any age or country' (*ib.*). Briefly, it is contrary to experience that a miracle should be true, but not contrary to experience that human testimony should be false (cf. ii. 105).

While the 'healing' miracles of the Gospels, or most of them, may be scientifically explicable in accordance with laws recognized by modern science (what M. Arnold called 'moral therapeutics'), the 'nature-miracles,' with the bodily Resurrection as the supreme instance, are ruled out as violations of natural law. This objection to nature-miracles, however, goes back to a view of nature and natural law which, as the offspring of a mechanical view of the world, is now obsolete, yet which continues to influence thought in subtle ways. If nature be regarded as a closed mechanical system owing its origin, it may be, to the creative power and wisdom of the Divine, but now a self-sufficient, self-running order bound together by iron bonds of natural law, then what we call 'miracle' can be conceived only as an intervention from without, an inroad or intrusion into an ordered and complete mechanical whole. But if nature, as a more adequate philosophy is now teaching us, and as science itself is increasingly recognizing, is no such closed mechanical system shut in upon itself, but alive, moving, a growing organism, a process of creative evolution; if its laws are not ultimate realities or entities which bind the universe into a changeless mechanism of material forces, but simply modes of the Divine activity, forms of God's self-expression—then a very different conception of miracle presents itself. The distinction between 'natural' and 'supernatural' becomes a distinction between lower and higher forms of Divine activity. What is called the 'natural order' is God's basal method of working in the world, the indispensable condition of all stable rational experience. What are called the 'laws of nature' are the general laws of sequence based on past observation and experience of the Divine working on this basal level—'a convenient short-hand method of summing up our existing knowledge'—whereby we can say that if the same conditions are fulfilled the same results will follow. In this sense nature is 'uniform' or 'regular.' If the conditions are changed, however, and new forces are introduced whereby a new level of Divine working is brought about, the ordinary laws of nature are not violated or contradicted but transcended, their action is controlled or modified for higher ends. Standing at the lower level and without experience of the higher, the new experiences may seem to contradict what is natural at that level, to be in that sense *contra naturam*, while really, as St. Augustine long ago pointed out, being only 'contrary to nature so far as yet known' ('non contra naturam, sed contra quam est nota natura' [*de Civ. Dei*, xxi. 8]). From the point of view of the physical order the phenomena of organic nature and still more of self-conscious personality will appear as if they contradicted the laws of that order. They would be contradictory only if these laws were assumed to be final and ultimate instead of being means to ends beyond themselves.

Apply this to the nature-miracles of Jesus, and in particular to His bodily resurrection. If we regard Jesus of Nazareth as one whose life moved wholly on the plane of our ordinary human experience, the *contra naturam* argument might be urged with plausibility. But in Jesus, as the narratives present Him, we have a new phenomenon in human history, unique in His character, person, and work. He stood in the midst of a sinful world, the alone sinless One, living in perfect communion with God, and claiming a unique relation to God and man—a claim which He substantiated in the experience of those who submitted themselves to Him, making them veritably 'new creations.' This is a miracle in the moral and spiritual sphere as wonderful as any alleged miracle in the physical. It is a new departure in human history—in this sense 'contrary to experience'—so that we cannot criticize Him by the light of any canons drawn from our past experience of ordinary humanity. In the case of such a new phenomenon we should antecedently expect that He would manifest Himself in new and unfamiliar ways. 'As with the appearance of man there were introduced new powers and properties unimaginable from the animal point of view and therefore from that point of view seemingly supernatural — so with the appearance of the Christ we ought to expect new powers and properties unimaginable from the human point of view and therefore to us seemingly supernatural, *i.e. above our nature*' (J. le Conte, *Evolution in Relation to Religious Thought*, London, 1888, p. 362).

Human personality is a unity in which spiritual and material are organically connected and mutually dependent, the spirit moulding the body and the body in turn influencing the spirit. Sin, accordingly, is a fact which though primarily moral and spiritual—a matter of the will—yet extends to and includes the physical as well, moral and physical mingling with and reacting on each other till the entire resultant may be spoken of as 'the body of this death'—'a complex whole in which it is impossible to disentangle the spiritual element from the diseased conditions and perverted functions of organ and tissue, which personal and ancestral sins have brought about' (Illingworth, *Divine Immanence*, p. 92). In like manner sinlessness is a fact which, though primarily moral and spiritual, concerns the physical as well, a sinless soul carrying with it as its correlative an unstained body. It may be 'contrary to experience,' as Hume says, that a human body should rise from the dead; it is contrary to our experience, that is to say, of ordinary human bodies, the bodies of sinful men. But in the case of a sinless personality like that of Jesus we have a fact so transcending ordinary experience that no amount of evidence drawn from such experience can warrant us in laying down beforehand how nature will react on such an one. It may be as normal for a sinless man to rise from the dead as it is for the bodies of sinful men to remain in the grave. At all events our modern scientific knowledge of the mutual interdependence of spirit and body makes it *a priori* probable that one who like Jesus was not holden of sin should also not be holden of death. Without this the manifestation of His triumph over sin would be incomplete. But more than this. Jesus claimed not only to be sinless Himself but to have come into the world to destroy the dominion of sin in others. He stood over against men the alone sinless One claiming to have power to forgive and to redeem, and, in manifestation of His power to rectify the whole disorder caused by sin and restore the entire personality of man, body as well as soul, to God's plan for it, He performed works of healing on the body. His healing of the one He connected with His forgiving of the other as parts of the same redemptive work. Of this redemptive Lordship, His own bodily resurrection was at once the consummating manifestation and the final guarantee; so that being such an One as He was and proved Himself to be *per ejus beneficia* 'it was not possible that he should be holden of death' (Ac 2^{24}).

It is in the light of these considerations that the physical Resurrection becomes credible, and even antecedently probable. It is not an isolated abnormal incident in an otherwise normal career. 'If the Resurrection were alleged to have occurred abruptly in the middle of a series of events which passed on slowly to their consummation unaffected by its interruption . . . then we might have paused in doubt before so stupendous a miracle, and pleaded the uniformity of nature against the claims of such an event upon our belief' (Westcott, *Gospel of the Resurrection*, p. 105). But the Resurrection is the resurrection of Jesus, and, as such, an event at once with unique antecedents and unique consequents. Its context on either side is miraculous. It is the culmination of a unique human life, a life which was a moral miracle constituting a break in human experience, and making such a physical miracle as the Resurrection altogether natural and congruous; a life too which was represented as the consummation of God's purposes in all previous human history—for this is the essential meaning of the appeal to prophecy made by the apostles. Then there are the unique consequents of the fact—and the nature of a cause becomes apparent only in the effect—the rise of the Christian Church as a new and ever-increasing power in history constituted in the continuous miracle of Christian history and experience. It is when we consider the Resurrection thus in its context that we see the naturalness and congruousness of the fact. As the consummation of the Incarnation and the means of realizing its purposes, the Resurrection is at once an end and a new beginning. 'To this fact all former history converges as to a certain goal; from this fact all subsequent history flows as from its life-giving spring' (*ib.* p. 104). And so, taking all the evidence together—evidence converging and cumulative—it is not too much to say with Westcott that 'there is no single historic incident better or more variously supported than the resurrection of Christ' (p. 137).

LITERATURE.—On the Resurrection and the supernatural see B. F. Westcott, *Gospel of the Resurrection*^{6}, London, 1888, pp. 15–54; J. O. F. Murray, 'The Spiritual and Historical Evidence for Miracles,' in *Cambridge Theological Essays*, ed. H. B. Swete, do., 1905, p. 311 ff.; M. Dods, *The Supernatural in Christianity* (in reply to Pfleiderer), ^{2}Edinburgh, 1894; J. R. Illingworth, *Divine Immanence*, London, 1898, *The Gospel Miracles*, do., 1915 (esp. ch. ii.); A. C. Headlam, *The Miracles of the New Testament*, do., 1914; A. J. Balfour, *Theism and Humanism*, do., 1915; H. Scott Holland in *Christian Commonwealth*, June 1909 (criticism of Sanday).

LITERATURE.—The chief relevant literature on the various aspects of the subject has been indicated in the body of the article. On the whole subject the older works of B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel of the Resurrection*^{1}, London, 1865, *The Revelation of the Risen Lord*^{2}, do., 1882, W. Milligan, *The Resurrection of our Lord*, do., 1881, *Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood of our Lord*, do., 1892, and S. D. F. Salmond, *The Christian Doctrine of Immortality*, Edinburgh, 1895, are not yet superseded. Among more recent works covering the whole field the more important are A. Meyer, *Die Auferstehung Christi*, Freiburg i. B., 1905; L. Ihmels, *Die Auferstehung Jesu Christi*, Leipzig, 1906; J. Orr, *The Resurrection of Jesus*, London, 1908; C. H. Robinson, *Studies in the Resurrection of Christ*, do., 1909; W. J. Sparrow Simpson, *Our Lord's Resurrection*, do., 1905, *The Resurrection and Modern Thought*, do., 1911. Cf. E. R. Bernard, art. 'Resurrection,' *HDB* iv. 281–236; W. J. Sparrow Simpson, art. 'Resurrection of Christ,' *DCG* ii. 505-514.

J. M. SHAW.

RETRIBUTION.—See VENGEANCE.

REUBEN.—See TRIBES.

REVELATION.—See INSPIRATION.

REVELATION, BOOK OF.—See APOCALYPSE.

REVELLING.—'Revelling' is the tr. of *κῶμος* (perhaps from *κεῖμαι*) in Ro 13^{13} (RV), Gal 5^{21}, 1 P 4^3. The Greek word denoted also a band of revellers. The *κῶμος* was a characteristic feature of Greek life. There was (1) the more regular and orderly *κῶμος*, the festal procession in honour of the victors at the games, partaking of the nature of a chorus. Most of Pindar's odes were written to be sung at *κῶμοι* of this sort. And there was (2) the riotous *κῶμος*, the nocturnal procession of revellers, who ended their carousal on a festival-day by parading the streets with torches in their hands and garlands on their heads, singing and shouting in honour of Bacchus or some other god, and offering wanton insult to every person they met. In later Greek mythology, as we learn from the *Εἰκόνες* of Philostratus (3rd cent. A.D.), Comus was the god of festive mirth. Milton calls him the son of Bacchus and Circe, and puts into his mouth the words:

> 'Meanwhile, welcome joy and feast,
> Midnight shout and revelry,
> Tipsy dance and jollity.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> What hath night to do with sleep?'
>
> (*Comus*, 102 ff.).

With such pagan ideas in mind, St. Paul urges the Romans to 'walk becomingly (εὐσχημόνως), as in the day; not in revelling and drunkenness' (Ro 13^{13}). See R. C. Trench, *Synonyms of the NT*^{8}, London, 1876, § lxi., and art. DRUNKENNESS.

JAMES STRAHAN.

REVENGE.—See VENGEANCE.

REWARD.—It will be convenient, in the course of this article, (1) to define the usage of the term; (2) to indicate its occurrence in the apostolic writings; (3) briefly to set forth the place of this conception in the apostolic teaching.

1. The verb 'to reward' is capable of neutral usage; it may mean to give in return evil as well as good (cf. Ps 7^{4} 35^{12} [AV]). But the usual meaning of 'reward' as a noun is an equivalent return for good. A 'reward' is a thing that carries with it the idea of gain, profit, or remuneration. The present discussion will confine itself to this view of the word and will endeavour to indicate the place which 'reward,' in the sense of payment or wages, holds as a factor in the Christian life.

2. The usual word in the NT for 'reward,' in the sense of hire or wages for work, is μισθός. It is so used by St. Paul (Ro 4^{4}, 1 Co $3^{8.14}$ $9^{17.18}$). In 1 Ti 5^{18} (quoting Lk 10^{7}) RV translates 'hire.' In Ja 5^{4}, 2 P $2^{13.15}$, and Jude ^{11} RV also translates by 'hire.' But in 2 Jn ^{8}, Rev 11^{18} 22^{12} the rendering is again 'reward.' St. Paul also twice uses the late, non-classical compound ἀντιμισθία, which in each case RV translates 'recompense.' This expression is neutral in meaning, for in Ro 1^{27} the allusion is to due recompense of error; in 2 Co 6^{13}, on the other hand, it is to corresponding enlargement of heart in response to the Apostle's affection.

The normal verb to express reward, in the sense of equivalent payment, of either good or evil is ἀποδίδωμι. This occurs in NT *passim*, and is the basis of the substantive which occurs only once in the NT as used by St. Paul in Col 3^{24}, when, in urging slaves to single-hearted service, he says that they shall receive from the Lord τὴν ἀνταπόδοσιν τῆς κληρονομίας (RV 'the recompense of the inheritance'). This word is frequent both in LXX and in classical Greek. It occurs also in inscriptions and papyri (cf. Moulton and Milligan, *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*, pt. i., London, 1914, *s.v.*).

From a combination of μισθός and ἀποδίδωμι we get the late and non-classical compound μισθαποδοσία, which word (with its corresponding μισθαποδότης, He 11^{6}) occurs in Hebrews only (2^{2} 10^{35} 11^{26}) and nowhere else in the Greek Bible. RV translates μισθαποδότης by 'rewarder,' but μισθαποδοσία in each instance by 'recompense of reward.' The word is employed in a neutral sense, for 2^{2} refers to the consequences of transgression and disobedience, while 10^{35} refers to the consequences of Christian παρρησία, and $11^{6.26}$ refer to the reward of faith and faithful endurance. In fact, the word emphasizes the exact requital of either good or evil by a sovereign judge.

The word μισθαποδοσία does not occur in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers. The Pauline ἀντιμισθία appears now and then in 2 Clement (i. 3, 5, ix. 7). In xi. 6 it is coupled with a quotation from He 10^{23}, πιστὸς γὰρ ἐστιν ὁ ἐπαγγειλάμενος τὰς ἀντιμισθίας ἀποδιδόναι ἑκάστῳ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ. xv. 2, speaking of faith and love, says, ταύτην γὰρ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀντιμισθίαν ἀποδοῦναι τῷ Θεῷ τῷ κτίσαντι ἡμᾶς.

ἀνταποδότης occurs in *Ep. Barn.* xix. 11 and *Didache* iv. 7, in the same phrase in both places: οὐ διστάσεις δοῦναι οὐδὲ διδοὺς γογγύσεις· γνώσῃ γὰρ τίς ἐστιν ὁ τοῦ μισθοῦ καλὸς ἀνταποδότης.

μισθός is of fairly frequent occurrence in contexts suggesting reward or requital. Perhaps the most interesting for the present purpose are 1 Clem. xxxiv. 3 and *Ep. Barn.* xxi. 3, in both of which the allusion is to Is 40^{10}: Κύριος μετὰ ἰσχύος ἔρχεται . . . ἰδοῦ ὁ μισθὸς αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτοῦ. The same idea is expressed in *Ep. Barn.* iv. 12: ἕκαστος καθὼς ἐποίησεν κομιεῖται.

3. The foregoing investigation has been concerned with the words usually employed by the apostolic writers to express the idea of requital in general and of reward in particular. The general idea of requital does not come up here for discussion. It may suffice to say that the idea of judgment, with the view that a man's works, the general moral tenor of his life, is the standard by which he will be judged, is the consistent doctrine of Scripture throughout. The more immediate question is the place which the idea of reward holds in the apostolic teaching—the conception of the Christian life as a service rendered for which payment will be received.

It may be said that the conception of reward may be traced throughout the apostolic writings, the later as well as the earlier, and that, presumably, it reproduces the teaching of our Lord. That it formed part of His teaching is undeniable (cf. Mt 6^{4} 16^{27}). It is sometimes suggested that the holding forth of reward is not the highest ground of appeal for virtuous action, and that our Lord's words here were conditioned by the exigencies of addresses to a popular audience. Without raising the question whether 'virtue for virtue's own sake,' in total abstraction from all thoughts of consequences of any kind, is a thing really conceivable by any human intelligence, it may be asserted that the idea of reward as employed by Christ requires neither extenuation nor apology.

He came to proclaim the Kingdom of God. The relation of the members of that Kingdom to God is one of service, a service involving the corresponding idea of reward. This idea of service is in no way incompatible with that of sonship; a son as well as a subject must serve. It should also be remembered that reward, so far as it appears in Christ's teaching, is conceived not quantitatively but qualitatively. The reward for which the disciple looks is simply the completion of his salvation. In all his service and all his sacrifice for the Kingdom he is moved by the desire for participation in the completed Kingdom. His reward lies in the attainment of that for which he has striven, and any other motive destroys the value of his service.

In fact, the idea of reward is entirely legitimate and appropriate when we remember in what the reward consists. It might be thought, for example, that the Johannine conception of salvation as eternal life, a life developing by its own inner necessity, would exclude the idea of reward. But in the Johannine writings, along with the idea of life, we have that of keeping Christ's commandments. From this point of view the idea of service appears, and with it the presence of an impulse, which is provided by the promised reward. What is the reward? Simply closer union with Christ. 'He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself unto him' (Jn 14^{21}); 'if ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love' (15^{10}); 'ye are my friends, if ye do the things which I command you' (15^{14}). A reward for service, which consists in abiding in Christ's love, needs no apology, but may well stand as the highest conceivable motive to action. The reward may be otherwise expressed as honour bestowed by the Father (cf. Jn 12^{24-26}, a passage which comes into close contact with the Synoptic presentment of the matter in Mt 10^{32}, Lk 14^{11}). It is the teaching of the Fourth Gospel, as quoted above, that forms the background to the passage in 2 Jn ^{8}, 'Look to yourselves . . . that ye receive a full reward.'

None of the various Greek words for 'reward' occurs in 1 Peter, but the general idea of the consummation of all things as a 'reward' to faith holds here, as it does in the teaching of Jesus; cf. 1^{9}, 'receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls.' This is the object of the 'hope' to which repeated allusion is made. Here, too, the reward is homogeneous with the service; it simply consists in this, that faith is recognized, and receives glory, praise, and honour at the return of Christ (1^{7}). This is expressed in more figurative fashion in 5^{4} as 'the crown of glory that fadeth not away.' It is quite true that life is viewed in this Epistle as a matter of Divine grace and Divine calling (cf. 5^{10}); but there is no inherent contradiction. The promised gift of grace is also viewed as a reward when the conditions for its attainment are admitted to have been fulfilled.

The fact is that the Christian salvation may be viewed under various aspects, which are not contradictory but mutually complementary. It is a life, it is sonship, it is membership in a kingdom, it is service; and with the last there goes, indissolubly, the idea of reward—a reward consisting in fuller life and opportunity for more faithful and loving service, with the Divine approbation and benediction. It is interesting to note that 2 Clem. iii. 3, speaking of Christ's confession of His faithful followers before the Father, says, *οὗτος οὖν ἐστὶν ὁ μισθὸς ἡμῶν*. When these considerations are borne in mind, any seeming difficulty in St. Paul's language tends to disappear. He undoubtedly speaks of reward, and at first sight he may appear to conflict with his own doctrine of justification by faith. But justification is a past act resulting in a present state. It pertains to the beginning of the Christian life. That life is one of action and of service, and the service is inspired by the hope of the reward. In Ro $2^{6f.}$ (quoting Pr 24^{12}) St. Paul says that God 'will render to every man according to his works: to them that by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honour and incorruption, eternal life.' The conception of *μισθός* appears in 1 Co $3^{8.9.14.15}$. The man whose work stands the test of the fire will receive his reward; the man whose work is destroyed will, apparently, though saved himself, lose his reward. The *μισθός* here does not appear to be identified with salvation, but more particularly with the opportunities of higher service as distinct from the man's own personal salvation. In 1 Co $9^{17.18}$ the Apostle comes more closely to the general NT idea of the *μισθός*. The 'pay' that he prefers is the continued opportunity to preach the gospel without pay. The opportunity for fuller service is the reward. It is in no way inconsistent with this that he regards those who have believed through him as his 'crown' (1 Th 2^{19}, Ph 4^{1}), and that, sharing the idea of St. James (1^{12}), St. Peter (5^{4}), and the Seer of the Apocalypse, he looks on to 'the crown of righteousness' that awaits him (2 Ti 4^{8}). So in Col 3^{24} the faithful and single-hearted slave will receive a 'reward' consisting in the Divinely promised inheritance.

It is quite mistaken to regard St. Paul's language about rewards as a piece of earlier Judaism persisting in his Christian teaching, in which it forms an intractable and contradictory element. It presents no fundamental opposition whatever to his cardinal doctrine of justification by faith.

It remains to say a word about the language of *Hebrews* at this point. One great aspect of Christianity, as depicted in this Epistle, is that it is the fulfilment of the Divine promises. But here again, in so far as the receiving of the promises is connected with the performance of the duties of the New Covenant, it may be regarded as wages or reward; hence the use of *μισθαποδοσία* in 10^{35}. So in 11^{6} God is conceived as the *μισθαποδότης* of those who seek for Him. It was the *μισθαποδοσία* for which he looked that nerved Moses to be 'evil entreated with the people of God' (11^{25}). And even in the case of Jesus Himself, the idea of reward is not alien: 'Who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross' (12^{2}).

The idea of reward accompanies, almost of necessity, belief in a personal God. Viewed as the apostolic writers were taught by our Lord to view it, it is the loftiest and most potent incentive to holiness of life.

LITERATURE.—Sanday-Headlam, *ICC*, 'Romans'^{5}, Edinburgh, 1902, on 2^{6}; A. Robertson and A. Plummer, *ib.* '1 Corinthians,' do., 1911, Index, *s.v.*; B. Weiss, *Biblical Theology of the New Testament*, Eng. tr. of 3rd ed., do., 1882–83, *s.v.*; *DCG*, *s.v.*

DAWSON WALKER.

RHEGIUM (Ῥήγιον, now *Reggio*).—Rhegium was an ancient Greek colony, mainly of Chalcidians, in the south of Italy. Commanding the southern entrance to the Sicilian Straits, it had great strategic importance, and willingly or unwillingly played a part in many wars. For a time it held its own among the leading cities of Magna Græcia, but in revenge for a slighted offer of friendship it was totally destroyed by Dionysius, the tyrant of Syracuse (387 B.C.). From this calamity it never quite recovered, but it profited by fidelity to Rome in the Punic Wars and to Augustus in the Civil Wars. Re-peopled by the Emperor, it assumed the name of 'Rhegium Julium.' Strabo, in the beginning of our era, speaks of it as 'tolerably well peopled,' and as one of three cities founded by the Greeks in Italy—the others were Neapolis and Tarentum—that had not become barbarian, *i.e.* lost the language and manners of their mother-country (VI. i. 6). Since 134 B.C. it had a further importance as the terminus of the Via Popilia, which branched from the Via Appia at Capua and traversed southern Italy. The actual place of crossing to Messana (now Messina) was, and still is, about 8 miles north of the city, at Columna Rhegina (ἡ Ῥηγίνων στυλίς), now *Villa San Giovanni*, where the channel is only 5 miles wide.

In view of the destruction of Reggio by earthquake in 1908, when 35,000 out of 40,000 inhabitants perished, Strabo's words, with their curious mingling of fact and fancy, are striking. 'It was called Rhegium, as Æschylus says, because of the convulsion which had taken place in this region; for Sicily was broken from the continent by earthquakes. . . . But now these mouths [of Ætna, the Lipari, and the neighbouring islands] being opened, through which the fire is drawn up, and the ardent masses and water poured out, they say that the land in the neighbourhood of the Sicilian Strait rarely suffers from the effect of earthquakes; but formerly all the passages to the surface being blocked up, the fire which was smouldering beneath the earth, together with the vapour, occasioned terrible earthquakes' (VI. i. 6).

To indicate the course of St. Paul's ship from Syracuse to Rhegium, St. Luke, who was evidently impressed by the good seamanship of the crew, uses a nautical term (*περιελθόντες*) which has perplexed exegetes (Ac 28^{13}). Probably it means 'by tacking.' This explanation was suggested by J. Smith, who writes, 'I am inclined to suppose that the wind was north-west, and that they worked to windward' (*The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*^{4}, 1880, p. 156). This tr. is now generally adopted in place of 'we fetched a compass' (AV) or 'we made a circuit' (RV). The alternative reading in ℵ*B—*περιελόντες*, 'casting loose'—was probably due to copyists who were not at home in the language of men of the sea. Arriving at Rhegium, the crew had to wait a day for a favourable wind. If the north-west breeze was still blowing, they could not go through the Straits, where there is scarcely enough sea-room for successful tacking; but when the wind veered to south they ran before it to Puteoli, a distance of 180 miles, in little more than a day (28^{13}).

LITERATURE.—C. Baedeker, *Southern Italy and Sicily*^{12}, London, 1896; P. Larissa, *Rhegium Chalcidense*, Rome, 1905.

JAMES STRAHAN.

RHODA (Ῥόδη, 'rose').—After St. Peter's miraculous deliverance from Herod's prison he went to the house of Mary the mother of Mark. When he had knocked, a young girl called Rhoda came to listen. In her joy at the sound of St. Peter's voice, she forgot to open the door, and, returning to report his presence, she was accused of being mad, but persisted in her declaration (Ac 12^{13-15}). Nothing further is known of her. The name was a common slave name, and she may have been a Christian slave in the home where we find her.

LITERATURE.—W. M. Ramsay, *The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the NT*, London, 1915, p. 209 ff.; Lady Ramsay, 'Her that kept the Door,' *ExpT* xxvii. (1915–16) 217 ff., 314 ff.

W. F. BOYD.

RHODES (Ῥόδος).—When St. Paul, in his voyage from Troas to Cæsarea, touched at the island of Rhodes (Ac 21^{1}), 12 miles from the S.W. corner of Asia Minor, he was in sight, if only for an evening and morning, of a beautiful city which was for centuries the capital of one of the noblest free States of ancient Greece. 'With regard to harbours, roads, walls, and other buildings, it so far surpasses other cities, that we know of none equal, much less superior to it' (Strabo, XIV. ii. 5). Highly favoured by Nature—'the sun shines every day in Rhodes,' said an ancient proverb (Pliny, *HN* ii. 62)—it owed still more to the naval enterprise, political wisdom, commercial integrity, and artistic genius of its people. On an amphitheatre of hills it was as carefully planned in 404 B.C.—by Hippodamus of Miletus, who also laid out the Piræus—as a modern garden-city. Occupying so central a position in the world that geographers reckoned from it their parallels of latitude and longitude, it succeeded in making itself a focus of the traffic of three continents. After the time of Alexander the Great, it was the first naval power in the Ægean, and its code of mercantile law was regarded as an ideal for all other States. Its opulence was merited by its humanity. 'The Rhodians, although their form of government is not democratic, are attentive to the welfare of the people, and endeavour to maintain the multitude of the poor. . . . There are public officers in the State, the function of whom is to procure and distribute provisions, so that the poor may obtain subsistence, and the city not suffer for want of persons to serve her, especially in manning her fleets' (Strabo, *loc. cit.*).

Such a commercial centre naturally attracted a colony of Jews, and about 139 B.C. Rhodes was one of the many free States to which Rome is said to have addressed a letter in favour of that race (1 Mac 15^{23}). Rhodes alternately benefited by the deserved favour and suffered from the unworthy jealousy of the Romans. For assisting them in their war against Antiochus the Great, she received (189 B.C.) a large part of Lycia and Caria, but when she began to be dreaded as a possible rival of Rome itself, she was not only shorn of these possessions, but nearly ruined in her commerce by the raising of her rival Delos into a free port. In the Mithridatic war her services to Rome were again so signal, and she won so much glory by successfully resisting a great siege (88 B.C.), that she recovered some of her lost territory and all her former prestige. Finally, however, for taking Cæsar's part in the Civil War, she was so severely punished by Cassius, who robbed her of her whole fleet (43 B.C.), that she never again attained her old prosperity. Vespasian made the island a part of the province of Lycia.

Rhodes was the city of the famous *Colossus*. Two specimens of her art are the *Laocoon* and the *Toro Farnese*. Her coins, with the Sun-god on the one side and the Rose on the other, are among the most beautiful in existence. Rhodes acquired a new fame in the Middle Ages as the home, for two centuries, of the Knights of St. John.

LITERATURE.—J. P. Mahaffy, *Greek Life and Thought*^{2}, 1896, ch. xv., *Alexander's Empire*, 1887, ch. xx.; C. Torr, *Rhodes in Ancient Times*, 1885; H. van Gelder, *Geschichte der alten Rhodier*, 1900.

JAMES STRAHAN.

RICHES.—See WEALTH.

RIGHT.—Three terms translated 'right' in the EVV call for notice.

1. *εὐθύς* ('straight') expresses pictorially the simplest notion, which also underlies the Eng. term 'right,' being especially used in connexion with 'way' or 'path' (Ac 13^{10}, 2 P 2^{15}). A transitional use, carrying an ethical sense, occurs in Ac 8^{21}: 'thy heart is not right' (*εὐθεῖα*).

2. *δίκαιος* comes into use when the notion of 'right' emerges on the ethical plane. Whatever accords with established custom (*δίκη*), with a recognized norm, is *δίκαιον*. That norm is found in the common ethical judgment of men; but the NT accentuates the norm as fixed by God (Ac 4^{19}). And ultimately the only true *δίκαιον* 'in the sight of men,' is *τὸ δίκαιον*, 'in the sight of God.' That is the element of truth in 'vox populi vox Dei.' In every conceivable position and relation in which a man finds himself there is a course of action or a state of being for him which is *as it should be*: the one straight line of conduct amongst many more or less crooked. This is *τὸ δίκαιον*, what it is right for a man to do or be.

3. *ἐξουσία* ('a right').—The idea of 'a right' easily grows out of the foregoing. It is the power or liberty to be, do, or possess what it is *δίκαιον* for a man in such and such circumstances to be, do, or possess (cf. 1 Co 9^{12}, He 13^{10}, Rev 22^{14}). (Regarding *ἐξουσία* as ='authority to rule,' note that all such authority, to be worth anything, must rest on *τὸ δίκαιον* as its basis.)

Discussions as to the 'rights' of Christians as such soon emerged in the primitive Church. In the NT see especially St. Paul's illuminating treatment in 1 Co 8–10. The widest, boldest claim is made as regards these rights (*πάντα ἔξεστιν*), only to be qualified immediately by a severe reference to the bearing of their exercise on others. Higher ethical judgments, too, may under certain circumstances demand the waiving of undoubted rights. See, *e.g.*, how St. Paul deals with the question of marriage, and especially with that of ministerial stipends (1 Co 9).

J. S. CLEMENS.

RIGHTEOUSNESS.—The term 'righteousness' does not convey a very definite or even a very attractive meaning to the reader of modern English, and the meaning which it does convey is only part of the full significance which the Greek term (*δικαιοσύνη*) would carry for a Christian reader in the Apostolic Age. In ordinary speech, a man is not usually called 'righteous'; the term has a certain formality and archaic flavour about it. But when he is, it means that he is just, that he will observe the moral code strictly, or that he will be punctilious in the discharge of such obligations as are incumbent on a man in his position. A 'righteous' man will be high-principled, but the adjective suggests limitations. It does not necessarily follow that he will be kind or affectionate. As a matter of fact, we speak of a man as 'just but not generous,' and 'righteous' has come upon the whole to be associated with 'just' in this connexion. A person who is 'righteous' is estimable rather than attractive. It is curious that once at least in the NT we come across a similar use of the Greek equivalent, in St. Paul's remark: 'Why, a man will hardly die for the just (ὑπὲρ δικαίου)—though one might bring oneself to die, if need be, for a good man' (ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, Ro 5^{7}). Here there certainly seems to be an implied distinction between the 'righteous' or 'just' man and the 'good' man; the former lacks those qualities of human kindness and affection which enable the latter to inspire enthusiasm and devotion in others. It is one thing to be scrupulous in respecting the rights of others, or even, as perhaps St. Paul meant, in fulfilling one's religious duties; it is another thing to have an instinctive sense of helpfulness and beneficence. The godly man may not be particularly human or humane. Even when he is, his beneficence sometimes lacks the warmth and heart which the 'good' man puts into his relations with others.

> 'He that works me good with unmoved face,
> Does it but half: he chills me while he aids,
> My benefactor, not my brother man!'
> (*Reflections on having left a place of retirement*, 49 ff.).

What Coleridge describes in these words resembles the character of the righteous or just man as distinguished from the good man. If we take Cicero's definition of the good man as 'he who assists those whom he can, and hurts nobody' ('vir bonus est is qui prodest quibus potest, nocet nemini' [*de Officiis*, iii. 15. 64]), we get a similar stress upon the positive and active interest of the good man in his fellows, as opposed to the more negative attitude associated with 'righteous.'[*]

But this is merely one of the meanings of 'righteousness' in the literature of the Apostolic Age. The Greek term δικαιοσύνη is employed by St. Paul in a technical sense, and by him and other writers in a variety of non-technical senses. One of the latter has just been noted, and, before passing on to the technical Pauline sense, it will be well to survey the other passages in which it is employed by him and later writers of the Apostolic Age without any specific theological reference.

1. Non-technical use of the term in apostolic literature (including St. Paul).—The usage of the term in 2 Cor. is particularly instructive. The verb 'justify' does not occur in this Epistle, but, as we shall see, one of the profoundest passages on righteousness in its technical application to the doctrine of justification falls within the scope of this letter. Yet side by side with this lie two non-technical meanings of the term.

(*a*) One of these is δικαιοσύνη in the sense of almsgiving, which it had already begun to acquire. In urging the Corinthians to be prompt and generous with their contributions to his fund for the relief of poverty among the Palestinian Jewish Christians, he quotes the LXX version of Ps 112^{9} and applies it to the situation of his readers (9^{9}): 'as it is written, He scatters his gifts broadcast to the poor, his charity (δικαιοσύνη) lasts for ever. He who furnishes the sower with seed and with bread to eat will supply seed for you and multiply it; he will increase the crop of your charities (τὰ γενήματα τῆς δικαιοσύνης ὑμῶν).' In this use of the term we can overhear the meaning which it had begun to gather in the religious ethic of Judaism (as early as the period of Sirach), where almsgiving or charity was regarded as so characteristic an expression of the truly pious life that δικαιοσύνη could be used as an equivalent for it upon occasion. Rabbinic piety now and then made this a feature of the *imitatio Dei*, as in the well-known saying[*] of Rabbi Chama ben Chaninah (*Sota*, 14*a*): 'As He clothes the naked (Gn 3^{21}), so do thou clothe the naked; as He nurses the sick (Gn 18^{1}), so do thou nurse the sick; as He comforts the mourners (Gn 25^{11}), so do thou comfort the mourners; as He buries the dead (Dt 34^{6}), so do thou bury the dead.' In other directions, it fitted in with the stress on charity as one of the surest means of acquiring merit before God. 'Almsgiving is a strong mediator between the Israelites and their Father in heaven; it brings the time of redemption nigh' (*Baba Bathra*, 10*a*). This still prevails in popular Islām. C. M. Doughty, speaking of his hospitable host Maatuk, observes that 'if the camels came home he milked a great bowlful for the stranger, saying, it was his sádaka, or meritorious human kindness, for God's sake.'[†] As the context indicates (see v.^{6}: 'he who sows generously will reap a generous harvest'), St Paul thinks of δικαιοσύνη here in the sense of an action (or rather, a character in action)[‡] which is pleasing to God, because it harmonizes with the Divine nature; bountiful, generous actions done to others will enrich a man with God's bounty as nothing else will. St. Paul would have been the last to teach any doctrine of charity as a merit, on which one could base some claim to God's approval. But he is free to recognize that such spontaneous expressions of kindness and mercy between man and man are inspired and rewarded by God.

(*b*) The other general sense is reflected in $6^{7.\ 14}$. In the former passage St. Paul, speaking of his methods in the Christian propaganda, claims that he employs 'the weapons of integrity for attack or for defence,' where δικαιοσύνη, as the preceding words indicate ('the holy Spirit, unaffected love, true words, the power of God'), is opposed to foul play, misrepresentation, and rancour; in evangelizing and in controversy, even when controversy is personal, he professes to be clean and honest. The second reference opposes δικαιοσύνη to iniquity or unregulated conduct, almost as goodness to wickedness: 'What have righteousness and iniquity in common, or how can light associate with darkness?' 'Morality' would be inadequate here, for what St. Paul has in mind is the religious life, but it is the religious life as expressed in conduct; he is certainly not using δικαιοσύνη in the technical sense in which he employs it elsewhere. 'Conduct is the word of common life,' says Matthew Arnold, 'morality is the word of philosophical disquisition, righteousness is the word of religion' (*Literature and Dogma*, ed. London, 1883, p. 16). It is in this sense, or in the allied sense of integrity, that it occurs in the Pastoral Epistles[§] (*e.g.* 1 Ti 6^{11}, 2 Ti 2^{22} 3^{16} 4^{8}), as well as in Eph 4^{24} 5^{9} 6^{14}. Similarly, the technical usage in Philippians is accompanied by the non-technical expression in 1^{11}, where the Apostle prays that the life of these Christians may be 'covered with that harvest of righteousness which Jesus Christ produces to the glory and praise of God.' This is equivalent to 'the harvest of the Spirit' (Gal 5^{22}), the good character produced by the influence of Christ or of the Spirit.

We have, indeed, no exact equivalent in English for what *δικαιοσυνη* meant to a Greek or to a primitive Christian, especially if he had been born in Judaism. ‘Righteousness’ is too formal and abstract in its associations for a modern mind; ‘justice,’ again, is too narrow and, like ‘integrity’ and ‘morality,’ it is insufficiently charged with religious feeling. The technical Pauline content of the term especially spills over when it is emptied into any of these modern words. They occasionally reproduce the sense of the Greek word in non-technical passages, but even in its restricted sense of political virtue, as applied to the man who obeys the law or who is a good citizen of the State, the term had impressed Aristotle, four centuries earlier, with its variety of meaning (*Nic. Eth.* v. i. 7),* and when it passed into the vocabulary of Judaism and of early Christianity its range became still wider, stretching from ‘justice’ across a broad field of meaning to ‘piety’ or ‘goodness.’ It may sound like a confession of defeat to say that we cannot reproduce the word precisely in English. But it is something gained, at any rate, to realize that the conception, even in St. Paul, is not stereotyped, and that the Apostle uses it in more senses than one. Much of the investigation into the Pauline usage has been vitiated by the assumption that the term invariably represented a single, well-defined idea in the writer's mind. St. Paul was not the slave of words, even of a great religious word like *δικαιοσύνη*. If his arguments on righteousness are sometimes puzzling, it is rather because he overtaxed this term and its family; he forced them to serve a variety of purposes, some of which were not obviously relevant to their original object and contemporary employment.

---

[*] There is an excellent note on this in Lightfoot's *Notes on Epistles of St. Paul*, London, 1895, p. 286 f. In Ro 7^{12}—'the command is holy, just (δικαία), and for our good (ἀγαθή)'—ἀγαθός has the same sense of 'beneficent.'

[*] Quoted in S. Schechter's *Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology*, London, 1909, p. 202 f.

[†] *Arabia Deserta*, 2 vols., London, 1888, ii. 278.

[‡] Cf. the splendid description of δικαιοσύνη in Job $29^{14f.}$, as social justice and goodness. The mere fact that צדקה often came to be rendered by ἐλεημοσύνη in later Judaism shows that δικαιοσύνη as a social virtue was far removed from our modern associations of 'righteousness.'

[§] In Tit 3^{5-7} God saves us in sheer pity, 'not for anything we had done ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ,' and justifies us (the only reference to justification in the Pastorals) by His grace.

Like Jesus, though more often, he uses ‘righteousness’ for the religious ideal, the relation to God in which all devout persons seek to stand. Thus, in Ro 9^{30-32} he writes: ‘Gentiles who never aimed at righteousness have attained it—that is, righteousness by faith; whereas Israel who did aim at the law of righteousness [*i.e.* at some code or rule which would lead to righteousness] has failed to reach that law. And why? Simply because Israel has relied not on faith but on what they could do.’ Similarly in the next section (10^{3-11}): ‘They would not surrender to the righteousness of God [*i.e.* to the righteousness which alone God will have and give], because they were ignorant of his righteousness [their zeal was not according to knowledge, v.^{2}] and therefore essayed to set up a righteousness of their own. Now Christ is an end to law, so as to let every believer (emphatic, as opposed to the man who relies on what he can do in the matter of obedience to law) have righteousness. Moses writes of law-righteousness: anyone who can perform it shall live by it.† But here is what faith-righteousness says: Confess with your mouth that Jesus is Lord, believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead,‡ and you will be saved; for with his heart man believes and is justified, with his mouth he confesses and is saved. No one who believes in him, the Scripture says, will ever be disappointed.’

These passages bring out two features of St. Paul's conception: (1) the contrast between God's righteousness and the religion which men make sincerely and passionately for themselves, and present as their own to God (‘a righteousness of their own’ here is equivalent to ‘a legal righteousness of my own’ in Ph 3^{9}); and (2) the remarkable substitution of Christ for the Torah as the means of establishing a right relation to God, involving so supreme and novel a conception of faith that St. Paul speaks of devotion to the Torah as though it really did not make faith count at all.* But, over and above these characteristics, it is noticeable that, probably owing to the particular argument he has in hand, he retains the classical term ‘righteousness’ for the great end which men sought by right and wrong ways of religious discipline.

Even in more general passages, ‘righteousness’ is the direct opposite to ‘sin’ (cf. Ac 13^{10}, 2 Co 11^{15}). Thus in Ro 6^{13}, ‘you must not let sin have your members for the service of vice; you must dedicate yourselves to God as men who have been brought from death to life, dedicating your members to God for the service of righteousness’ (and similarly in vv.$^{18-20}$). The expression in Ro 8^{10} is less obvious. When St. Paul says that ‘the human spirit is alive *διὰ δικαιοσύνην*,’ does he mean, as in ch. 6, ‘for the sake of righteousness’ (*i.e.* to practise righteousness), or ‘as the result of righteousness’ (*i.e.* of the new, vital relation to God which the Divine righteousness has created through Christ—the thought of $5^{17f.}$)? Probably the latter is uppermost in his mind. In Ro 14^{17}, however, we have the term used in what is apparently a more restricted sense: ‘the reign of God is not a matter of eating and drinking; it means righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit.’ As peace is defined immediately to mean harmony and good feeling between members of the Church (v.^{19}), the likelihood is that righteousness denotes primarily either integrity or just dealing as an expression of the Christian spirit (so Clem. Rom. lxii. 2), the very opposite of ‘injuring your brother’ (v.^{15}). The larger interpretation of the three terms is not, of course, to be ruled out, especially as all three have been already conjoined in 5^{1}, and as the distinctively religious basis would never be far from St. Paul's mind. But the context (v.^{18}, ‘he who serves Christ on these lines’) suggests that the stress falls upon what may be called, for the sake of convenience, though inaccurately, the ‘ethical’ bearings of righteousness and peace at any rate. (It is quite unlikely, however, that St. Paul had in mind the saying of Mt 6^{33}, ‘Seek God's reign and his righteousness.’) Matthew Arnold has somewhere described this verse as one of the texts in shadow, which ought to be brought into prominence to correct materialistic, popular views about the Kingdom of God. But this was not St. Paul's point, even on the ‘ethical’ interpretation of his words; he was not opposing conduct to supernaturalism in thus defining the nature of the reign.

In the cognate sense of justice, *i.e.* of the moral goodness which makes an authority act fairly and impartially, *δικαιοσύνη* for the Greeks was not only a human but a divine virtue. There is a remarkable passage in Plutarch's *Life of Aristides* (6) which brings out this usage of the term. Plutarch observes that the justice of Aristides was what impressed his contemporaries most, and won for him ‘that most royal and divine title of “the Just.”’ He then proceeds to moralize upon the disinclination of men to imitate and reproduce this quality of the divine nature. The quality of incorruption (*ἀφθαρσία*) and eternity (*τὸ ἀΐδιον*) they envy and felicitate God on possessing; the quality of power (*τὸ κύριον καὶ τὸ δυνατόν*) they dread and fear; they love and honour and revere the deity for his *δικαιοσύνη*, and yet, Plutarch sadly reflects, the first of these three emotions, the passion for immortality (‘of which our nature is not capable’), is the strongest, while the divine *ἀρέτη*, *i.e.* justice, which alone of the divine excellences is within our reach, commands least interest.

---

* He regards *δικαιοσύνη* as (*a*) complete virtue, in the general sense of obedience to law, and (*b*) as a special part of virtue, viz. fairness or equity.

† The original implies that this is quite possible (Lv 18^{5}; cf. Bar $4^{1f.}$: ‘this is the book of the commandments of God, and the law that endureth for ever; all they that hold it fast are to live, but such as leave it shall die’), but the present writer translates as above in order to suggest St. Paul's meaning, viz. that it had been proved impossible.

‡ This cardinal note of saving faith, viz. belief in Jesus as the Risen Lord, was what St. Paul found already adumbrated in the faith of Abraham (Ro $4^{17. 24}$). In the OT, as in the NT, faith is elicited by, and directed towards, ‘a God who makes the dead live.’

* *E.g.* Gal 3^{23-25}, where the coming of faith, faith in Jesus Christ, marks an epoch after the regime of the Law.

Plutarch is thinking specially of men in authority, and his language illustrates the use of the term in the Epistle to the Hebrews (1^{9}), where the writer quotes Ps 45 as a description of the Messianic King,* 'Thou hast loved justice and hated lawlessness,' and later on (7^{2}) recalls the meaning of Melchizedek's name as 'king of justice.'

After St. Paul, the idea of righteousness ceases to occupy any special position in the apostolic literature; the term either echoes his technical usage, though this is rare, or is employed in one or other of its general meanings. The sole occurrence in the Fourth Gospel (16$^{8-10}$) is remarkable, because it gives a turn to the word which is unfamiliar even to St. Paul. One of the three converging lines along which the Spirit, acting through the Church, confounds and condemns the unbelieving world is the witness to the Resurrection, which proves that Christ was not a blasphemous Messianic pretender, as the Jews held, but innocent, just, acting according to the Divine will. 'He will convince men of righteousness, because I go to the Father and you see me no more.' The overcoming of death by Jesus, which is testified by the presence of His *alter ego*, the Spirit, in the Church, is a convincing proof that He was 'right' in His claims, and that Christians who believed in Him, not the Jews who murdered Him, were 'righteous,' *i.e.* fulfilling the Divine will. The obscure line from the primitive hymn quoted in 1 Ti 3^{16}, 'he was vindicated by the Spirit' (ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι), probably is an allusion to this point of view.† It is singular that this is the only ‡ NT application of the OT sense of the phrase, which meant the open vindication of Israel, by some signal act of Divine favour, before the nations who had been scoffers and persecutors.

The justification of Jesus came up, however, not long afterwards in a different form. Trypho told Justin (*Dial.* 67) that if Christians could prove from Scripture that Jesus really was the Messiah, it would be better to argue that He deserved this honour on account of His dutiful obedience to the rites and regulations of the Law than that He owed it to a legendary virgin-birth. Justin's reply is that Jesus was circumcised and obedient to the other ordinances of the Mosaic code, but 'not as if he were justified thereby.'

Justin's position is practically that of Mt 3^{15}; Jesus fulfils every religious requirement (πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην) of the Law, but only as that is part of His obedience to the Father. It is noticeable, in this connexion, that St. Paul never speaks of Jesus Christ as 'righteous,' nor of His righteousness, although this was a familiar predicate of Messiah not only in the OT but in the later Judaism, especially in the *Enochic Parables*, where righteousness is one of the leading characteristics of Messiah as well as of the saints. Messiah as Son of Man is 'born to righteousness' (lxxi. 14) and possesses it as an essential quality of His nature; it is primarily the virtue of a conqueror, who establishes the right and vindicates the faithful by overthrowing the strong anti-Divine powers of earth; but it is beginning to be more than the equipment of the Divine champion or law-giver, and (cf. *Test. Judah*, xxiv. 1) it is associated with sinlessness as well as with wisdom or knowledge. Even when St. Paul speaks in terms of this militant Messianism (*e.g.* 2 Th 1–2), he refrains from calling Jesus 'The Righteous One.'§ Otherwise, he describes Him as 'born under the law' and as serving the Jews on earth in fulfilment of God's promises; in Ph 2$^{6f.}$ he does not suggest that the obedience of Jesus under the Law amounted in any sense to 'justification,' or even to the maturing of character outlined in He 5$^{8f.}$ His large use of 'righteousness' did not include any reference to the sinlessness which he presupposed in the Son of God.

The crisis of the Pauline struggle with the Law is so far behind that the author of 1 John feels at liberty (cf. Rev 22^{11}) to use a legal phrase like 'doing righteousness' (cf. *Pss.-Sol.* ix. 9 : 'he who does righteousness is treasuring up life for himself with the Lord'). Its associations were as old as the Greek Bible, and evidently it could no longer be misunderstood (cf. Clem. Rom. xxxi. 2, etc.). Thus in 2^{29} and 3^{7} the 'doing of righteousness' is a synonym for the 'doing of God's will';* it is at once the expression and the evidence of regeneration, and consequently the antithesis to 'committing sin.' It is possible that the stringent tone of these sayings about the ethical bearing of 'righteousness' was called out by some antinomian movement which disparaged mere morality in the interests of a Gnostic superiority, or by a local abuse of the Pauline teaching. Certainly the latter is the case in the Epistle of James, *e.g.* 2^{23}. The idea that belief justified by itself would not have been suggested, so far as we know, by any Jewish type of piety. The formalism † against which the writer feels it necessary to warn his readers arose from an exaggeration and misapprehension of the Pauline antithesis ‡ between faith and works—an antithesis which was coined by St. Paul. Hence 'faith' in St. James is closer to a confession of monotheism (cf. 2^{19}) than to the Pauline conception. This is not affected by the reference in 2^{1}. St. James can conceive the existence of a faith which is devoid of any practical element, requiring the breath of 'works' to vitalize it: 'As the body without the breath of life is dead, so faith is dead without works' (2^{26}). From the Pauline standpoint, the reverse would be more true: it is faith that vitalizes works. But 'works' are moral actions for St. James, not legal observances. The entire omission of any reference to the Law in this section of his Epistle is significant. It corroborates the impression that justification means for him God's recognition of moral conduct, not the free forgiveness of sins, which according to St. Paul made any Christian character and conduct possible. The only allusion to δικαιοσύνη is in the OT quotation (2^{23}), from which he draws the inference that Abraham's righteousness rested not on his faith alone but on his act of practical obedience in being prepared to sacrifice Isaac. When he says elsewhere that 'human anger does not promote divine righteousness' (1^{20}), *i.e.* the religion of which God approves, and that 'peacemakers reap righteousness' (3^{18}) as the harvest of their quiet efforts in the Church, he is illustrating the wrong and the right ways of promoting the religious life; δικαιοσύνη is employed in its familiar and normal sense to denote the devout life of goodness as that is lived under the standard and scrutiny of God (cf. Ac 10^{35}: 'he who reverences God and lives a good life—ἐργαζόμενος δικαιοσύνην—in any nation is welcomed by him'), and the writer urges that wrangling and angry controversy are not a soil which can be expected to foster the growth of spiritual religion (δικαιοσύνη = 'cet état normal auquel Dieu prend plaisir et auquel le chrétien doit tendre' [E. Reuss, *Les Épîtres catholiques*, Paris, 1878, p. 139]). The second of these phrases is paralleled by the expression in He 12^{11}, where those who are trained by the discipline of God 'reap the fruit of it afterwards in the peace of an upright life' (καρπὸν εἰρηνικὸν . . . δικαιοσύνης); here δικαιοσύνη includes participation in the holiness of God's nature (v.^{10}) as the characteristic of personal religion, and the peace is primarily harmony with His purpose, an absence of friction and fretting, although the further thought of harmony within the community is soon developed (v.^{14}). Neither here nor elsewhere in Hebrews do we find δικαιοσύνη used outside the non-technical range of meaning. In 11^{33} 'wrought righteousness' means 'administered justice,' and in 5^{13} the term is not far from what a modern would call moral truth,* as the context proves (v.^{14}). Similarly in Ac 24^{25}: when St. Paul made Felix uneasy by preaching 'about δικαιοσύνη and self-mastery and the future judgment,' it was not the δικαιοσύνη of Ro 1^{17} but the morality demanded by God (cf. Ro $2^{3f.}$). The only exception is the isolated echo or adaptation of the Pauline phraseology in He 11^{7}, where Noah is said to have inherited 'the righteousness that follows faith' (τῆς κατὰ πίστιν δικαιοσύνης). Noah is passed over by St. Paul, but Philo had already noted that he was the first man to be called δίκαιος in the OT, and although the writer of Hebrews carries back this title of honour to Abel (v.^{4}), he signalizes the faith of Noah as the reason why he obtained the position of δίκαιος before God. The non-technical use of Pauline language here tallies with the fact that the writer does not work elsewhere with the Pauline categories of faith and justification. Noah had faith, acted on it, and thus was entitled to the position of δίκαιος. The idea is closer to St. James than to St. Paul.

---

* Similarly, in the only reference to a Divine δικαιοσύνη in Revelation (19^{11}), the Messiah discharges the two-fold function of a Semitic king—he 'rules and makes war *justly*' (ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ). God is 'righteous' in the Apocalypse (*e.g.* 15^{3} 16$^{5.7}$ 19^{2}), in the OT sense of vindicating the saints and punishing the wicked persecutors.

† This does not corroborate the hypothesis that St. Paul regarded Jesus as Himself justified by His resurrection, *i.e.* that the latter proved Him to be vindicated as sinless by God, so that Christians who identify themselves with Him by faith show and appropriate the same justification. Had St. Paul conceived the matter thus, he would have spoken of Christians being 'justified with Christ.' But he never uses this phrase.

‡ Unless we group with it 1 P 3^{23}.

§ St. Luke makes him use the term in Ac 22^{14}; otherwise, it is confined to Stephen (Ac 7^{52}), Peter (1 P 3^{18}), and John (1 Jn 2^{1}).

* When Mt 7^{21} is quoted in 2 Clem. iv. 2, 'righteousness' is similarly substituted for 'the will of my Father in heaven.'

† Thus Clem. Rom. xxx. 3 can even say, 'we are justified by deeds (ἔργοις) not words.'

‡ For a different view, cf. B. Bartmann's paper on 'St. Paulus und St. Jacobus über die Rechtfertigung' in *Biblische Studien*, ii. [Freiburg i. B., 1897] 30 f., 146 f., and S. Harbent's discussion in J. M. A. Vacant and E. Mangenot's *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, lii. [1913] 70 f.

In Rev 19^{8} the white linen in which the Bride of Messiah is allowed to array herself for the marriage is defined as 'the righteous conduct (δικαιώματα) of the saints,' *i.e.* of the faithful who are personified as the Bride. The plural is curious; it recalls the plural use of δικαιοσύναι, *e.g.* in (the Greek of) Sir 44^{10} and *Pss.-Sol.* ix. 6 (cf. 2 Es 7^{35}), as acts of righteousness (charity). But St. Paul uses the singular in Ro 5^{18} of a righteous act, and the plural actually occurs in Bar 2^{19}, the famous protest against the doctrine of the *zecuth* of the Fathers (see below). The absence of the doctrine of justification by faith from the Apocalypse made it less difficult for the writer to adopt such language without fear of being misunderstood. He emphasizes as usual that moral purity and activity are the conditions of future bliss, but no one who read his pages could suspect him of reducing the religious life to moralism. The figure of speech is as old as Job 29^{14}, Is 61^{10}, *Pss.-Sol.* xi. 8, and Sir 27^{8}, but the words of Bar $5^{2f.}$ ('O Jerusalem . . . cast round thee the tunic of the righteousness that is from God') are a specially apt parallel. The last-named passage, which predicts that in the Messianic Age Jerusalem's name is to be 'the peace of righteousness,' illustrates the original background of allusions like He 12^{11}; vindicated Israel, triumphantly justified by God over her persecutors, will enjoy peace. It was a short step to the moralization of this, and to its application to the religious experience of δικαιοσύνη in the present.

In 1 Peter, the just judgment of God brings out the thought of the moral order as a warning against careless conduct on the part of Christians (1^{17}) and as a consolation for the innocent who may have to suffer unjustly, like Jesus (2^{23}); but the term 'righteousness' † is employed only in its general, non-technical sense (2^{24} 3^{14}), as repeatedly in the Apostolic Fathers (*e.g. Barn.* iv. 12, etc.). The same is the case * in 2 P 2^{5} and 3^{13} (apocalyptic sense), but in 1^{1} it denotes the 'equity' of God in granting the same privilege and quality of faith to Gentiles as to Jewish believers, or to ordinary Christians as to apostles. Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 93 f.) quotes Gn 15^{6} for the same purpose as St. Paul does in Ro $4^{9f.}$—to prove that Abraham's faith was prior to his circumcision—and concludes that God cannot be shown to have acted capriciously or unfairly in history, since the condition for righteousness has been the same (as Clem. Rom. xxxii. 3 f.) from the first. But, when he comes to define righteousness, he echoes the definition of Jesus rather than that of St. Paul, quotes Mt 22^{37}, and adds: 'since all righteousness is divided into the two branches of love to God and love to one's neighbour, whoever loves God with all his heart, and with all his strength, and his neighbour as himself, is truly a righteous man.' This is precisely the definition of the commandment of δικαιοσύνη given by Polycarp (*ad Phil.* iii. 2).

The language of the *Odes of Solomon* recalls partly the OT and partly the NT, though it never quotes from the latter. The Divine righteousness succours the elect (viii. 22) and their righteous cause triumphs over spiritual evil (viii. 6 f.); in this OT sense, righteousness can be spoken of as man's as well as God's. It is even personified, like Victory, and represented as conferring the everlasting crown of truth upon the pious (ix. 7–10). The allusion in xxix. 5 is obscure; if verse 6 ('For I believed in the Lord's messiah . . .') is a (Christian) interpolation, then the words 'He brought me up out of the depths of Sheol: and from the mouth of death He drew me: and thou didst lay my enemies low, and He justified me by His grace' might denote, as in viii. 6, the vindication of the Christian or of Messiah (cf. above, p. 373), but probably the Ode is a unity and refers to the experience of spiritual victory (see Rendel Harris's ed., Cambridge, 1911, p. 61, and E. A. Abbott's *Light on the Gospel from an Ancient Poet*, do., 1912, p. 247 f.), like the still more obscure reference to justification in xxxi. 5. The singer, in xvii. 2, is 'justified in my Lord,' *i.e.* freed from the bondage of vanity and error; the expression is Pauline but not the content, and in xxv. 10 the more congenial OT significance recurs ('I became holy by thy righteousness; and all my adversaries were afraid of me . . . and I was justified by His gentleness'), righteousness being the saving strength of God exerted on behalf of His own. One of the repeated sources of ambiguity in the interpretation of the Odes is the uncertainty as to who is the speaker—the soul of man, Truth, or the Christ. In xli. 13 Christ is distinctly described, however, as 'exalted by His own righteousness,' and the Divine title of 'The Righteous One' occurs in connexion with the Crucifixion in xlii. 3 (though not in Frankenberg's reconstruction of the text), but it is not so clear whose Heart pours out 'as it were a gushing stream of righteousness' (xxxvi. 7). In the only ethical allusion (xx. 3), the OT colouring leaves it uncertain whether the hymn-writer, in saying that 'the sacrifice of the Lord is righteousness, and purity of heart and lips,' meant by 'righteousness' works of mercy and charity (see above, p. 371), or, in the more general sense, goodness inspired by the Golden Rule.

Ignatius quotes Mt 3^{15} in *Smyrn.* i. 1, but the term and the idea have no place in his theology.† Polycarp uses the word more frequently; he quotes Mt 5^{10} in *ad Phil.* 2 and 2 Co 6^{7} in iv. 1, he employs δικαιοσύνη to bring out the general idea of Christian goodness (iii. 1, 3, ix. 1 f.), he echoes St. Paul in speaking of Christ as 'our righteousness' (viii. 1: 'let us hold fast by our hope and the pledge of our righteousness, that is, of Christ Jesus who bore our sins in his own body on the tree, who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth, who endured all things for our sakes, that we might live in him'), and once speaks of God's righteousness, though not in the Pauline sense (v.^{2}: 'likewise the deacons must be blameless before his righteousness,* as servants of God and Christ, not of men'). God's righteousness here probably means His searching presence, before which Christians must eschew sin, just as in *En.* ci. 1–9 it denotes the Presence which ought to inspire fear and reverence in men ('Observe the heaven, ye children of heaven, and every work of the Most High, and fear ye him and work no evil in his presence. If he sends his anger upon you because of your deeds, ye cannot petition him; for ye spake proud and insolent words against his righteousness: therefore ye shall have no peace. And see ye not the sailors of the ships, how their ships are tossed to and fro by the waves, and are shaken by the winds, and are in sore trouble? . . . Do not the sailors of the ships fear the sea? Yet sinners fear not the Most High!'). On the other hand, St. Paul's very language is echoed, and his ideas reproduced, in the *Epistle to Diognetus*, 9—one of the passages in the so-called Apostolic Fathers which send the surge of genuine religious feeling straight into the mind of a modern reader. 'So, having himself planned everything together with his Son, he permitted us during the time before to be swept along by disorderly impulses just as we chose, carried away by pleasures and passions—not at all because he delighted in our sins, but because he was forbearing [ἀνεχόμενος; cf. ἀνοχῇ in Ro 3^{26}: below, p. 388], not because he approved of that period of iniquity, but because he was fashioning [δημιουργῶν] this present period of righteousness in order that we, whose very actions then proved us unworthy of life, may now be [made? counted?] worthy of it by God's goodness, and may be enabled by God's power to enter the Kingdom of God after we had made it plain that by ourselves we could not. When our iniquity was full, and when it had become perfectly plain that the recompense of punishment and death was awaiting it [this corresponds to the Pauline philosophy of history in Gal 4^4, Ro 5^6; see below, p. 389], and when the time came which in God's purpose was to manifest his goodness and power (O the surpassing kindness and love of God!), instead of hating us, rejecting us, or bearing malice against us, he was long-suffering, he bore with us, he took our sins upon himself in pity, and gave his own Son to be a ransom for us, the holy for the wicked, the innocent for the evil, the just for the unjust, the incorruptible for the corruptible, the immortal for the mortal. What else but his righteousness could cover our sins? By whom, save only by the Son of God, could we be justified [δικαιωθῆναι: either 'made just' or 'acquitted'], wicked and impious as we were? Oh sweet exchange! O inscrutable creation [δημιουργία]! O benefits unlooked for! That the wickedness of many should be hidden by [ἐν] a single righteous One, that the righteousness of One should make many wicked righteous [δικαιώσῃ as above]!' The use of δικαιοσύνη in this fine outburst of faith recalls both senses of the term. On the one hand, it denotes generally the Christian religion, and this is repeated at the close of the next chapter, where the writer tells Diognetus that, when he sees what the real fire of hell is like, he will count Christian martyrs blessed who 'endure the temporary fire for the sake of righteousness.' On the other hand, we find the term used specifically in a Christological sense. The latter usage reaches back to St. Paul, and to it we may now turn, *i.e.* to δικαιοσύνη, as something more than a particular virtue or grace of the Christian life, or even than a generic term for Christian goodness.

---

* The present writer prefers this interpretation of λόγος δικαιοσύνης to the interpretation of von Soden ('richtiger Rede') and Reuss ('l'enseignement complet'), though the latter can also support itself on Greek usage.

† In Ac 17^{31}, the only place where it occurs in St. Paul's speeches, it is in a quotation from the Psalter (Ps 9^{8})—'he has fixed a day on which *he will judge the world justly* (ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ) by a man whom he has destined for this' (*i.e.* Jesus).

* Noah is 'the herald of righteousness' (2^{5}), as in the Jewish tradition of *Jubilees* (vii. 20 f.) and *Sibylline Oracles* (cf. p. 483) *e.g.* he preaches to his wicked contemporaries.

† The phrase in *ad Phil.* viii. 2 ('that I may be justified by your prayers') seems to refer to martyrdom.

2. Technical Pauline use of the term.—

The small group of words connected with righteousness in the specific sense of the term is as follows: δικαιοσύνη or 'righteousness' is the state of those who are δίκαιοι ('just')* because they have been 'justified' (the verb is δικαιοῦν, -οῦσθαι) by God, and their acquittal or justification is δικαίωσις. The declaration of this verdict is sometimes taken to be the meaning of δικαίωμα, but in Ro 5^{16} it is probably equivalent to δικαίωσις, and in Ro 5^{18} it means the 'act of redress' which makes acquittal possible. The latter sense develops the Greek usage, which, according to Aristotle (*Nic. Eth.* v. vii. 7), employed δικαιοπράγημα as the opposite of ἀδικήμα and reserved δικαίωμα for the rectification of an unjust action (τὸ ἐπανόρθωμα τοῦ ἀδικήματος).

The phrase 'righteousness of God' occurs in 2 Co 5^{21}, Ro 1^{17} $3^{5.21-22}$ (twice) $3^{25f.}$ (twice) 10^3 and Ph 3^9 (δικαιοσύνη ἐκ θεοῦ). The phrase 'righteousness of faith' occurs in Ro $4^{11.13}$ 9^{30} (δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως) 10^6 (δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως) and Ph 3^9 (δικαιοσύνη ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει). The former is an OT expression, although some of the LXX translators seem to have avoided it as far as possible. St. Paul stamps it afresh, and he coins the cognate expression, 'righteousness of faith.' In neither case is there any subtle difference of meaning suggested by the addition of ἐκ; it merely emphasizes the fact implied in the simple genitive, that the δικαιοσύνη originates with God. The life He possesses, He imparts to men, and therefore δικαιοσύνη may be said to be 'His' in either sense. Whether we start from the idea of δικαιοσύνη in itself or from that of faith, it is plain that St. Paul could have neither thought nor spoken of any such standing or relationship except as one of experience, a position of life resting on the attitude of God to sinful men in Jesus Christ.

Instead of discussing ***seriatim*** the succession of conflicting views of righteousness in St. Paul's theology, we shall prefix some characteristic definitions and descriptions, in order to indicate the main outlines of debate, and the various attempts which have been made to extricate a meaning from the labyrinth of this problem.

(i.) 'This δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ . . . is . . . the adequate relation founded in God's own nature, in which, as the idea of religion requires, man has to stand towards God' (F. C. Baur, *Paulus*, Eng. tr., vol. ii. p. 136). It is 'the way opened up by God for this purpose' (*ib.* footnote).

(ii.) 'The true relation between God and man, which, being ordained by God, presents itself to the consciousness of man as a new religious principle, as a new regulator of his religious behaviour, and to which man has to submit himself, by allowing his attitude towards God to be determined by this divinely ordained principle' (O. Pfleiderer, *Paulinism*, Eng. tr., London, 1877, vol. i. p. 175).

(iii.) 'The highest religious-ethical ideal, the realization of which every religion must ultimately strive after, because it is only in consequence of its realization that man knows himself to be standing in that right relation to God which guarantees his salvation' (B. Weiss, *Lehrbuch der biblischen Theologie des NT*, Eng. tr., vol. i. p. 317 n.).

(iv.) 'Righteousness is nothing else than moral goodness regarded in its intrinsic worth or acceptableness . . . viewed relatively to God's judgment or approval of it' (J. H. Newman, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*^{3}, London, 1874, p. 107).

(v.) 'This righteousness which comes from God by faith is not a more or less relative perfection which God realizes in man, but consists in this, that God, as the consequence of faith, replaces man in normal touch (*rapport normal*) with himself' (Goguël, *L'Apôtre Paul et Jésus-Christ*, p. 29).

(vi.) 'This righteousness obtained by man through Christ is designated the righteousness of God, not merely to denote that it is valid in His sight, or that He recognizes it as equivalent to the fulfilment of the law . . . but to show that this righteousness is produced and constituted by God as a state which He Himself can alone impart' (C. von Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age*, i.^{2} [London, 1897] 167).

(vii.) 'This righteousness exists already in God as an attribute and active force; it is transferred to man, and realized in him by the action of Divine grace.' It 'is more than a simple acquittal of the guilty; it is an actual power (δύναμις Θεοῦ), which enters into the world and is organically developed there,—like the power of sin, but in opposition to it' (A. Sabatier, *The Apostle Paul*, Eng. tr., pp. 298, 299).

(viii.) 'Paul's starting-point, it cannot be too often repeated, is the idea of righteousness'; 'the righteousness of God; a sense of conformity with the divine moral order, the will of God, a sense of harmony with this order, of acceptance with God' (Matthew Arnold, *St. Paul and Protestantism*, London, 1887, pp. 44, 41 f.).

(ix.) 'The righteousness of faith is the divine righteousness which a man receives when he receives Christ. It is not a mere declaration by God that the sinner is justified or forgiven for his past sins and accounted righteous without regard to his actual character; it is not a mere status into which he is introduced by such declaration, but it is at bottom the real righteousness or the righteous nature which is bestowed upon the believer by God' (A. C. McGiffert, *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, Edinburgh, 1897, p. 142 f.).

---

* Cf. *En.* liii. 7, 'before his righteousness' (*i.e.* his holy presence).

* But St. Paul prefers to call them δικαιωθέντες rather than δίκαιοι. He does not even call Abraham δίκαιος.

(x.) 'Righteousness is an objective condition of mankind transferred into this condition by an act of God . . . an objective righteousness which by the grace of God is imputed to the man who believes in God's grace in the cross of Christ, although he is actually still sinful' (C. Holsten, *Das Evangelium des Paulus*, vol. ii. p. 65).

(xi.) 'God's righteousness is not only judicial righteousness but also the righteous attitude of God, corresponding to his nature, which in virtue of his faithfulness to his promise is made accessible to men in the gospel, so that they too share in his righteousness' (P. Feine, *Theologie des NT*², p. 343 f.).

(xii.) 'There are two great facts which correspond to the doctrine of righteousness by faith, which is also the doctrine of the universality of the Gospel: first, the vision which the Apostle saw on the way to Damascus; secondly, the actual conversion of the Gentiles by the preaching of the Apostle. Righteousness by faith, admission of Gentiles, even the rejection and restoration of the Jews, are—himself under so many different points of view' (B. Jowett, *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians, and Romans*, London, 1894, ii. 258).

(xiii.) 'It is unbiblical, then, to assume that between God's grace or love and His righteousness there is an opposition, which in its bearing upon the sinful race of men would lead to a contradiction, only to be solved through the interference of Christ. The righteousness of inexorable retribution, which would be expressed in the sentence *Fiat justitia, pereat mundus*, is not in itself a religious conception, nor is it the meaning of the righteousness which in the sources of the Old and New Testaments is ascribed to God' (A. Ritschl, *Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*, Bonn, 1882–83, Eng. tr., ii. [1900] p. 473).

(xiv.) 'The Pauline conception of righteousness is not juristic but ethical, and he does not recognise as proceeding from God's nature of holy love any contradiction of righteousness and grace which must be removed by a satisfaction of the former' (W. Beyschlag, *NT Theologie*, Eng. tr., vol. ii. p. 137).

(xv.) 'The righteousness of God . . . its intrinsic meaning is God's own eternal righteousness, revealed in Christ for reconciling the world to himself, rather than (as commonly interpreted) the *forensic* righteousness (so-called) imputed to man' (J. Barmby, on Ro 1^{17}, in *Pulpit Commentary*, London, 1890).

(xvi.) 'I know that by the righteousness of God is sometimes meant that of which God is the author, and which he bestows upon us; but here the only thing meant is, that being supported by the expiation of Christ we are able to stand at the tribunal of God' (Calvin, on 2 Co 5^{21}).

This catena is representative so far, that it illustrates the two-fold tendency, since Baur, to re-state the older Reformed idea of an objective righteousness, and on the other hand to moralize the conception. But the more recent movements of criticism (see Literature) have been specially swayed by an emphasis on the eschatological element and an attempt to establish some organic connexion between the Pauline and the OT conceptions. Cremer's monograph is of special value, in both directions, for its independent re-statement on the lines of Ritschl.

3. Technical Pauline use of the term 'God's righteousness.'—(*a*) *Origin and meaning.*—The phrase 'God's righteousness' or 'a righteousness of God' is one which St. Paul has charged with a special meaning. The Greek words δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ are sometimes employed in another sense—*e.g.*, as we shall see, in Ro 3^{25}, where they denote His justice or moral equity, and in $3^{4f.}$, where they similarly express the thought of His justice or faithfulness to His word.[*] But in a central group of passages they bear a technical meaning. One set of passages within this group connects the Divine righteousness closely with the Person of Christ (1 Co 1^{30}, 2 Co 5^{21}, Ro $3^{22.\ 26}$); another set presents the thought in a less definite connexion (Ro 1^{17} 10^{3}). What is common to all, however, is the presupposition that this righteousness, this state of acceptance with God, this right relationship between the righteous God and sinful men, is brought about by God. It is not the goal of a laborious quest of man for God. The initiative is with Him. That is what the genitive signifies. He wills, He creates, He bestows, this bliss. 'It is all the doing of God' (2 Co 5^{18}). When St. Paul speaks of righteousness as 'God's,' in opposition to a righteousness which is man's ('their own,' 'my own,' see below), he has the same religious interest as the Johannine theology in speaking of the new birth. The origin of the Christian life lies in the will of God as a will of life for man. 'The righteousness which consists not in what we do but in what we are, is the righteousness of faith,' and what we are, we are by the grace of God. It is He who sets us in this new, vital relationship, by pardoning us for Christ's sake.

P. Wernle, who laments St. Paul's doctrine of justification by faith as 'one of his most disastrous creations' (*Beginnings of Christianity*, Eng. tr., London and New York, 1903–04, i. 309), admits that its misleading husk contains the great and profound thought that 'God is our Father, who freely gives to us whether we deserve it or not, and that we men, just as we are, are His children, living by His love.' Jowett's essay on 'Righteousness by Faith' (*The Epistles of St. Paul to the Thess., Gal. and Rom.*³, ii. 247–272) is not one of his strongest pieces, but it equally penetrates to this thought as one of the ethical contributions of the doctrine to the religious life. In *Exp*, 8th ser., iv. [1912] 252–262, J. Oman emphasizes the same aspect. It is one of the points at which St. Paul's subordination of the βασιλεία or *malcuth* doctrine to that of the *zecuth* turns out to be a real parallel to the teaching of Jesus, who subordinated the *zecuth* idea to that of the *malcuth*. St. Paul's category is closer to the Rabbinic standpoint, but the conception of God as the gracious Giver breaks through until it answers to that of the Father, in the teaching of Jesus, who takes the initiative by sending the Son and setting up the Kingdom for men on earth. For some other aspects of this parallel, see W. Sanday's article on 'St. Paul's Equivalent for the Kingdom of Heaven,' in *JThSt* i. [1899–1900] 481–491.

It is this interest that made the legal phraseology about faith being 'reckoned as righteousness' by God so attractive to St. Paul. The status of being right with God was something which men owed to Him, not to themselves; it depended on His verdict, on His gracious assurance that He was prepared to treat them as 'righteous.' But in several ways the Apostle shows that the status was more than a legal fiction. In itself, 'the idea of righteousness as dependent on a divine judgment (חָשַׁב) could only have arisen on the basis of legalism, while at the same time it points beyond it' (Skinner, *ICC*, 'Genesis,' Edinburgh, 1910, on Gn 15^{6}).[*] It points beyond legalism in St. Paul from various aspects. The God who thus reckons men righteous is a Giver, not a Judge, not even a Lawgiver. The basis for His reckoning is a Divine self-sacrifice, due to Divine love for men, the death of Christ, God's Son, who breaks the power of sin and death in the flesh for the doomed race of men. And the reckoning is interpreted as equivalent to forgiveness, a blissful experience (Ro $4^{5f.}$). To be treated as 'righteous' is to be pardoned and reconciled. The status is a relationship to God which means life, as opposed to the condemnation and death which are the fate of sin, *i.e.* of those who refuse this reconciliation and therefore have their trespasses still counted against them (2 Co 5^{19}: 'In Christ God reconciled the world to himself, instead of counting men's trespasses against them'). Just as sin means to fall short of the Divine glory (Ro 3^{23}), so to receive God's righteousness is to participate in that glory—and glory, in this connexion,[†] is associated (cf. 2 Co 3^{6}–4^{6}) with life. The terminology of 'righteousness' and 'justify' was not quite so well suited to bring out this positive, personal relation to God as some other phrases and conceptions[*] which St. Paul employs, but even here he reveals now and then the deeper religious interests to which the juridical conception pointed. Thus, while the old debate whether righteousness, in the phrase 'righteousness of God,' meant an attribute of God or some quality which He imparted, whether 'God' was subjective or objective—while this was largely a philological rather than a real issue, and while *δικαιοῦν* or 'justify' certainly denotes (as its opposite, *κατακρίνειν*, indicates) 'to consider or pronounce righteous,' not 'to make righteous,'[†] nevertheless when St. Paul could write to the Christians of Corinth, 'Some of you were once like that' (immoral, vicious, criminal), 'but you washed yourselves clean at baptism, you were consecrated, you were justified (*ἐδικαιώθη*) in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ[‡] and in the Spirit of our God' (1 Co 6^{11}), when he could speak of Christ being made 'our righteousness' by God, or of our becoming 'God's righteousness in him,' it is plain that the juridical sense of a change in the position of men towards God is shading off into that of a change in the character of men,[§] and that the 'righteousness' in question is not simply formal and forensic but real. It is a status, but a status 'in Christ'—which makes all the difference in the world. Justification is not followed by sanctification, in the technical sense, but accompanied by 'consecration'; it is a transformation in the attitude of God to sinners, which not only frees them from the power and penalties of sin but makes them God's very own people—not righteous as He is righteous, for (as Häring admits) that is an un-Pauline and (cf. 1 Jn 3^7) almost an unbiblical turn of thought, but in possession of His eternal life through Jesus Christ. The objective righteousness which He has realized and revealed through the sacrificial death of His Son implies a subjective righteousness, in men, and the decisiveness with which St. Paul states the former as fundamental to the gospel must not be allowed to obliterate the fact that he recognized the latter, even in his use of juridical formulæ which lent themselves specifically to the prior truth.

---

[*] In relation to the special problem (resumed afterwards in 9–11) of God's attitude towards Israel. The rejection of Christ by individual Israelites means their rejection by God, but not any refusal of God to fulfil His word and obligations to Israel as a whole. Again, no one (Jew) has the right to plead that because his wrong-doing serves to bring out the Divine consistency and faithfulness, it is unfair of God to punish him (cf. A. Robertson in *The Thinker*, iii. [1893] 429 f.). Here the Divine πίστις, δικαιοσύνη, and ἀλήθεια are all practically synonymous. The quotation in 3^{4} is the nearest approach, in St. Paul's Epistles, to the idea of God being justified, which is so characteristic of the *Psalms of Solomon* (*e.g.* ix. 3), where the saints humbly acknowledge that He is just even as He chastises them.

[*] Barnabas (xiii. 7) quotes this verse as *μόνος πιστεύσας ἐτέθη εἰς δικαιοσύνην.*

[†] The conception of 'glory' as the immortal, sinless life enjoyed by Adam and Eve in Paradise, and to be enjoyed by the faithful, underlies the Pauline usage of the term; cf. H. A. A. Kennedy, *St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things*, London, 1904, pp. 92 f., 301 f.

What does obscure this occasionally is the undue emphasis laid on the retributive or penal element in God's 'righteousness' as the Apostle employs that form of expression. But this is merely one element. The acquittal, for example, which is the result of Christ's death for men (Ro 5^{16}), is opposed to doom or the condemnation of death, *i.e.* exclusion from the presence of God, and it therefore looks to 'life,'[‖] 'glory,' or 'salvation.' It is not enough to say that these are further stages in the process initiated by the justifying verdict; they are implicit in it. St. Paul often speaks of the latter by itself, no doubt, concentrating attention upon the Divine act of grace which inaugurates the new standing of men, but we are drawing distinctions which he never drew when we confine this initial stage to the forgiveness of sins, as if that were merely or mainly a negative boon, or to a verdict which does not carry with it the instant admission of the believing man to the life of God through Jesus Christ. Take his own explanation, *e.g.*, of what is meant by having 'faith counted as righteousness.' To us that is apt to sound formal and forensic. There is a ring of unreality about it, in modern English. But just as to have one's trespasses 'counted against' one (2 Co 5^{19}) means the definite exclusion of the sinner from God and his relegation to doom and death, so he who has his faith 'counted as righteousness' (Ro $4^{5f.}$) is thereby admitted to the inward experience of forgiveness, *i.e.* to a positive and real relationship with God. It is not simply God opening the door of the prison, though it is that; it is God bringing us out into the sunlight beside Himself. That is what 'righteousness' means, as His free gift through Jesus Christ. Similarly—to look at the same truth from another angle—the faith which justifies at the outset cannot be regarded as apart from some experience of the Spirit. Faith and revelation correspond to each other, and both are conditioned by the Spirit. The Galatian Christians, who had the Crucified Christ placarded before the eyes of their mind when St. Paul preached the gospel, began with the Spirit (Gal $3^{1f.}$). Their belief in the gospel message of the death of Christ started with an experience of the Spirit. Justification by faith cannot, therefore, be regarded as a preliminary stage which has a more or less negative character. The faith which mediates it for the sinner is God's action upon him, and initiates him into the new standing of grace; it is his reception into that ideal relation between God and His people which St. Paul describes from one point of view as 'righteousness.' It is called 'righteousness' because that denotes the saving, gracious relation between the two parties, and it is called 'God's righteousness' not only because He, and He alone, has the right to create it, upon the ground of Christ's death, in view of human sin, but because it is His will of love to establish it. This being so, it means life with God, life in Jesus Christ His Son. The antithesis to *δικαιοσύνη* is *θάνατος* (Ro 5^{21} 6^{15}), and it is impossible to overvalue the significance of this. It would be un-Pauline to say that nothing remains to be done; the justified man has a great deal to do for God, and God has a great deal still to do for him and with him. But it would be still more un-Pauline to say that anything remained to be done, even by God, in order to fill this relationship with intimate fellowship and an experience of the Spirit. 'As we are justified by faith, let us enjoy the peace we have with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have got our access into this grace where we have our standing. . . . God's love floods our hearts through the Holy Spirit given to us' (Ro $5^{1ff.}$). These are the words of a man to whom justification was not a pale, formal preliminary, but a real experience which transformed the relations between himself and God, and in so doing transformed his own life into a shining light which was to shine more and more unto the perfect Day.

It is imperative, at the outset, to realize this vital character of the Divine righteousness in Paulinism.

---

[*] *E.g.* 'consecration' or *ἁγιασμός*, which also meant primarily a religious relation to God in which men stood as *ἅγιοι*, but readily suggested (*e.g.* 1 Th $4^{3f.}$) the moral implication of such a position (p. 387).

[†] The latter view is still held by some, on exegetical grounds (cf. McGiffert's *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, p. 143 f.; E. P. Gould in *AJTh* i. [1897] 149–158) or for more theological reasons (cf., *e.g.*, R. C. Moberly's *Atonement and Personality*, London, 1901, p. 335 f., and J. Drummond in *HJ* i. [1902] 83 f., 272 ff.). But, while the protest against an extravagant interpretation of St. Paul's language is justified, the 'forensic' element is too fundamental to be ignored (cf., *e.g.*, W. A. Stevens in *AJTh* i. 443–450) in favour of a 'factitive' sense for *δικαιοῦν* (F. W. Mozley in *Exp*, 7th ser., x. [1910] 481–503). Much of the strife and confusion arises from the tendency either to exaggerate or to ignore the distinction between a religious relation to God and a moral state, which Orientals did not find it difficult to understand.

[‡] There is a verbal parallel, at any rate, in the Pharisaic *En.* xlviii. 7, where the righteous are said to have 'hated and despised this world of unrighteousness, and have hated all its works and ways in the name of the Lord of Spirits: for in his name they are saved.'

[§] Cf. J. Weiss's notes on these passages in *1 Corinthians*^{9} (Meyer's *Kommentar*, Göttingen, 1910, pp. 41 f., 155).

[‖] How naturally St. Paul assumed this may be seen in his remark (Gal 3^{21}), 'had there been any law which had the power of producing life, righteousness would have been really due to law.' But it is written over all his letters. *Δικαίωσις* means *ζωοποίησις*, and this comes out (*e.g.*) in Col $2^{13f.}$) even where the *δικαιοσύνη* idea is replaced by another.

But it is easy to misinterpret it. 'Righteousness' and 'righteous' are already OT terms for the action and character of God, and the suggestion has been made [*] that St. Paul employs them as the psalmists and prophets did, that by 'righteousness' in God, *e.g.*, he means not inexorable retribution but the self-consistent and undeviating action of God on behalf of the salvation of His community, and that he posits no opposition between grace and righteousness,[†] the two being for him as for the OT essentially identical. As 'righteous,' God champions the interests and vindicates the character of His own people against threats and accusations. Probably this is the sense in which the Johannine theology occasionally applies the term 'righteous' to God, *e.g.* in Jn 17^{25} and 1 Jn 1^{9}, where it denotes, not any rigorousness, but, on the contrary, the gracious loyalty of God to His people.[‡] But it is less easy to agree that such a meaning covers the entire range of the special usage in St. Paul. Its reality for OT religion is veiled from the reader by the misleading associations of 'righteousness' in English. In Deutero-Isaiah, particularly, the Divine 'righteousness' and salvation are closely associated: 'There is no God beside me—a God who is righteous and saving' (45^{21}); 'I bring near my righteousness, it shall not be far off, and my salvation shall not tarry' (46^{13}); 'My righteousness is near, my salvation is gone forth . . . my salvation shall be for ever, and my righteousness shall not be abolished' (51^{5-6}). 'Righteousness' here means active aid; if there is any punishing to be done, it is not Israel but her enemies that are punished. But what of St. Paul's position? 'These passages,' it is said, 'seem to have made a deep impression upon St. Paul.'[§] Perhaps they did. But we have no evidence for it. He never quotes any of them, never even alludes to them—a fresh proof, according to Holtzmann, of the slighter emphasis laid by St. Paul the ex-Pharisee, as compared with Jesus, on this great prophetic section of the OT. The truth is, that the sharp factor of human sin reset for St. Paul the older idea of righteousness as a Divine characteristic. In the OT, it denotes God's 'consistent adherence to his revealed line of action, which involves deliverance to faithful or at least repentant Israel, and destruction to those who thwart his all-wise purposes' (T. K. Cheyne, *The Prophecies of Isaiah*^{5}, London, 1889, ii. 29, note on Is 51^{5}). He vindicates His own people openly; if He did not, He would be unjust. But in the central passages of St. Paul, the two parties are God and sinners. St. Paul's problem starts from the time 'when we are still enemies.'[‖] It is no longer a people who are faulty but still in touch with Him and requiring vindication before the hostile world; it is humanity, people who even as Jews have no claim on God. Those who need God's righteousness are not wronged but wrong.[¶] When St. Paul is at the heart of his argument on sin, it is not to God's righteousness as loyalty and faithfulness that he appeals; his gospel is addressed to men who need to be delivered not from their enemies but from themselves, to men who are enemies of God, alienated from Him, by their disobedience; and it is a gospel, not because it reveals the Divine righteousness as a spontaneous force diffusing itself among men, or as a vindication such as is contemplated even in Ps 73, but because it reveals that righteousness as God in Christ reconciling unfaithful men to Himself and enabling them, when they have nothing to say for themselves (Ro 3^{19}), to be right with Him. Ritschl's interpretation is correct in protesting against any exclusively punitive view of the Divine righteousness, which would oppose it to grace, and in bringing out the positive, life-giving element in the Pauline conception. But it fails by transferring language from the OT situation to a situation which differed materially and formally.

For several reasons, it is difficult to trace the precise lines of this difference, but the broad fact emerges from the apocalyptic literature and even from the sources of contemporary Rabbinic theology, that an alteration had taken place during the 1st cent. B.C.

There are signs that during the period of the later Judaism the old confidence in God's righteousness as His loyalty to Israel's interests and His gracious intervention on their behalf had begun to wane in certain circles, and that the rise of individualism and the deepening sense of personal sin as more or less connected with racial guilt tended to suggest condemnation and punishment when 'righteousness' was spoken of as an attribute of God (cf. W. Bousset's *Die Religion des Judentums im neutest. Zeitalter*^{2}, Berlin, 1906, pp. 358 ff., 435 ff.).[*] The Divine righteousness became more forensic and distributive. The pious no longer appealed to it with the same naive confidence. They dreaded it, as their conscience was troubled by transgression. Touching appeals to God's mercy and compassion fill the religious literature of the period; the pious plead their weakness, acknowledge that He is just in punishing them for their offences, and beseech His gracious favour on various grounds, but not usually on the score that He is a 'righteous' God in the sense of primitive Israel.[†] It is possible to over-estimate the extent of this change of mood, but not to deny its reality. And unless we are prepared to take the short and easy method of excluding the apocalyptic literature from a historical appreciation of Jewish popular piety during the NT period, we must take this factor into account in estimating the contemporary significance of a term like 'righteousness' for St. Paul and his age. As he found it and used it for his special dialectic on justification, it bore traces of the later as well as of the earlier connotation; neither exactly corresponded to the significance which he attached to it, but the change of meaning through which the term had passed helped to mould it for his purpose. He did not regard God's righteousness as a dread attribute which had to be supplemented by His grace, but he was still further from the older view that the Divine righteousness could be counted upon to succour and deliver the faithful people. The contemporary expression of this reliance assumed a certain right on the part of the pious, which was more or less modestly urged, to receive the benefits of God's *justitia distributiva*, on the score either of what they were able to do in the way of keeping the Law, or of their reverence for the Lawgiver. Even in the apocalyptic eschatology, a certain moral rectitude, as compared with the Gentiles, is assumed. Only thus did the *justitia distributiva* become *justitia salutifera.*[*] This is what was anathema to St. Paul; it is the position that he attacks in his criticism of righteousness by works. As against the tendency to make repentance and amendment deserve forgiving grace,[†] he revived the phrase about 'justifying,' which had ceased to be used commonly of men, and he turned it into the utterly un-Jewish[‡] expression, 'justify the ungodly,' pleading that God was 'righteous' in treating men so, because the death of Christ enabled Him at once to punish sin justly and to 'justify' sinners, *i.e.* freely to forgive them as a gracious God. In the Cross of Christ, God shows that He has the right as well as the will to pardon the ungodly. The Atonement is, therefore, not a compromise between righteousness and love in God, unless 'righteousness' is taken in its narrower sense. St. Paul recognized its broader sense, and usually expressed the punitive element otherwise, *e.g.* by the conception of the Divine anger, just as he sometimes expresses the action of the Divine righteousness by the more positive term 'grace,' and its effect by the warmer term 'reconciliation.'

---

[*] By Ritschl in *Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*^{2}, Eng. tr., ii. 473 f., and after him, on independent lines, by Cremer, Sabatier, and C. Bruston (*Revue de Théologie*, ix. [1900] 299 f.; *ZNTW* vii. [1906] 77 f.) especially.

[†] In Gn 19^{19} ('thou hast magnified thy mercy, which thou hast shewed unto me in saving my life'), Ex 34^{7} ('keeping mercy for thousands'), and other passages, the usage of δικαιοσύνη by some LXX translators is significant.

[‡] With 1 Jn 1^{9} compare Wordsworth's apostrophe:

'The best of what we do and are,
Just God, forgive!'
(*Memorials of a Tour in Scotland*, iii. 65 f.).

[§] Sanday-Headlam, *ICC*, 'Romans'^{5}, Edinburgh, 1902, p. 35.

[‖] *I.e.* exposed to the Divine wrath. In Ro 5^{10} ('when we were enemies') it is God's hostility to us, not ours to Him, that is meant by ἐχθροί (as in Ro 11^{28}).

[¶] It is a different matter when St. Paul appeals to God's moral equity (2 Th $1^{6f.}$) in punishing the persecutors of the loyal Church. This is a further stage, not the initial stage of making it possible for such a church to exist at all.

[*] Also H. Cremer's *Die paulin. Rechtfertigungslehre*, p. 95 f., though he fails to differentiate the prophetic current from the 'legal,' which made faith, *i.e.* adherence to the true cultus and doctrine of the Torah, the basis for Israel's assurance of favour.

[†] The devout confidence in the Divine δικαιοσύνη as protecting favour and guidance is voiced, however, in the combination of 'mercy and righteousness' (*Jub.* xxxi. 24–25 and Bar 5^{9}) most expressively.

Two features in the current Rabbinic view of righteousness are conspicuous by their absence from St. Paul's re-statement. (1) One is the combination of God's gracious favour with His judicial verdict on a man's record, the beautiful idea that when a man's good and bad actions left his status doubtful before the *justitia distributiva* of the Lord, He threw His mercy into the scales. Contemporary Judaism must not be dismissed off-hand as a merely legal, bargaining religion. The religious consciousness was far too large for any theory of personal righteousness simply on the score of works, and demanded this recognition of a God who was at liberty to favour and forgive, in doubtful cases, a God whose mercy did not require any prompting[§] to season His justice. But St. Paul did not conceive of God's righteousness in such a way that it required His grace to temper it for sinful man. Neither could his view of justification as a synthetic verdict, on what man is, not on what he does, admit the allied notion that a man's faith might be taken generously as the guarantee, supplement, or equivalent of righteousness. The remark in the Mechilta on Ex 12^{28} is characteristic: 'Have they fulfilled the Passover command already? No, but from the instant that they undertook to perform it, God reckons it to them as if they had fulfilled it.' It is erroneous to understand St. Paul as valuing faith thus in justification, although ethical interests have led some interpreters to this conclusion. What faith means in this connexion for the Apostle is not any intention which God, who takes the will for the deed, may be pleased in His mercy to accept. The Pauline view of righteousness, no less than the cognate view of faith, rendered it impossible for such a conception to enter into his theology. (2) The other element ignored by St. Paul is akin to this. It was occasionally felt that the Divine mercy at the Judgment might be set in motion by the intercession of the righteous—an extension of the principle of solidarity, by which the righteousness of the living saints was considered to have merits availing for the erring members of the nation. But the idea that the righteous could intercede on behalf of the ungodly at the Last Judgment is entirely ignored by St. Paul,[‖] and expressly repudiated not long afterwards by the author of *4 Ezr.* (vii. 102–105): 'And I answered and said: If I have found favour in thy sight, show this also to thy servant—whether at the day of Judgment the righteous shall be able to intercede for the ungodly or to entreat the Most High on their behalf, fathers for sons, sons for parents, brothers for brothers, kinsfolk for their nearest, friends for their dearest. And He answered and said: . . . None shall pray for another on that day, neither shall one lay a burden on another; for then everyone shall bear his own righteousness or unrighteousness' (cf. G. H. Box's note in his edition of *The Ezra-Apocalypse*, London, 1912, pp. 153–156). In the contemporary *Apocalypse of Baruch*, which Charles describes as 'a good representative of the Judaism against which the Pauline dialectic was directed' (*Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the OT*, Oxford, 1913, vol. ii. p. 470), a similar view is urged (lxxxv. 12): 'When the Most High will bring to pass all these things, there shall be there no . . . place of supplication for offences, no intercession of the fathers, no prayer of the prophets, no help of the righteous' (see, further, Charles's note on *Slavonic Enoch*, liii. 1 [*ib.* p. 462]). The 2nd cent. *Testament of Abraham* (cf. M. R. James, in *TS* ii. 2 [1892]) contains a *ψυχοστασία*, or weighing of souls by angels, which is singular in Jewish apocalyptic; but even more singular is the fact that one poor soul whose fate literally hangs in the balance, since his sins and good deeds (*δικαιοσύναι*) happen to be exactly equal, is saved by the intercession of Abraham and Michael. It has to obtain one more *δικαιοσύνη* in order to be saved. Abraham proposes to Michael to try what prayer to God will do, and 'when they rose from prayer, they did not see the soul standing there. Then said Abraham to the angel, "Where is the soul thou wast holding in the midst?" and the angel said, "It has been saved by thy righteous prayer."' The absence of any allusion to this, in St. Paul, is the more striking as he was familiar with the ideas of imputed righteousness and imputed sin in current Judaism.

(*b*) *The eschatological background.*—The primary conception of righteousness in the earlier prophetic literature naturally pointed to the end, when God would make the issues clear by establishing the triumph of His cause and people over the ungodly. The final world-judgment would be the vindicating of Israel by her righteous, loyal Lord, who then would do justice to His own in the sight of pagans. This prevails through the later Judaism as well. The idea of a present justification, especially for individuals, is not absent, as we can see from 1 K 8^{32} ('Hear thou in heaven and judge thy servants, condemning the wicked and justifying the righteous, to give him according to his righteousness'), or from the background of an allusion like that in Lk 18^{14} (cf. *Jub.* xxx. 17 f.). But the specific interest of the righteousness-craving was focused on the Last Day, the impending crisis when the Lord would intervene in favour of His folk and exhibit openly their right position, which for the time being had been obscured. This predominates not only in the OT, where righteousness is a Messianic boon (*e.g.* Is 11^4, Jer 23^6 33^{16}, Bar 5^2) promised by God, but in the apocalyptic piety.[*] Even where the Law is prominent, the reward of loyalty to the Commandments is steadily regarded as life, to be conferred at the close of this world-age, when the lawless pagan powers will be annihilated or reduced to abject submission. To get a footing in the Messianic order, to ensure 'life' or righteousness in the world to come, the essential condition was to keep the Commandments, for the reign which God was to set up would be over the dutiful and law-abiding.

When we pass into the Pauline view of righteousness, this eschatological background is still behind both the terminology and the cardinal ideas, however radically the latter are modified by the faith that Jesus had inaugurated the first stage of the Messianic order on earth. The imminent return of the Christ will complete this saving work. And, meantime, what are the factors in the situation which make this return so decisive? Primarily, we may say, the traditional conception holds true. It is still sin which furnishes the need for righteousness and the occasion for justification, and sin, as *παράβασις* or *ἁμάρτημα* or *παράπτωμα* or *ἁμαρτία* or *ἀδικία*, is conditioned by the Law; it disqualifies for the status of blessing and reward, to be assigned at the end for obedience. The terminology retains its OT associations. Righteousness implies a standard of character and conduct which is appointed by God. 'The ideas of right and wrong among the Hebrews are forensic ideas; that is, the Hebrew always thinks of the right and the wrong as if they were to be settled before a judge. Righteousness is to the Hebrew not so much a moral quality as a legal status. . . . In primitive society the functions of judge and lawgiver are not separated, and reverence for law has its basis in personal respect for the judge. So the just consistent will of Jehovah is the law of Israel, and it is a law which as King of Israel He Himself is continually administering' (W. R. Smith, *The Prophets of Israel*, London, 1895, p. 71 f.). The repeated violations of the Law, which the weakness of the flesh produces, result, according to St. Paul, in a state of guilt which calls out righteousness as the punitive duty of the Lawgiver. He speaks of this less often than of sin, but the outcome is the punishment of death as the supreme expression of the Divine wrath for wilful transgressions of the Divine Law. The Law works out in wrath (Ro 4^{15}); the thunderclouds of doom are ready to break over those who take that path. In one place, he attributes moral perversity (Ro $1^{24f.}$) to the working of the Divine wrath. But this is merely one expression of it, and ($2^{3.5f.}$) the stress falls on the eschatological visitation of God's wrath. The ὀργή of God, like its opposite, σωτηρία, is for St. Paul * originally and especially eschatological (cf. 1 Th 1^{10}, Ro 5^{9}); it is an accompaniment of the Day of Judgment, the punishment of those who wilfully disobey God.† To St. Paul the history of the world is a drama of disobedience, and the fifth act of the tragedy is being played out; the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ prove that the final scenes are imminent. Accordingly, the primitive Christian eschatology viewed justification as the anticipation of salvation at the end, the guarantee that he who is justified will be right with God at the Final Judgment. The decision of God will be in his favour. He will be inside, not outside, the Messianic realm of bliss and life. 'By faith we wait in the Spirit for the righteousness we hope for' (Gal 5^{5}),‡ *i.e.* the final acceptance and freedom (1 Co 1^{8}, Ro 8^{33}) from condemnation. But God's wrath is not exclusively eschatological for St. Paul, neither is His righteousness. As in Judaism § already, so, and much more so, in St. Paul, justification ceases to be a mere hope. It is not simply the assurance of being acquitted at the end, but becomes a present, definite attitude of the soul towards God. Here and now there is a valid status before God. St. Paul's word is, 'We are justified,' not 'We shall be justified.' God's righteousness is a revelation in the present order, a reality of experience here and now. In Ro 1^{17}, *e.g.*, it is not wholly eschatological any more than wrath is; the term 'salvation' tends to retain its predominantly eschatological meaning, but 'righteousness' increasingly bears upon the immediate position of the soul towards God, largely because it was so definitely associated with forgiveness. The eschatological hope usually came to be expressed by St. Paul in other terms; 'righteousness' was so bound up with the sacrifice of Christ and the present fellowship into which faith ushered the Christian, that it gradually became concentrated upon the experience and standing of the believing man. It is needless to multiply proofs of this obvious Pauline position. A sentence like that in Ro 5^{9} clinches the matter: 'Much more, then, now that we are justified by his blood, shall we be saved by him from wrath.' The present experience of God's righteousness (1^{17}) becomes the ground of assurance that we are freed from condemnation and that we shall not be exposed to the final doom of His wrath (1^{18}, 1 Th 5^{9}) which is imminent and eschatological. The eschatological background to St. Paul's theory of righteousness * and justification is real (cf., *e.g.*, Ro $2^{13.16}$), but it may be exaggerated, as it is by those who fail to see that justification, like υἱοθεσία, the alternative conception, deepens into a present moral and spiritual experience, involving a career as well as a hope, or rather a hope which implies a career of goodness. Because the Christian is sure of final acquittal, he is to live up to it. Or, to put it in an antithesis: he is not to be saved because he is good, he is to be good because he is justified. It is a short interval till the final crisis arrives, but the Christian can await the Judgment with confidence, on the strength of his justification by faith and (Ro $13^{11f.}$) readiness for salvation.

---

[*] Cf. Sokolowski's *Die Begriffe von Geist und Leben bei Paulus*, p. 173 f.

[†] See, *e.g.*, *Jub.* v. 17: 'If they [*i.e.* the children of Israel] turn to Him in righteousness, He will forgive all their transgressions and pardon all their sins. It is written and ordained that He will show mercy to all who turn from all their guilt once each year' [*i.e.* at the Day of Atonement].

[‡] A Jew would have quite agreed that God *δικαιοῖ τὸν ἀσεβῆ* if *δικαιοῖ* meant, as it seems occasionally to have meant in Attic prose, 'punishes.' What St. Paul means by 'the ungodly' is, of course, the man who, in spite of his sins, has a desire for God and the godly life.

[§] Sometimes it is the prayers of the righteous which are able to make His mercy overpower His anger (e.g. *T. B. Succah*, 14*a*, *Berachoth*, 7*a*).

[‖] The nearest approach to it is the passing allusion (in Ro 11^{28}) to Israel as 'beloved (by God) for the sake of the fathers.'

[*] It reappears in the liturgy of the *Shemoneh Esreh* (10–11): 'Sound the great horn for our freedom; lift up the ensign to gather our exiles, and gather us from the four corners of the earth . . . reign thou over us, O Lord, thou alone, in lovingkindness and tender mercy, and justify us in judgment' (see, on this point, J. Köberle's *Sünde und Gnade im relig. Leben des Volkes Israel*, Munich, 1905, p. 639 f.).

(i.) This is exaggerated by Wernle's thesis † that St. Paul never thought about the problem of sin in the Christian, or at least, very seldom, since the hope of the immediate End was so vivid that it left no place for any ethical transformation of the believer; the Christian who is justified is thereby guaranteed all the bliss that belongs to the Messianic community of the αἰὼν μέλλων, but St. Paul does not leave either time or need for dealing with defects of character in the brief interval before the End. Sin belongs to this present world, whereas the Christian life is the beginning of the new age, and therefore is sinless. Such an unqualified estimate of the eschatology implies that faith does not possess any distinctive ethical force or regenerating energy. It is true that St. Paul did say something about 'faith working by love,' and Wernle (*op. cit.* p. 85) is troubled by this remark (Gal 5^{6}). However, he reflects that it must be an *obiter dictum*! After all, we must remember that it does not occur in Romans! The content of faith, in Paulinism, is not to be evaporated into adherence to the Messianic community, however; Paulinism was not a religion of sheer eschatological enthusiasm, which refused to see facts that contradicted its theory; and it is a mistake to regard the doctrine of righteousness as little more than a piece of mission-propaganda, which had no significance for the life of Christians in the Church.

(ii.) Nor is it possible to regard righteousness in St. Paul's theology as the state which qualifies for the final salvation, the condition God appoints and will accept (E. J. W. Williams, *St. Paul's*

---

* Like John the Baptist (Mt 3^{7}=Lk 3^{7}), but unlike Jesus; in the Synoptic record of His teaching, it is introduced by St. Luke only once (21^{23}), while Mt 24^{21} and Mk 13^{19} simply speak of θλίψις.

† This is reiterated in Ro $2^{5f.}$, and St. Paul puts the reverse side in $2^{13.16}$. 'To be just before God,' or acquitted, or delivered from His wrath, is the supreme boon of the Messianic order. Christ has already inaugurated this order by His death and resurrection, and He is sure to complete it at His return, when the Day of Judgment will decide the fate of men. The conditions of that decision are stated by St. Paul, but he denies that believing men need have any fear of the result; their present relation to God through Christ, in the new order, enables them to anticipate the future with confidence (Ro $5^{1f.}$ $8^{31f.}$). We can feel the alteration of emphasis from the contemporary Jewish faith, which drew its passion for law-righteousness largely from its interest in the future final hope of glory and recompense.

‡ Contrast the contemporary *Apoc. Bar.* xiv. 12 ('the righteous justly hope for the end . . . because they have with thee a store of works treasured').

§ Particularly, though by no means exclusively, in apocalyptic circles, where the heavenly powers and realities were believed to be already moving in human life, instead of remaining hidden in heaven until the epoch of consummation. The fact of Christ's death and resurrection having recently taken place increased the Christian tendency to realize that the new age had already begun in the existence of the Church whose experiences of justification and fellowship rested on Christ's sufferings and risen glory.

* Sketched, *e.g.*, by Kölbing, K. Müller, Titius, and Shailer Mathews (see Literature).

† In *Der Christ und die Sünde bei Paulus*, Freiburg i. B., 1897, pp. 22 f., 92 f., 100 f. He is right in emphasizing the fact that 'justification is the first boon of the Messianic age, and signifies reception into the community of the true worship and the true hope' (p. 93).

Doctrine of Justification, London, 1912); this theory is open to the same objection, that it ignores the ethical substratum of the soteriology and eschatology. God might no doubt be considered free, as we shall see in a moment, to lay down a fresh qualification for acceptance, viz. faith. He might replace the *νόμος ἔργων* by the *νόμος πίστεως*, although that would not explain St. Paul's full attitude to the Law. Also, the primary idea of justification was the status of a man before God, not his ethical character. Granted. But in Paulinism we cannot distinguish rigidly between a man's standing and his heart; and faith, the faith which justifies, is more than a special method of enabling men to get out of their inherited status of original guilt and become qualified for the final salvation. Such a theory fails to fit St. Paul's deep sayings about the present position of the believing man. We cannot, *e.g.*, translate the opening words of Ro 5 as if they meant, 'Being therefore made eligible from faith, we are to have peace before God.' It is not untrue to say that, when St. Paul regards God as pronouncing a man righteous on the score of faith, he assumes that He is not pronouncing the verdict of a judge but laying down a legal principle, as He is entitled to do; yet this is not all the truth. The faith in question cannot be left as a mere attitude of mind, unrelated to the moral self; and the experience of the justified man is more than an assurance of being qualified for some future position of bliss. St. Paul's conception of Christ's victory over sin, death, and the Law, in the flesh, gave a fresh content to the idea of 'righteousness' alike in God and in human nature, and at the same time it reset the idea of faith.

We must now attempt to define this content more closely.

(*c*) *Apologetic and controversial setting.*—'Righteousness' was a term common to Jew and Christian. What differentiated the two, according to St. Paul, was the method of attaining this religious position of acceptance with God which ensured acquittal and bliss at the end. St. Paul's motto was, 'righteousness by faith,' and he defined his meaning controversially by way of contrast; 'by faith' meant 'not by the Law,' 'not by works.'

The controversy was not simply with Jews, but with Jewish Christians as well. Many in the primitive Church had not thought out their relation to the Jewish Law; they were not alive to the full consequences involved by their faith in Jesus Christ. They were content to rest in a Messianic conception of the Lord, as if His forgiveness availed for such sins as their obedience to the Law failed to cover. His pardon was a welcome and necessary supplement; still, it was a supplement. The Law and Christ were two saving principles. In a word, their position might be summed up thus: justification by the Law *plus* Jesus Christ. This seemed to offer an indispensable guarantee for morality and to preserve continuity. It was only under the logic of facts, like the conversion of Gentiles, and the stress of St. Paul's arguments, that they admitted that obedience to the Law was not essential to salvation. The admission was hard to make, but it had to be made for the sake of the Gentiles as well as for themselves. We have this put strongly in Galatians, the fighting line of Paulinism against the Jewish Christian propaganda of the early Church. Thus, in $2^{15f.}$, the Apostle starts for the sake of argument from the same premisses as St. Peter and the Jewish Christians ('since we know a man is justified by faith in Jesus Christ, and not by doing what the Law commands, we ourselves have believed in Jesus Christ'), but he draws a conclusion from these premisses which they did not draw, when he adds, 'so as to get justified by faith in Christ and not by doing what the Law commands, for by doing what the Law commands *no person shall be justified.*' This is St. Paul's inference. It was he, not they, who made an antithesis between Christ and the Law. Instead of holding to righteousness by the Law *plus** Christ, the Apostle laid down the thesis: either Christ or the Law. Justification from, not by, the Law. As he put it to them bluntly, 'You are for justification by the Law? Then you are done with Christ, you have deserted grace' (Gal 5^{4}).

The further development of this thought belongs to the discussion of the Law. All that we require to note at this point, for our immediate purpose, is that St. Paul treats the Law as a whole, instead of distinguishing, as we might expect him to do for the sake of lucidity and logic, between the ethical and the ceremonial sections. In Romans it is possible to feel that the ethical is uppermost in his mind, in Galatians the ceremonial. Yet even in the disparaging references of the latter Epistle, he has room for the great saying, that the entire Law is summed up in the single command to 'love your neighbour as yourself' (5^{14}). The fact is, he invariably regards the Law as the supposed way to life, from the Jewish standpoint, and argues that life comes by another way, by faith in Christ. Justification means life, and justification is based on the death and resurrection of Christ, which superseded the Law as a revelation of God's mind and will for sinful men. Besides, he actually adds, in pre-Christian Judaism the Law did not lead to life; it stirred up evil in a man, and reduced the earnest to despair. Above all, it never elicited faith. Doing, not trust, was its watchword.

This criticism of the works of the Law has been itself subjected to criticism. Was the antithesis fair to Jewish piety? it has been asked. Did not St. Paul, in the stress of controversy, exaggerate the position of his opponents? When he criticized them for the place they assigned to 'works of the Law,' what place did he leave for works, or, as we should say, for ethics, in his own system? Does not his own appeal, in non-controversial moments and for practical needs, to the Divine judgment on works indicate that he was not really so far from the Jewish Christian position as his controversial passages would seem to claim? If it is true that the Pharisees almost deified the Law, is it not the case that Paul as nearly caricatured it?

So far as these criticisms are relevant to the special topic of righteousness in the Pauline system, they must be considered from the historical point of view, that what St. Paul encountered was not the OT type of devotion to the Law and righteousness such as is presented in the 119th Psalm, but a Pharisaic type of piety in which he had himself been trained. We can see now that he was really reviving the prophetic spirit of protest against an undue emphasis on the external, which had the unhealthy effect of fostering self-righteousness, and reviving it on a higher level. He insists, with uncompromising rigour, *e.g.*, on the paramount significance of faith, not as one means of pleasing God but as *the* means, the source and centre of true righteousness. In this, he opposes Jewish legalism, as Jesus did. 'With Paul as with Jesus, faith is the decisive thing. St. Paul has found the same God as Jesus: he has learnt that God is far greater and His demands far more searching and lofty than the Jew believed.'* The controversy between Jesus and the legalism of the Pharisees is practically reproduced in the criticisms passed by St. Paul, the quondam Pharisee, upon the doctrine of righteousness by works. The religious interest is the same. Faith is conditioned by the character of the God who is revealed to the soul; and our God, says St. Paul after Jesus, though he says it in his own way, is One who gives Himself freely to man in his utter need. The primary thought of righteousness is for him not task but gift. St. Paul's technical phraseology must not be allowed to obscure the relation of his teaching at this point to the teaching of Jesus upon the Father who freely gives to His children, and gives them life with Himself. The Apostle's phrase, 'righteousness by faith,' aims at the same idea of life imparted freely by God, for justification is not a formal verdict or declaration—that would not alter a man's nature or create a new personality. Justification is to treat as right or just, no doubt. But this is for St. Paul the action not of a judge but of a Father, and everything depends on the character and purpose of Him who determines to treat thus the erring penitent. How is it right? When is it wise? To Jesus, the character of the Father is a sufficient answer by itself. So it is to St. Paul; only, he looks through the Cross to God's character, and also interprets the Cross through God's character, since the Cross is the supreme revealing action of God. The Cross proves that God is a God of love, a God who will have mercy even on the ungodly; it also proves that He does not condone sin. The sinner can trust the love of it, and yet be sure this mercy is not dealing lightly with his sin. Hence faith arises, the faith that justifies. The words differ, but the spirit is akin to the interest which underlay the teaching of Jesus about the conditions which evoked trust in God.

---

* In Ac 13^{39} St. Luke appears to attribute this idea to St. Paul. 'Remission of sins is proclaimed to you through him, and by him everyone who believes is absolved from all that the Law of Moses never could absolve you from (*δικαιωθῆναι*).' But the language does not make it quite clear that St. Luke thought justification by faith came in to remedy the defective pardon of the Law. At any rate it is not so clear as the narrower identification of justification with *ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν*. St. Paul, on occasion, could speak of a man being 'absolved from sin' (Ro 6^{7}, *δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας*), but he is speaking of a dead man in a contemporary mode of thinking, and using this rather as an illustration.

We may wonder (i.) why he did not, like the author of Hebrews, employ the sacrificial sections of the Law to illustrate the death of Christ as the means of establishing this righteousness with God; (ii.) why he did not conceive the Law as a preparatory stage for Christianity or the new law of righteousness, as a later age did; (iii.) why he never reckoned with the Jewish† doctrine of the merits of the Fathers availing to supplement the demerits of living Israel; and (iv.) why he was not driven, as Marcion after him, to deny outright the validity of the Law as a Divine institution. Probably he was too much of a Pharisee, with too strong a sense of the purpose of God in history and in Israel, to break so radically with the past. His attitude towards the Law as a means of righteousness is thoroughly characteristic of his Pharisaic antecedents and his individual experience. To him, the Law is everything or nothing. He sees it as a rival to Christ and strikes at it in unqualified antitheses. From what he saw of Judaism and of Jewish Christianity, he considered it was essential to prove that the Law not only could not justify, but was never intended to justify, by faith. According to his analysis of the tendencies of the contemporary legalism—and there is no historical reason to doubt that his analysis was substantially accurate—the practical outcome of devotion to the Law, as glorified by Pharisaic piety, really resulted in an endeavour to attain righteousness by one's own moral record. This had broken down in his own case, and he argued from that to a general proposition. It was important to do this, for 'when he looked at the Jews who retained their unbelief in face of the gospel, he was convinced . . . [that] it was not imperfection, but the effort to reach righteousness that kept them away from the gospel.'* His criticism of the Law was not a clever, one-sided *jeu d'esprit* of dialectic; it was evangelistic as well as apologetic, an attempt to save others from the *impasse* into which he had himself once strayed in sheer sincerity of purpose. The repudiation of the Law as a method of attaining righteousness sprang from the fact that in his own experience he had felt what he regarded as the fundamental error of Pharisaism. Hence it is possible for J. Weiss to say (*Paul and Jesus*, Eng. tr., London, 1909, pp. 82–84) that St. Paul 'saw more deeply into the nature of Pharisaism and rejected it more absolutely than even Jesus Himself. Jesus constantly referred to the inconsistency between outward behaviour and inward motive; the formalism and unreality of this pietism aroused His anger. Paul, on the basis of his personal experience and by means of his entirely religious nature, realised that Judaism was distorted as a system and that its attitude towards religion was from the outset perverted; he regarded as chimerical the theory that by means of works men could force God to deal out reward and salvation in fulfilment of a contractual obligation; moreover, this attitude towards God, which seemed to regard Him as a contracting party with rights and claims not superior to those of man, was recognised by Paul as impious and as a blasphemous misrepresentation of the position of man, in view of his entire dependence upon God. The irreligious aberrations of Pharisaism consisted in this "boasting before God," as Paul calls it, or as we may paraphrase it, "in self-glorification upon the ground of past achievement, in making demands of God"; this mad "going up to heaven" to bring salvation down from thence, and this unseemly "reckoning" with God which is entirely characteristic of all Jewish thought,† are the by-products of a pietism which, like heathenism, professed to exert compulsion upon God; heathen magic, sacrifice and prayer, was here replaced by the practice of righteousness to which God was unable to refuse reward. Paul himself had shared this passionate zeal for the law, this painful ἐργάζεσθαι, . . .; it was this experience which enabled Paul not merely to conquer certain outposts of Judaism, but to show that the system must be rejected as absolutely incompatible with the gospel.'

The negative propositions about righteousness not being by the works of the Law are therefore the reverse side of St. Paul's positive conviction that justification did originate by faith. They represent him coming to terms with Judaism, stating his new faith as against its old rival. His repudiation of legalism finds its strength in his personal conviction of God's grace in Christ. He does not set up, it has to be noted, any antithesis between faith and works, *i.e.* moral actions. Only, the latter are regarded as the outcome of faith, and denied any place in winning a state of acceptance with God. The opposite of his doctrine of righteousness by faith is the popular Rabbinic conception of *zecuth* or satisfaction,[*] according to which anyone who kept the commands of the Law was in a state of *zecuth* or 'grace,' and being thus 'righteous' might claim the Divine reward of justification. Such a man is right with God, because he has made himself right, satisfying God's demands, especially by the study of the Torah, by almsgiving, charity, and the like. He can even swell his credit, and do so of his own initiative. It is this sort of self-made morality, with its tendency to self-righteousness, that St. Paul antagonizes in his polemic against the works of the Law as a basis for righteousness.

---

* H. Weinel, *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments*^{2}, p. 281.

† *E.g.* in the contemporary *Apocalypse of Baruch*, where the works of the righteous avail for other generations (xiv. 7, lxxxiv. 10: 'Pray diligently with your whole heart that the Mighty One may be reconciled to you, and that He may not reckon the multitude of your sins, but remember the rectitude of your fathers'). This quantitative doctrine of the *zecuth* of the fathers, *i.e.* their righteousness as availing for their descendants, implied that by the grace of God their meritorious goodness was allowed to count in favour of those who were defective in piety, instead of the latter being judged strictly on their own merits (cf. E. G. Hirsch in *JE* x. 423, and Schechter, *Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology*, ch. xii.).

* Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age*^{2}, i. 156.

† These expressions are too strong; the evidence of Rabbinic religion must be allowed to modify them, though not to disprove their essential truth.

Without entering into details on St. Paul's conception of faith, or of justification as compared with contemporary Jewish views (*e.g.* in the *Apocalypse of Baruch*), we may notice two items of importance. (i.) One is the triple repudiation of 'works' in the earliest allusion to justification (Gal 2^{16}). There is a curious misinterpretation of this verse, which takes *ἐὰν μή* with *ἐξ ἔργων*, as if St. Paul wrote, 'a man is not justified by the works of the law unless he believes in Jesus Christ.' Newman, *e.g.*, adopted this view for dogmatic reasons in his *Lectures on Justification* (3rd ed., p. 279). He pleads ingeniously that 'it does not follow that works done in faith do not justify, because works done without faith do not justify.' But it does follow, according to St. Paul. Newman's position is the very position of the Jewish Christians, which St. Paul regarded as ambiguous and compromising to the gospel, viz. that if a man does believe, his moral obedience and actions cooperate in his justification. 'We know,' says the Apostle, 'that a man is justified simply by faith in Jesus Christ and not by doing what the law commands.' He explicitly seeks to lift and free Christianity from the Jewish Christian combination of faith and works which re-appears in Newman's theory.

(ii.) In the second place, we notice that as soon as he speaks of righteousness, he brings in faith (Ro 1^{17}); from first to last—this seems to be the meaning[†] of *ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν*—the saving revelation of God is conditioned by faith. Faith is for man its source and sphere. It is not a faith which is itself a 'work,' on which a man might plume himself. It is not *ποιοῦσα* but *ἀκούουσα* (Ro 10^{14}), elicited by the revelation of God's grace in the gospel of Jesus Christ (cf. Gal $3^{1f. 5}$, Ro 10^{17}, 1 Co $2^{4f.}$). The faith which justifies is called out by this overpowering disclosure of God in the Person and sacrifice of Christ. The Cross, with the love of God in it, exhibits God's righteousness and elicits faith in man, the faith of which St. Paul says, 'a man who instead of "working" believes in him who justifies the ungodly, has his faith counted as righteousness' (Ro 4^5). Obviously it is not a meritorious action, any more than it is a legal condition for a legal acquittal. At the same time, it is not an empty state, this faith stirred in the soul. The contrast of 'not by works' and 'by faith,' in the dialectic of 'righteousness,' does not imply that a man believes in Christ by putting out of life henceforth all moral energy. 'Works of the law' mean for St. Paul that a man is constantly thinking of himself, urging himself on, putting moral pressure on himself, striving to please God on his own resources, and inevitably taking some credit to himself; 'by faith' means that a man turns from his moral or immoral self to God, meeting Him who comes triumphing over weakness and sin in Jesus Christ, daring to trust himself to Him who has successfully invaded sin and death in their headquarters in the flesh, ready to live by this faith, because it identifies him with the power and inspiration of the Lord. This is, according to St. Paul, the way to be right with God; and it means a right life, for the end of such a Divine righteousness is to create spiritual personalities, and the faith which appropriates it is not so much an act as a reception of Christ or an abandonment of oneself to Him. Hence, *e.g.*, the explanation that even Abraham's faith implied a reverence for the power of God and a willingness to act upon His word (Ro $4^{17f.}$). Hence also the association of faith with obedience (Ro 1^5 $6^{17f.}$ 10^{21}), *i.e.* submission to the gracious will of God which meets us in the gospel, a willingness, at any cost of pride and prejudice, to take His road to life; you must 'give in' to God's terms, he declares (Ro 10^3). How hard that was, especially for a man of moral character, he himself knew well—how hard, and yet how glad and fruitful, once the surrender was made.

There are two considerations which have to be weighed in estimating the justice of St. Paul's verdict on contemporary Judaism. One is, that he was diagnosing Pharisaism on the spot—and not across nineteen centuries, from a restricted survey of the earlier OT and the later Rabbinism. The other is, that he was diagnosing the symptoms of a disease from which he had himself suffered. Scattered statements can be disinterred from Rabbinic literature to prove that faith was not ignored by all the leaders of contemporary Israel, that many were conscious of the need of Divine grace in order to obey the Torah, that they found a true religious joy in practising this obedience, that they were not invariably pluming themselves upon their merits, and that the Torah meant for them more than a code of legal enactments. No historical critic has any interest in minimizing such data. Nor has he any hesitation in allowing for the deflecting influence of controversy upon St. Paul's mind; St. Paul was apt to be unconciliatory at times, and this idiosyncrasy would be fostered by the inevitable tendency of dialectic to state a case without qualification, in order to be impressive and telling. But that he knew what he was talking about when he analyzed the practical effects and the underlying spirit of the Pharisaic conception of righteousness, that his religious genius enabled him to detect and expose the cardinal issues which were bound up with the problem of the Jewish Law in relation to Christian faith, there is no sound reason to doubt. History and religious experience have justified the sense of exultation, the thrill, the delight of breaking out into the open air, which throbs through his words on the liberty of the believing man—and this liberty is only another aspect of his 'righteousness by faith' conception.

The conception of righteousness, in this specific sense, is bound up with the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith; in fact, it enters into the Apostle's thought upon the Person of Christ, sin, the Law, election, and eschatology. What it conveys, however, is largely a generalization of his own experience. 'Righteousness' is one of the classical terms of OT and contemporary Jewish piety, but St. Paul has stamped it with an original meaning, due to his sense of the inadequacy of moral obedience to the Law, his profound consciousness of sin, and his experience of the forgiveness and fellowship which faith in Christ opened up to him. Further, his use of the term is not only personal but polemical. He turns against legalism with weapons drawn from its own armoury, and the paradoxical element in some of his phrases and arguments is best explained by the fact that these are employed by him to defend a religious position very different from their original object and setting. It is probably for this reason also that the discussion of righteousness by faith is absent from the Thessalonian Epistles. When he wrote these letters, he had already been through the crisis depicted in Galatians. But the theme was primarily of apologetic interest to him, and at Thessalonica the controversy with Jewish Christians and Jews was not raised on this issue. The argument about righteousness was a particular expression of his views on the absolute grace and goodness of God in Christ, but these views could be otherwise expressed. Consequently we find that in the earliest Epistles, as in the later, the 'righteousness' argument falls into the background, and even in the main Epistles it hardly ever appears except in controversial passages—the principal exceptions being 1 Co 6^{11} and Ro $8^{31f.}$. When St. Paul was not developing his doctrine in opposition to Jewish tendencies, within or without the Church, he generally chose other terms and methods. This does not imply that the fundamental thought in his conception of righteousness is secondary. On the contrary, it is from that central conception that his views on other matters ray out. His doctrine of sin, *e.g.*, is really elicited by his deeper interest in righteousness, and the former is developed in connexion with the latter. At the same time, it must be realized that the doctrine of righteousness or justification by faith, in what we may call its fighting aspect, does not cover the entire range of St. Paul's theology, and that the terms belonging to this particular aspect could be translated into other equivalents for the underlying religious experience. Thus, the conception of righteousness is closely allied to that of life. Only, whereas in the latter idea St. Paul seems to be developing tendencies characteristic of Hellenistic Judaism, whereas his conceptions of 'the bliss to be' are tinged and shaped by Greek thoughts which had filtered into the Jewish mind, in 'righteousness' and 'justification,' despite Reitzenstein's plea, we must hold that the Apostle is on a Palestinian basis, even when he is constructing there a fresh, Christian synthesis. His argument on righteousness is neither that of the OT nor that of the mysticism reproduced in the later Poimandres literature. Its specific elements are due to a new religious experience, and its specific terminology is best illustrated from the Messianic categories of Palestinian Judaism.

---

[*] Cf. W. O. E. Oesterley and G. H. Box, *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*^{2}, London, 1911, p. 274 ff.

[†] Not 'ex fide legis in fidem evangelii,' nor 'from weak faith to strong faith,' nor 'from the faith of the preacher to the faith of the hearer,' nor 'from belief in the gospel-message to personal trust in Christ.'

In *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen* (Leipzig, 1910, pp. 100–104), R. Reitzenstein argues that the use of *δικαιοῦσθαι* in the Hermetic religious literature on the re-birth of the initiated points to a Hellenistic usage which ought to determine the sense of the term in Ro 8^{30} as 'made sinless (in nature).' The verb denotes the deliverance of a person from the *δύναμις* of *ἀδικία* by the Divine powers which 'deify' him (*ἐδικαιώθημεν, ὦ τέκνον, ἀδικίας ἀπούσης*). It is by no means certain, however, that these ideas represent a pre-Christian type of mystical piety on Egyptian lines. Furthermore, as Reitzenstein admits, *δικαιοσύνη* is not prominent as a Divine *δύναμις*, and it seems hazardous to infer that originally it must have played a more important rôle, since the parent Egyptian religion expected a verdict of acquittal for the pious dead. It is interesting to find *δικαιοῦσθαι* losing its forensic sense and denoting freedom from *ἀδικία*, but the origin of this type of mystical religion is as yet too unexamined to permit the conclusion that we have here the clue to St. Paul's use of the term, *e.g.* in 1 Co 6^{11}, or to his conception of the Divine *δικαιοσύνη* entering a human personality as a power to expel unrighteousness. This may be due to the influence of Christian language on a later Gnostic religious mysticism. Even if it is not, the juristic associations of *δικαιοσύνη*, as of *υἱοθεσία*, define the central thought of St. Paul, without any need of conjecturing the influence of the Hermetic mysticism. 'Righteousness,' like *υἱοθεσία*, was capable of suggesting a state or relation to God as well as the initial act which created that state, and St. Paul's faith-mysticism would do the rest.

What is St. Paul's religious interest in this sharp distinction between faith and works as the rival bases for righteousness? Why does he distinguish the one from the other as true and false? The answer depends on an analysis of what he meant by faith in this connexion.

(i.) At the close of his argument about justification in Ro 3^{27} he asks, 'Then what becomes of our boasting (*ἡ καύχησις*)? It is ruled out absolutely. On what principle? On the principle of doing deeds (*τῶν ἔργων*)? No, on the principle of faith.' 'Boasting' means relying on one's personal merits, the Pharisaic self-consciousness which feels that it is able to bring God something which deserves favourable consideration. We may call it 'Pharisaic,' not because it was characteristic of all Pharisees in St. Paul's day, nor because it was confined to them, but because the Pharisaic type of theology, as St. Paul knew it from personal experience and observation, tended to develop a religious self-consciousness, a self-satisfaction which was inclined, on the score of moral qualities and achievements, to treat with God and even claim His favour as more or less a due. Such a mood, no doubt, involved faith of a kind, faith in a Divine recompense which was just in its awards. But this was not the faith of St. Paul. Nor was his 'faith' the faith which itself amounted to a meritorious 'work,' on which a man might secretly or openly plume himself as if it entitled him to some credit with God, for his confidence, his insight, his dutifulness, his loyal venture of the soul.[*] It was to avoid any such misconception that St. Paul defined faith as the opposite of works, and not as a work or action of which man was the author and on which he could pride himself. There was a place for *καύχησις* in the Christian order, but it was not on faith as an achievement; hence the paradoxical use of the term in Ro 5^{1-11}: 'As we are justified by faith, . . . we triumph (*καυχώμεθα*) in the hope of God's glory;[†] not only so, but we triumph in our troubles . . . not only so, but we triumph in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we now enjoy our reconciliation.' Or again, in the proud humility of Ph 3^{3}: 'We are the true circumcision, we who worship God in the spirit, we who pride ourselves (*καυχώμενοι*) on Christ Jesus.' There is a legitimate sense, St. Paul would say, in which we Christians can speak of 'boasting' or 'pride,' but what evokes it is the sheer grace and generosity of God in Jesus Christ—the very revelation of Himself which elicits faith. The Pharisaic boasting went back to the conception of faith as a meritorious work, as, *e.g.*, in the Midrash on Gn 15^{6}, which interpreted the words thus: 'Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him as a righteousness,' a meritorious work. St. Paul took faith as the vital spring of life, set in motion by God Himself. When he substituted faith for works as the basis of righteousness, it might seem as though he only meant to make faith the supreme 'work.' On the strict Pharisaic doctrine of the Divine sovereignty, which St. Paul shared (Ro 9–11), God could do as He pleased. He was not bound to obedience to the Law as the condition of righteousness; conceivably (see above, p. 379), He might make faith that condition. But St. Paul did not understand God as exempt from moral consistency (cf. Ro $3^{4f.}$). He did not adduce faith as selected arbitrarily by God to be the essential qualification for righteousness. On his view, it was organic to the entire order of the Christian religion from the first, and drawn out fully by the gracious revelation in Jesus Christ. Faith is always the correlative to revelation, and saving faith is the response of the entire personality to God's reconciling love in Jesus Christ. The initiative is with God. Faith, therefore, is not belief or even fidelity, in the primary sense of the term; it is not an act or quality of the soul, but the yielding of the whole nature to God's appeal and offer in the gospel. There must be no thought of credit in this initial surrender, St. Paul insists. Genuine trust clears every trace of such a mood out of the soul. 'In the work of man's salvation an unconditioned initiative belongs to God, and all that is required of man is the unreserved abandonment of himself to what God has done. That is faith in the sense of St. Paul.'[*] But there is a tendency in human nature, not simply in Pharisaism, to evade or modify this unqualified demand; it is a tendency which may be due, in part, to conscientious feeling and ethical principle, but none the less it is out of place. St. Paul felt this strongly, and it is from his sense of the religious principle involved, not simply owing to the exigencies of theological controversy, that he sharply reiterates the antithesis between faith and works. For him there was only one way to be right with God, and the only assurance of being on that way was the sense of having risen above the mists of religious self-satisfaction.

---

[*] Cf. the point of Jn 15^{16}: 'You did not choose me, it was I who chose you.'

[†] A characteristically Jewish expression. But St. Paul's basis is not that of contemporary Judaism. 'Full recompense does not come until the future world. . . . Then Israel, both as a nation and as individuals, will be rewarded for its loyal fulfilment of the Law by a life of untroubled bliss. Good works, like reverence for father and mother, beneficence, peace-making among one's neighbours, and above all study of the Law, are comparable therefore to a capital sum, whose interest is already enjoyed in the present life, while the principal itself remains for the future life. This hope of a future recompense was the main impetus to zeal for the Law. In fact, the entire religious life of the Jewish people during our period moved round the two poles: fulfilment of the Law and hope of future glory' (Schürer's *GJV* ii.^{4} [Leipzig, 1907], p. 547 f.; cf. Eng. tr., II. [Edinburgh, 1885] ii. 92 f.).

(ii.) One special temptation of the Pharisaic καύχησις was particularism, and therefore faith also swept away the system of ideas which gave the Jew or Jewish proselyte an exclusive or pre-eminent claim on God's favour. In this aspect, too, faith was not arbitrary. It was bound up for St. Paul with the universal scope of the gospel. Thus, in Romans for example, immediately after the words on καύχησις which have just been quoted, he adds: 'We hold a man is justified by faith apart from deeds of the Law altogether. Or, is God only the God of Jews? Is he not the God of Gentiles as well? Surely he is. Well then, there is one God, a God who will justify the uncircumcised as they believe and the uncircumcised on the score of faith' (3^{28-30}). The argument is that God as One is the same for all, and faith is the one, common method of being right with Him. To have faith, you do not need to have the Law or to be a Jew (circumcised). 'I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel,' said Jesus once of a pagan. St. Paul generalizes the same conviction. He had the palpable fact before him, that Gentiles could be and were being saved apart from the Law. If a man can be right with God apart from the Law, then faith is universal; or, *vice versa*, as faith is a universal instinct, it implies a universal range for the faith of the gospel. In Romans and Galatians, through the abstruse, winding arguments upon righteousness, two thoughts are constantly before St. Paul's mind: one is that Christianity is a religion of grace which evokes faith, the other is that it is a religion for mankind. These are cognate thoughts, and Gal 3, *e.g.*,[†] is a series of curious illustrations and exegetical arguments on both. Thus, after contrasting the Law and faith, he suddenly goes off in 3^{25}: 'faith has come, and we are wards no longer; you are all sons of God by your faith in Christ Jesus. . . . There is no room for Jew or Greek, there is no room for slave or freeman, there is no room for male or female: you are all one in Christ Jesus.' Faith at once suggests to him the catholicity and humanity of the new religious order. It supersedes exclusiveness. Christianity as the redemptive religion, basing righteousness on faith, transcends the divisions of race and class and sex which contemporary religions, especially Judaism, recognized. This is what Jowett[‡] meant when he declared that 'the whole doctrine of righteousness by faith may be said to be based in a certain sense on fact, on two great facts especially—the conversion of the Apostle himself, and the conversion of the Gentiles.' Again we see the specifically religious interest which underlay the Apostle's antithesis between faith and works. It is not a piece of scholasticism, but the interpretation of God's acts in history and experience, an interpretation which was meant to be as uncompromising as the facts on which it rested were decisive.

Observe, St. Paul's argument is not 'Have faith like Abraham.' That would leave out Christ. He argues 'You are all sons of God by your faith in Christ Jesus.'[*] It is not by imitating Abraham's intuition of trust, but by faith in God as revealed in Christ His Son, that you are members of His household. With Christ, faith receives for the first time its proper and full object—the adequate, absolute revelation of the Divine purpose for men. St. Paul does not even call on Christians to have faith like Christ, to believe in God as Jesus believed. 'Faith such as Jesus had' is not a Pauline conception. It is surely impossible to interpret the phrase πίστις Ἰησοῦ as if it meant 'the faith of Jesus'; what it does mean is faith in the gracious will of God manifested in Christ, a faith which transforms the personality into His Spirit. 'The life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God who loved me and gave up himself for me' (Gal 2^{20}). This is almost the nearest approach (yet cf. Ro 3^{22}, Gal 2^{16}) which St. Paul makes to speaking of πιστεύειν Χριστῷ, as he speaks of πιστεύειν θεῷ. For him, Christ 'is the object of faith so far, that in him, especially in his death and resurrection, the favourable will of God, which is the real object of religious trust, has been revealed.'[†] This revelation was not made by a legal act; it was shown in devotion to the point of death, and consequently it can elicit devotion from the heart which seeks and finds in it union with the object of its trust and love.

(*d*) *God's righteousness and human sin.*—As the righteousness of God means a status of man before Him, or rather a relationship between Him and man, which He brings into being through the sacrificial death of Christ, and which becomes a reality of experience for man as he believes, St. Paul can speak of it as he could not if it were merely an attribute[‡] of God's nature. He can say that it is due to 'faith in Jesus Christ' (Ro 3^{22}), or that it originates with God and rests on faith (Ph 3^{9}). The believing man possesses it as the gift of life to him. These two sides of the truth are always present to the mind of St. Paul, but one is sometimes more prominent than the other, and he freely passes from the one to the other. It is necessary to recollect this, as we go on to analyze the Apostle's main statements upon the relationship in question.

Righteousness, on the Pharisaic lines of piety, meant an ἔννομος βίωσις, fidelity to the Divine Torah as embodying the standard set by God for His people; in other words, all that God requires from man in relation to Himself and to other men. It is a matter of life and death. To be saved, a man must be righteous; and he alone is righteous who conforms to this Law. And God? His righteousness consists in fidelity to His own Law, as the highest norm of life. He is righteous as He rewards and praises those who keep that Law, which as Judge or Ruler He is bound to uphold. Now this was an aspect which, in the strict sense of the term, St. Paul naturally left out of account, since he held that no one, however much care and passion he devoted to legal obedience, could possibly attain a position which entitled him to such praise and reward.[*] Sin intervened so powerfully and disastrously that St. Paul was forced to fix his mind upon the other side of the Divine righteousness, viz. the punishment of disobedience. It was axiomatic for him as for the Judaism of his age, though in different degrees, that the just God could not leave sin unpunished; He must maintain the rights of the Law when it was violated. The Divine Law, like human law, involved the praise of those who kept it and also the punishment of transgressors. The old maxim held good: 'judex damnatur ubi nocens absolvitur.' It was essential that God should prove Himself 'just' in this restricted sense of 'righteous,' by taking account of evil and transgression. But this punitive attitude, which St. Paul describes as the anger of God, did not exhaust His mind towards a humanity which deserved nothing else. There is the way of expiation or atonement, which enables God to acquit the sinner without condoning the sin. No sacrifice that men can offer has this atoning power; St. Paul never troubles to argue that the ceremonial sacrifices, or even the sacrifice on the Day of Atonement, on which probably pious Jews relied for the completion of pardon, did not avail for this purpose. The sacrifice is offered by God Himself; in modern terminology, it is a Divine self-sacrifice for the sake of sinful men; the Cross of Christ reveals the heart of God in its righteousness (or grace) and also reveals his condemnation of sin. Through the blood of the Cross God's righteousness is revealed fully as the saving power of His love for men. It represents His grace—and grace for St. Paul means the power as well as the disposition of God's love to sinners—but, as *δικαιοσύνη* connoted justice in the narrower sense, St. Paul could use the term upon occasion to bring out that punishment of sin which was essential to His nature and relations to men, or, as a modern might say, to the moral order.

---

[*] Denney, *Exp*, 6th ser., iv. 90.

[†] Cf. the present writer's *Paul and Paulinism*, London, 1910, p. 55 f.

[‡] *Epistles of St. Paul to the Thess., Gal. and Rom.*, i. 148.

[*] In this particular passage (Gal 3^{26}) it is possible to take διὰ τῆς πίστεως by itself, and render, 'you are all sons of God in Christ Jesus, by your faith'; but this is less probable, and even if it were taken thus, there are many other passages where the above-noted principle is implied (*e.g.* Ro $4^{23f.}$).

[†] O. Pfleiderer, *Paulinism*, Eng. tr., 2 vols., London, 1877, i. 163.

[‡] The Philonic habit of regarding certain attributes of God's nature as semi-personified, and therefore capable of being appropriated by man, might form a precedent for the view that St. Paul considered God's righteousness as emanating from Himself and yet entering into human experience upon certain conditions. But this is not supported by his language. He does objectify or personify sin and death and wrath, but Ro 1^{17} is too slender a basis for the idea that righteousness is similarly conceived as a Divine power operating in history. The personification in 2 Co 5^{21} is irrelevant to such a notion (see below).

The revelation of Divine goodness or righteousness in the gospel is therefore thrown into relief against the revelation of Divine anger which is the only alternative for those who will not have faith to see God's meaning and purpose in the gospel of Christ. This is the point of Ro $1^{16f.}$ ('the gospel is God's saving power [*δύναμις θεοῦ εἰς σωτηρίαν*] for everyone who has faith . . . God's *δικαιοσύνη* is revealed in it by faith and for faith'). It is apt to be distorted for modern readers, who inevitably associate righteousness with an austere, retributive exercise of judicial power. But St. Paul here distinctly connotes it with saving power and opposes it to the Divine wrath, in a way that reminds us of the Psalmist's phrase (Ps 98^2): 'The Lord hath made known his salvation (*τὴν σωτηρίαν αὐτοῦ*): his righteousness (*τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ*) hath he openly shewed in the sight of the nations.' The Apostle, as often, objectifies his thoughts. By the words 'a righteousness of God is revealed' he means that God is revealed as a God who justifies, as a God who, Himself righteous, seeks to have men righteous before Him (cf. 3^{26}).

> 'Light is light which radiates,
> Blood is blood which circulates,
> Life is life which generates'
> (Emerson, *Threnody*, 242 ff.).

God as righteous is the living God, not one who stands aloof from sinful men, leaving the race to itself, except to brood over its heightening impiety with the anger of outraged justice that ends in punishment and death. The supreme obstacle to His life generating life in men is sin, the sin which has assumed such tyrannical power over humanity. But in the gospel He removes this obstacle, or rather, breaks this hostile power, by the sacrificial death of Christ, His Son, so that His righteousness or vital energy can now come into play.

When the Apostle eventually describes this in more detail (in Ro 3^{21-26}), he still speaks of the Divine righteousness being manifested, but, by a natural turn of thought and expression, he also uses *δικαιοσύνη* in v.$^{25f.}$ in the narrower sense of 'justice' as opposed to laxity. The atoning death of Christ is put forward as a proof that He did recognize the doom with which sin had to be punished, and therefore that His righteousness bestowed on believing men is consonant with moral justice. If St. Paul could use *δικαιοσύνη* already in a restricted sense in v.^{5} of this chapter, the present writer sees no reason why he should not employ it in this particular sense in v.$^{25f.}$, especially as it was a sense which was innate in the term. Whenever 'righteousness' was associated with the thought of sin, its aspect of justice naturally tended to become prominent; the sombre punitive element came to the front, as in the case of the verb *δικαιοῦν* (see above).

The use of a word in different senses in the same context may be illustrated from the very next paragraph (Ro $3^{27f.}$), where St. Paul employs *νόμος* in the special sense of principle (v.^{27}) and then (v.^{28}) as 'Law' (see above, p. 384). The *Psalter of Solomon* furnishes another case of *δικαιοσύνη* being used in two or three different senses close together:

> 'The works of mercy (*δικαιοσύναι*) of thy saints are before thee . . .
> O God, our actions are in our own choice and power, to do right (*ποιῆσαι δικαιοσύνην*) or wrong in the works of our hands.
> In thy righteousness (*ἐν τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ σου*) thou visitest the sons of men' (ix. 6–8).

Before going further into this passage, however, we must turn to the prior allusion in 2 Co 5^{21}, one of the most startling personifications in the Pauline literature. 'For our sakes he made him to be sin who himself knew nothing of sin, so that in him we might become the righteousness of God.' When did God 'make Christ sin'?[*] At the Incarnation, when the pre-existent Son of God was made to wear the flesh of sinful man? This is Holsten's view. He regards St. Paul as holding that the flesh was essentially sinful, and consequently that Christ's human birth might be said to imply that He took sin upon Him by entering our sinful state. This view of the flesh, however, is untenable, and the fact which St. Paul has in mind is the Death pre-eminently. Whether 'sin' means 'sin-offering' is not quite so clear. It is no argument against such an interpretation that it involves a double sense of 'sin' in the same verse, for the compressed, rapid style of the Apostle here might admit of that. But the parallelism of 'sin' and 'righteousness' tells against it strongly. It is a daring expression, though not unexampled. God, St. Paul seems to mean, treated Christ as a sinner, let Him suffer death (the normal consequence of human sin) in the interests of men, that we might become righteous[†] by our union with Him. 'Righteous' here obviously means more than acquitted; to become righteous in Christ, righteous before God, is to enjoy not simply freedom from guilt but a positive relation to God. How this takes place, St. Paul does not state in the verse before us; his words must be read in the light of his other references to the virtue of Christ's sacrifice as the death of One who, as sinless, did not deserve to die, and whose death therefore availed for the guilty. God thus reconciles men to Himself, and it is an act of love. This death of the One for all (v.$^{14f.}$) means that 'all have died, and that he died for all in order to have the living live no longer for themselves but for him who died and rose again for them.' It is in the light of such words that we can interpret what St. Paul intended by this antithesis of v.^{21}. The identification of Himself with sinful men is the clue to the meaning of Christ's death; it is an expression of His love, just as from another side it shows God's treatment of Him as bound up with sinners, so as to die for them. The result is that sinners are freed from the death which is their due, and raised to a position which is defined as devotion to Christ or as 'righteousness,' that is, life shared with God, the life to which Christ Himself rose and into which He raises His people. Instead of being condemned to death, they are now freed from condemnation and made 'right' with God; *i.e.* they are reconciled (v.$^{18f.}$), they are made a new creation (v.^{17}), which has a moral purpose in it. This purpose is elsewhere described as 'consecration' (ἁγιασμός), *e.g.* in 1 Co 6^{11}, where justification is associated with consecration, as a real and true relation to the living God. In reconciliation or justification there is an implicit purpose of 'holiness' or consecration, in this sense of belonging to God, and of caring to belong to Him, as members of His own community.[*] But the sharp point of the paradox in 2 Co 5^{21} lies in the phrase about the act of God which makes the Christian standing a reality. At first sight, the parallel indeed seems unreal. Christ was not really a sinner, in His death for sin. Is our 'righteousness' of the same kind? Is it only an estimate? We may reply, with Sabatier (*The Apostle Paul*, Eng. tr., p. 330), 'Redemption consists precisely in this, that God sees in Christ that which is in us,—namely, sin; and in us that which is in Christ,—namely, righteousness. No doubt this is a logical contradiction; but it is the Divine contradiction of love. The logic of the heart triumphs over that of the intellect.' We may also perhaps add this moralizing consideration. When Christ by the will of God identified Himself with sinful men, His sympathy with them only intensified His holiness and goodness; the more He came into contact with sin, the stronger did His holy love become. So, as we identify ourselves with Him, we come to share His mind towards our sin; we learn to condemn it and to side with God against ourselves. When we are brought to cry, 'Who shall deliver me from this body of death?' we become God's. It is through the death of Christ that we truly learn our hopeless position as sinners, and the hope enshrined in His sacrifice. What St. Paul elsewhere describes as 'by faith,' he expresses here by the phrase 'in him.' The vicarious death of Christ implies that God subjected Him to real suffering for our sakes, to the last extremity of desertion and death, and when we identify ourselves with Him, when we trust Him with ourselves, God subjects us to as real an experience of reconciliation. Christ's experience of agony and desolation at the end was real in its bitterness; He was not going through a painful official formality when He suffered. So our experience of union with God is a real bliss, a direct, personal relation to Himself. What is common to both is the intense and growing reaction against sin which Christ's sacrifice produces in us. What differentiates Christ and men is that our characters are transformed by the creative act of One whose character required no change.

---

[*] Unlike his contemporary, the author of the *Apocalypse of Baruch*, who (li. 3 f.) describes in glowing language the glory of 'those who have now been justified in My law . . . those who have been saved by their works, and to whom the law has been now a hope.' Some lines of the description ('they shall be changed into every form they desire, from beauty into loveliness, and from light into the splendour of glory') recall 2 Co 4^{18}.

[*] The expression is even stronger than the similar phrase in Gal 3^{13}: 'Christ ransomed us from the curse of the law by becoming accursed (*κατάρα*) for us: for it is written, Cursed (*ἐπικατάρατος*) is everyone who hangs on a gibbet.' St. Paul leaves out the LXX *ὑπὸ θεοῦ* after *ἐπικατάρατος*.

[†] In *En.* lxii. 3 ('righteousness is judged before him'), 'righteousness' similarly means 'the righteous.'

The importance of taking 2 Co 5^{21} at this stage in an analysis is two-fold: it is a fresh corroboration of the truth that 'God's righteousness' is a positive, personal relation to Himself; and also of the vital connexion between this righteousness and the Person of Jesus Christ. We are hardly surprised to discover that the close association of righteousness with a personal experience of Christ[*] emerges in the last autobiographical reference, in Ph 3^{5-11}. St. Paul summarizes his Pharisaic prerogatives, a passionate and positive orthodoxy, 'immaculate according to the standard of legal righteousness,'[†] zeal, high character, and all the rest, all the κερδῆ which he and others thought contributed materially to salvation. 'I parted with them gladly,' he confesses, 'for the sake of intimacy with Christ Jesus my Lord.' And I gained far more. It was for the sake of 'gaining Christ and being found (when I die) in him, possessing no legal righteousness of my own (*i.e.* no religious standing which a man thinks he can secure by scrupulous obedience to the moral code of the Law) but the righteousness of faith in Christ, the Divine righteousness that rests on faith.' There is only a verbal difference between this last description and the more personally tinged expression 'knowing Christ Jesus my Lord'—where 'knowing' means practical reverence and intimacy.[‡] Whether St. Paul speaks of 'righteousness by faith,' or of Christ being made righteousness for us, or of our being made righteousness in Him, the same inspiring conviction breaks through the somewhat legal and technical phraseology, viz. that while the reconciliation is a reality apart from our experience of it, it becomes a reality for us only through our personal surrender to the personal will of love which reaches us in the Cross and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

From these earlier and later allusions, we may now turn back to the references in Romans. The conception of righteousness is commonly studied first of all in Ro 1–8, where it is discussed for its own sake,[§] rather than in Galatians, where the leading thought is the freedom of Christians, and justification comes in to illustrate the main theme. So far, the method is legitimate. But this concentration of interest on Romans has had its drawbacks and dangers. One thing, *e.g.*, which has thrown investigators off the track repeatedly has been the circumstance that the earliest allusion to righteousness in the Epistle appears to introduce it in rather an abstract sense. 'I am proud of the gospel; it is God's saving power (*i.e.* it is a thoroughly effective plan of ensuring the Messianic σωτηρία, which no one need be ashamed of trusting and serving) for everyone who has faith, for the Jew first and for the Greek as well. God's righteousness is revealed in it by faith and for faith—as it is written, Now by faith shall the righteous live' (Ro $1^{16f.}$). Even here, the impression of abstractness is superficial. St. Paul is speaking of the gospel, and that is God's personal, direct message and gift to the faith of men, inseparable from Jesus Christ. Still, the very absence of any direct reference to Christ has led some critics at the start to isolate righteousness and consequently to misunderstand it either by treating it as a Divine quality which operates more or less independently of the Person of Christ, or by regarding the entire topic as a religious piece of forensic controversy. But even the context itself implies that justification, *i.e.* the process by means of which one becomes right with God, is not a cold ante-chamber through which the Christian is ushered into the warm atmosphere of personal intimacy beyond. It is not a chamber or hall of justice; it is the household of the living God. The righteousness which is revealed and conveyed is not simply acquittal, but life in the fullest sense of the term. 'By faith shall the righteous live.' The righteousness which comes by faith is not a preliminary stage, at which a man is pardoned for his sins and let off; it is a living, personal experience of God revealed in Christ. The righteousness revealed in the gospel is not the issuing of a pardon or the proclamation of an amnesty, but a relation of acceptance with God, in fellowship with Jesus Christ, which depends on faith as the personal surrender of a man's entire nature to the Divine will of reconciliation.

---

[*] The term (ἁγιασμός) quite naturally included the further idea of the life which answered to this position (cf. 1 Th $5^{3f.}$), just as δικαιοσύνη did (p. 377).

[*] The lack of any reference to the Messianic promise in Jer 23^{6} (Israel's name is to be 'The Lord our righteousness') is surprising. Zahn explains it (*Der Brief des Apostels Paulus an die Römer*, Leipzig, 1910, p. 84) by the fact of the LXX mistranslation Ἰωσέδεκ, but thinks that a writer like St. Paul, who knew the Hebrew original, cannot fail to have been influenced by the striking expression.

[†] St. Paul belonged to the Luther and Bunyan class—not to those who, like Augustine, broke through to Christ out of a vicious life.

[‡] Cf. Wis 15^{3}: 'to know Thee is complete righteousness, and to know Thy power is the root of immortality.'

[§] W. G. Rutherford, in his translation of *St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, London, 1900, arranges the entire Epistle, apart from its preface (1^{1-17}) and epilogue (15^{14}–16^{27}), under the category of 'righteousness': righteousness created by faith (1^{18}–5^{21}), righteousness realized in faith (6^{1}–8^{17}), righteousness triumphant (8^{18-39}), faith the only source of righteousness (9^{1}–11^{36}), righteousness as affecting conduct (12^{1}–15^{13}).

This is fundamental to Paulinism, and one of the simplest ways to grasp the truth of it is to note how the Apostle twice over uses 'righteousness' in a personal sense, as applied to Christ. 'This,' he argues in 1 Co 1^{30}, 'is the God to whom you owe your being in Christ Jesus, whom God has made our "Wisdom" (σοφία), that is, our righteousness and consecration and redemption.'* Christ as the Divine Wisdom is further defined as righteousness and consecration and redemption for us. The Christian 'Sophia' is not a vague, shadowy, speculative idea or æon; it is embodied in Christ's personal relation to the sin and need of men, whom He has brought into intimate relation with God. Again, in the more difficult passage in 2 Co 5^{21}, God is said to have treated Christ as a sinner for our sakes, to have allowed Him to suffer what sinful men suffer, dying the accursed death of the Cross (Gal 3^{13}). 'For our sakes he made him to be sin who knew nothing of sin (*i.e.* because he knew nothing of sin as a personal experience), so that in him we might become the righteousness of God' (*i.e.* Divinely righteous). St. Paul may personify righteousness in Ro 1^{17} and elsewhere, but it is more important to observe how readily he identifies it with the personal relations of Christ to men and of men to God. Nothing proves more clearly how far he was from regarding it as an abstract, official relationship between the sinner and the Saviour, which led to some further and closer fellowship.

In the light of all this, we can at last read the central passage in Ro $3^{20f.}$: 'On the score of obedience to law, no person will be acquitted in his sight. What the Law imparts is not acquittal but only the consciousness of sin [ἐπίγνωσις, St. Paul's favourite word for a full recognition, a sight of the real meaning, of anything or any person]. But now [harking back to 1^{17}] we have a righteousness of God disclosed apart from law altogether [*i.e.* entirely apart from any human achievement of obedience to law, as above]; it is attested by the Law and the prophets [*i.e.* 'apart from law' does not mean that the revelation has no continuity with the OT], but it is a righteousness of God which comes by believing in Jesus Christ, and it is meant for all who have faith. No distinctions are drawn [the religious interest of catholicism, already noted; cf. p. 385]. All have sinned, all come short of the glory of God, but they are justified for nothing by his grace through the ransom provided in Christ Jesus [all this was in his mind when he spoke of God's righteousness being revealed in the gospel, $1^{16f.}$], whom God put forward as the means of propitiation (ἱλαστήριον) by his blood, to be received by faith.' Later on, he will explain how God condemned sin through His Son (8^{3}), but here he goes on to note that, while this 'righteousness of God' is made available for believing men apart from the Law altogether, the fact that it rests on the Divine self-sacrifice in the death of Christ is enough to prove that God is not taking sin lightly or failing to visit transgressions with their moral due. He has in mind a criticism of his doctrine of righteousness. It had been objected—or he anticipated the objection—that the Law, with its sacrificial rites and stress on repentance, at least took moral evil seriously; St. Paul might deride it and criticize it, but surely it was not open to the charge of laxity like his own theory, which asserted that a sinner could be restored to God by faith and nothing more. The Apostle replies by claiming actually that the very reverse is true. God's new means of providing righteousness shows that He is dealing with sin more rigorously than He ever did under the old system of the Law; the sacrifice of Christ, His Son, exhibits His uncompromising attitude towards sin, which hitherto had not been displayed to the full. When the gospel bids men seek righteousness outside the code and ritual of the Jewish Law, it is not suggesting that God is now pleased to be satisfied with an inferior type of righteousness, or that He is prepared to annul sin without more ado. To drive this point home, St. Paul now uses δικαιοσύνη in its narrower sense. In v.$^{21f.}$ it denotes the general redeeming purpose of God, as in 1^{17}, but in v.$^{25f.}$ the meaning is closer to that of v.^{5}, *i.e.* the moral integrity of God, which in presence of deliberate sin implies the reaction of His inviolable justice. In order to realize His righteousness for sinful men, God had to vindicate His character of 'justice.' Hence the two-fold purpose of Christ's sacrificial death. It was 'to demonstrate the justice of God in view of the fact that sins previously committed during the time of God's forbearance* had been passed over; it was to demonstrate his justice at the present epoch (in contrast to the past, when it had not been so exhibited), showing that God is just himself and that he justifies man on the score of faith in Jesus.'

Whether ἱλαστήριον means propitiatory gift or sacrifice, it is offered by God Himself, not by men; and this sacrifice of Christ was necessary for the realization of God's righteousness or redeeming purpose. It is fairly clear from the context, and this interpretation is supported by other data, that the words 'by his blood' refer to the historical Crucifixion. It is the sacrificial death of Christ, not blood-fellowship with the Risen Christ, which the Apostle has primarily in mind.† What enables

---

* ἀπολύτρωσις here is as little eschatological as in Ro 3^{24}.

* Not in the previous life of people who are now saved, but in the sense of Ac 17^{30}, although the eschatological horizon is more distinct there than here.

† It is true that justification implies the Resurrection (Ro 3^{25}), but the relation of the justified to God depends on one who '*was dead* and is alive again' as their Lord. In view of a passage like $5^{9f.}$, it is beside the point to lay stress, as Lipsius does, on the absence of any reference to the Cross here. The recent popularity of this blood-fellowship interpretation (cf., *e.g.*, G. A. Deissmann in *EBi* iii. 3034–3035; A. Schettler, *Die paulinische Formel* '*Durch Christus*,' Tübingen, 1907, p. 5; and Otto Schmitz, *Die Opferanschauung des späteren Judentums*, do., 1910, p. 223 f.) is probably due to a right reaction against the idea of righteousness as a purely forensic status, depending on the death of Christ, but it is not necessary from an exegetical point of view, and it tends to miss the truth that the relationship of righteousness implies a communion with God through Christ in which the sacrificial power of His death is the effective thing (cf. A. Juncker, *Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus*, Halle, 1904, p. 121 f.).

God to justify sinners, what justifies Him in justifying them, is the *ἱλαστήριον* of Christ. It is through this sacrificial death that God's moral character as *δίκαιος* becomes, in relation to human sin, the attitude and action of a *δικαιῶν*. Till Christ and outside of Christ there is no righteousness for men.

This is the vital point at which the conception of righteousness crosses the conception of atonement in St. Paul's theology. Without trespassing on the province of the articles JUSTIFICATION and ATONEMENT, we may point out that in the present passage St. Paul distinctly regards the sacrificial death of Christ as the explicit sentence of God on human sin. This is why he speaks of the past, and in so doing uses *δικαιοσύνη* in v.$^{25f.}$ in the specific sense of 'justice.' In the death of Christ as the one adequate offering for sin, God now shows His real mind towards sin and sinners as punitive and judicial; He condemns sin, and thus cannot be suspected of any indifference to it. Men, arguing from the long past when He forbore to exhibit any such weighty reprobation as the death of Christ now conveyed, might impugn His justice, as if He were indifferent to moral interests. But the terrible expression of His real attitude in the death of Christ removed any such suspicion; it revealed for the first time and finally His true verdict on sin. If He had forborne to show this until now, that was because He sent Christ, as St. Paul elsewhere argues,[*] at the proper moment in the world's history, not because of any failure to conserve the interests of justice. St. Paul would have admitted that sins had been visited by God's anger in the past; this is the thought of Ro 1$^{18f.}$ ('God's anger is revealed from heaven against all the impiety and wickedness of men'). The mere fact of death (Ro 5$^{12f.}$) showed that sin had consequences for sinners. But until the death of Christ on the Cross the full exhibition of God's condemnation of sin could not be made; and it had to be made, not only in view of the previous forbearance or abeyance of judgment, by which God had spared the Jews, instead of punishing them by extinction, but in order to realize the new righteousness. That new righteousness or state of acceptance with God involved a recognition of the just connexion between sin and death ('God himself is just'), and at the same time of a gracious power triumphing over both ('all are justified for nothing by his grace through the ransom provided in Christ Jesus,' 'he justifies man on the score of faith in Jesus'). This demonstration was furnished in the death of Christ, the Divine Being who died on the Cross neither as a sinner nor as a sinless individual but as God's Son, the innocent for the guilty, reversing the fatal consequences of Adam's transgression and inaugurating a new relationship between God and His people, on the basis of faith in Himself. When St. Paul describes this death as a ransom, he is thinking pre-eminently of its positive results in the creation of fellowship rather than of its negative side. The uppermost idea is the restoration to God of those who belong to Him, not of what they are ransomed from, nor of the particular price paid. It is God who provides this sacrifice, as it is God who desires the restoration. Obviously, the new content of the religion is larger than the old sacrificial metaphors employed to state it, but *ἱλαστήριον* does carry sacrificial meaning. Here as elsewhere the fundamental thing in righteousness is the positive relation of life to which those who believe in Christ are admitted, their new standing before God ('We are justified by faith . . . through our Lord Jesus Christ we have got access to this grace where we have our standing'). It is not exhausted in the assurance that they are now considered far from blame and no longer liable to punishment. Whether 'the righteousness of God' means God bringing men to Himself or the relation in which they stand to Him when they are thus brought home—and both meanings naturally emerge, and emerge together, in St. Paul's language—the cardinal idea is the same; it would be scholastic to imagine that he thought of this righteousness either as a preliminary action of God, clearing away the obstacles in order to let the Spirit have full play, or as a state which required to be vivified by a second act of grace. Here the contrast between the Law and the ransom is enough to explode any such misinterpretation. The *ἱλαστήριον* enables God to do what the Law could never do, and if the Law meant anything it meant the maintenance of living communion between God and men.

Such were the presuppositions underneath the first allusion to the Divine righteousness in Romans (1^{17}), for the gospel in which it is disclosed has been already described in vv.$^{2-6}$ as a gospel of redemption through Jesus Christ, God's Son. God's anger is revealed from heaven against human sin, and the counterpart is the revelation of His righteousness, for the moral situation is such that man cannot put himself right with God. This revelation of His righteousness is inaugurated by the sacrificial death and resurrection of Christ; it is not a revelation which has been in existence from the beginning, the revelation of a Divine attribute which constantly unfolds itself in human history and has acquired a heightened expression through Christ. On the other hand, it is not punitive, for the attitude of God to sin is described as 'anger.' What is denoted by 'righteousness' is saving power, as defined more fully elsewhere.[*] The main difference between the use of the phrase *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ* here and in most of the other passages is that the emphasis falls upon *δικαιοσύνη* in this passage, not on *θεοῦ*. The contrast is between 'righteousness' and 'anger.' Human sin leaves no alternative but for God to show His moral displeasure in punishment, but He freely and graciously reveals through Christ how sinners can be right with Him. His righteousness is the new hope for men who have brought upon themselves His anger.

We may ask, Why is not love the antithesis to anger? It really is, in St. Paul's view. The entire justification of men is due to God's love. 'Therefore, as we are justified by faith, let us enjoy our peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ . . . since God's love floods our hearts. . . . God proves his love for us by this, that Christ died for us when we were still sinners' (Ro 5$^{1.5}$). St. Paul never distinguishes, as moderns have often done, between love and righteousness in God. Incidentally, as we have already seen, he recognizes a sense in which 'righteous' is less than 'loving' as applied to men, but God is never 'righteous' to him in this sense of the term. Probably the reason why he prefers to speak of God's righteousness rather than of His love, in this connexion, is either because he cherishes the old classical term, or because he was dealing with a controversial topic in its own vocabulary, or because he desired to emphasize the moral quality and aim of God's nature and dealings with men. This may be why he uses 'righteousness' here, just as elsewhere he chooses to speak of grace, which is only the Divine love in action upon the sin of men. 'Righteousness' is God's nature revealed in its special purpose of dealing with the desperate situation of man's sin and guilt; the Johannine theology uses 'love' outright in this connexion, but St. Paul generally prefers the term 'grace' as an equivalent for this purpose in its personal action upon sinners who yield, and 'anger' for the relation of God to wilful disobedience and rebellion. It is characteristic of his Jewish training that he employs a term like 'righteousness' to express not only what was fundamentally a religious relation between God and man, but also the moral issues of that relation. The persistence with which he rules out any human element which might compromise the absolute grace of God in justifying sinners becomes all the more significant when we find that he did not hesitate still to use this very term 'righteousness' as one of the words for the ethical outcome or aspect of justification. To this we may now pass.

---

[*] 'In due time' (Ro 5^{6}), 'when τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου came' (Gal 4^{4}).

[*] *E.g.* in 3^{26} (God 'just himself and the justifier of' men).

(*e*) *God's righteousness and the new life.*—The problem of the nexus between this faith-righteousness and the moral life of the Christian, between the free forgiveness which cuts away 'works' as establishing any claim on God and the strong ethical interests of the Pauline gospel, is unusually difficult, but it has sometimes been made needlessly difficult by dogmatic handling. For example, some of the Reformed theologians, in a laudable effort to oppose the Roman theory of merits, occasionally tended to reduce faith to a barren assent, which emptied it of ethical content, making it either (a) a mere organ for receiving the initial blessing of forgiveness, *i.e.* assent to a doctrine of salvation, or (b) too much a matter of subjective feeling. Luther himself, in his sheer anxiety to safeguard the interests of saving faith, now and then allowed himself to say paradoxical things which suggested that there could be justifying faith apart from love. Luther is certainly a better exegete of St. Paul at this point, in the main, than the tradition derived from Augustine. Augustine tended to regard human faith as worthless until it was infused and vitalized by Divine grace, and he seems now and then to read St. Paul as if God's grace revived faith and made it ethically valid by means of the sacraments. The spirit of Luther's fundamental interpretation is at any rate more true to the Apostle's teaching. At the same time, the problem of the relation between righteousness by faith and the conduct of the Christian really does belong to the problem of justification (*q.v.*), for St. Paul, as we have seen (above, p. 372), does not scruple to speak of the Christian life as 'righteousness' in the non-technical as well as in the technical sense of the term. The vexed problem of the relation between righteousness by faith and the judgment on works (which includes Christians) might be supposed to lie, strictly speaking, outside our subject; for while St. Paul regards justifying faith as in no essential respect different from the faith which underlies the entire course of the Christian experience, he generally employs other methods of statement (the 'fruit of the Spirit,' etc.) to elucidate the general conduct of the Christian. The terminology of righteousness by faith did not rule his whole theology. Yet, whatever explanation may be adopted of the nexus between the so-called forensic and ethical sides of his theology, the term 'righteousness' is not always dropped when he proceeds to state the latter. This is clear, *e.g.*, in Ro 6^{13-22}, where he reiterates the thought that Christians must dedicate themselves to 'the service of righteousness.' Life is a service, however you take it, he implies.* In fact, apologizing for the oxymoron, he calls the new life a 'slavery to righteousness'! 'Set free from sin, you have passed into the service of righteousness' (*ἐδουλώθητε*, v.^{18}). Sin is a slavery, so is *δικαιοσύνη*. You once knew the former; now take the latter. Here the position of *δικαιοσύνη*, which is absolutely due to God's grace, as he has just been arguing in the previous chapter, becomes not only a memory and a hope but an obligation upon those who are justified, the nexus being the Person of Christ with which our faith identifies us, since Christ has broken the hold of sin over us and opened up to us the sphere and the capacity of the Divine life.*

This nexus is not a mere play on the different senses of *δικαιοσύνη*. The forensic metaphors used by St. Paul in connexion with righteousness in the technical sense render it all the more imperative to grasp the larger thought for which he is seeking a somewhat controversial expression. When a sinner is pronounced righteous or justified, as we have seen, this does not correspond to the cool verdict of acquittal passed by some outside authority; it is the gracious dealing of a loving God, whose end is life for the sinner. The clearest statement of this truth is in the long passage of Ro $5^{16f.}$: 'While the sentence ensuing on a single sin resulted in doom, the free gift ensuing on many trespasses issues in acquittal' (but acquittal is not the last word). 'For if the trespass of one man allowed death to reign through that one man, much more shall those who receive the overflowing grace and free gift of righteousness reign in life through One, through Jesus Christ.' The *δικαίωμα* or acquittal carries life with it. Hence the Apostle sums up: 'Well then, as one man's trespass issued in doom for all, so one man's act of redress issues in acquittal and life (*εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς*) for all; just as one man's disobedience made all the rest sinners, so one man's obedience will make all the rest righteous . . . sin increased, but grace surpassed it far, so that while sin had reigned the reign of death, grace might also reign with a righteousness that ends in life eternal through Jesus Christ our Lord.' It is passages like this which suggest that the Pauline doctrine of righteousness by faith finds its equivalent in the Johannine doctrine of fellowship with the Father and the Son, life in both cases being the central thought. The door into this fellowship opens from within, and similarly the righteousness which issues in life is steadily regarded as a free gift of God; you cannot pay for it, or work for it, you have only to accept the reconciliation. The life comes through a Divine self-sacrifice. When St. Paul is using his most juridical language, he never forgets to bring this out, and the very fact that his line of argument in this section does not lead him to develop the human faith which receives the gift enables him to lay all the more stress upon the Divine generosity which provided it for needy man.† 'The gift,' 'the free gift,' 'for nothing'—it is as if he could not say enough to convince his readers of

---

* As Jesus did in Mt 6^{24}: 'you cannot serve two masters, but you must serve one, either God or mammon.' In the next chapter (Ro 7^{4}), St. Paul puts the same thought from another point of view: 'you must belong to Someone, either to the Law or to Christ.'

* It is the *ὑπακοή* of Christ (5^{19}) which realizes the new order of reconciliation and *δικαιοσύνη* for men, who in turn have to give in (see above), by an act of obedience, to these gracious terms of God for their redemption. But the human *ὑπακοή* is not exhausted by this surrender to God in Christ; it has to be worked out in His service and spirit (Ro $6^{12f.}$). Cf. W. Schlatter's *Glaube und Gehorsam*, Gütersloh, 1901.

† Cf. what R. W. Dale once said about Maurice (*Life of R. W. Dale*, London, 1898, p. 541): 'What he wanted was to be conscious that he *deserved* all the love and trust that came to him. I am more and more clear about this, that we must be content to know that the best things come to us both from man and God without our deserving them. We are under grace, not under law. Not until we have beaten down our pride and self-assertion so as to be able to take everything from earth and heaven just as a child takes everything, without raising the question, Do I deserve this or not? or rather with the habitual conviction that we deserve nothing and are content that it should be so, do we get into right relations either with our Father in heaven or with the brothers and sisters about us. That principle is capable of a most fatal misconception, but in its *truth* it is one of the secrets of righteousness and joy.'

God's character and motives in the work of reconciliation.

Yet even when he considers human faith in this connexion, it only serves to emphasize the truth that the new relation of righteousness cannot rest on any pact between a man and his God. Faith is not the contribution which the sinner makes. There were religious conceptions of righteousness which gave a place to faith alongside works, but St. Paul would not hear of such an admixture as we meet, *e.g.*, in the apocalypse of *4 Ezra.* 'A worker has his wage counted to him as a due, not as a favour; but a man who instead of working believes in him who justifies the ungodly has his faith counted as righteousness' (Ro 4^{4}). Everything turns upon faith, he adds (4^{16}), for the new righteousness is a gift or, historically regarded, a promise; these are the terms on which it is offered.

In the light of this, it is not difficult to understand why, after urging Christians to 'serve righteousness' (in $6^{13f.}$), he instinctively varies the phrase: 'now that you are set free from sin, now that you have passed into the service of God' (this is another way of stating what he means by justification or the possession of 'God's righteousness'), 'your gain is consecration (ἁγιασμός), and the end of that is life eternal. Sin's wage is death, but God's gift is life eternal in Christ Jesus our Lord.' The life which the practice of δικαιοσύνη produces is ultimately a Divine gift. Even in this sphere, where the human will is active, where a man is bidden co-operate with all his powers, the notion of merit is carefully excluded. A man gets something out of the service of sin, and he has himself to thank for it! He also gets something out of the service of righteousness (*i.e.* out of his devotion to the character which God approves), but he has God to thank for this. The fact that St. Paul uses δικαιοσύνη in this definite sense of character, so soon after he has just used it to denote a religious standing or relationship to God, is noticeable; it confirms our interpretation of the latter as implying a positive experience of life, and it illustrates at the same time the common basis of both in the grace of God, mediated through Jesus Christ. Not only justification but the service of δικαιοσύνη depends upon man's relation to Him, since the latter means a life lived for Him (2 Co 5^{21}) or in Him (Ro 6^{11}). In both senses of the term, δικαιοσύνη means life (Ro 5^{21} 6^{23}), and whether this life is viewed as a standing before God or a calling it is equally dependent upon Him. St. Paul could have conceived acquittal apart from moral renewal as little as he could have conceived moral renewal apart from acquittal (Sokolowski, *Die Begriffe von Geist und Leben bei Paulus*, p. 14); the one involved the other, and, as both implied the mediation of life through Jesus Christ, the intrusion of merit or self-righteousness was definitely eliminated. In Ph $3^{9f.}$ we have both aspects and senses of δικαιοσύνη held together; the gift is a task, and the very task is itself a gift, depending for its inspiration as well as for its reward upon the Lord. In Ro $6^{15f.}$, the conception of faith, which elsewhere reveals the nexus between the so-called forensic and ethical sides of righteousness, is conspicuous by its absence, but the second half of the chapter rests on the thought of the first half, viz. the identification of the Christian with Christ in His new life of power over the flesh and sin, and therefore the Apostle's language about the duty of devotion to δικαιοσύνη as the religious ideal could not be misunderstood, as if it implied that in this career of goodness a man was somehow less dependent upon God than in the initial crisis of justification. The juridical associations of 'righteousness' and 'justify' made it more easy for the Apostle to bring out the absolute indebtedness of man to God for forgiveness and fellowship at the outset of the Christian experience. They did not suggest so naturally the same exclusion of merit in the statement of the new career of δικαιοσύνη; in fact, their terminology did not lend itself so readily * to the expression of this positive and living content in justification at all, for we cannot assume that he ever used the verb 'justify' (apart from the quotation in 3^{4}) of God in any sense except that of pronouncing a verdict. But when believers were 'counted righteous,' because they believed in Christ who had died for their sins, this involved their possession by God; they were now His, for His own purposes, and His purpose was life. Through their organic union with Christ, this life is reproduced in their experience, and consummated. 'He glorifies those whom he has justified' (Ro 8^{30}). Probably it was to avoid any possible misapprehension that St. Paul never spoke of God 'making' men righteous; he reserved δικαιοῦν strictly for the verdict of acquittal, which altered once and for all the standing of the sinner before his God. Instead of using the same term for the process of making the justified man 'righteous' in the moral sense of the term, he employed other words (*e.g.* Ro 7^{4}) and metaphors. Nevertheless the acquittal was a creative act, and even 'righteousness' is used in connexion, *e.g.*, with life, which shows what was in the writer's mind. Allusions like those in 2 Co 5^{16} and Ro 8^{10} (whatever view is taken of this clause; cf. above, p. 372) indicate what he regarded as implicit in the initial verdict of 'justified,' and what prompted him for once to employ δικαιοσύνη as he does in Ro $6^{13f.}$.

Finally, a word upon the idea of rewards and punishments being meted out to Christians at the end. Bunyan pointed out that the village of Morality lay off the straight, safe road to the Celestial City; he also recalled how Mr. Honest in his lifetime had appointed 'one Good-conscience' to help him over the River of Death, and how 'the last words of Mr. Honest were, *Grace reigns.*' So with St. Paul. He warns the Christian off 'works of the law' (Mr. Legality is the leading inhabitant of the village of Morality!), and also warns him not to meet the end without a good conscience, without a moral record which will bear the most searching scrutiny. For such a scrutiny awaits even the justified, even those 'for whom there is now no condemnation'; they will be taken to account before the Divine tribunal for what they have made of their life. The emphasis set by St. Paul on the moral transformation of the believing man is shown by this striking fact that he retains the conception of judgment being passed on the works even of Christians at the end, although logically it seems incompatible with the truth that Christians were already free from doom and assured of salvation. Various explanations of this have been offered. The Apostle's stress upon recompense is excused as a remnant of his traditional Pharisaic theology, which he did not reconcile with his evangelical principle of justification by faith; the two are left side by side as parallel lines, religious and ethical; or, the doctrine of judgment on works is taken to refer to the degrees of glory in which Christians are to stand, all being saved as believers in Christ, but with varying records. The latter view † is ingenious, but it has to be read into St.

---

* St. Paul did not quote Ps $118^{19f.}$ as Clement of Rome did (xlviii. 2–4), to show that 'of the numerous gates which are opened, this in righteousness is the gate in Christ, whereby blessed are all they that enter and make straight their paths in holiness and righteousness.' In view of Gal 6^{8} it is literally, but no more than literally, correct to say (with Lightfoot on Ro 6^{21}) that St. Paul 'never uses καρπός of the results of evil-doing, but always substitutes ἔργα.' Still he does tend to confine this organic metaphor to the new life in the spirit; he avoids speaking of καρπὸς δικαιοσύνης (cf. Pr 11^{30}, LXX) except in Ph 1^{11}.

† It is argued by E. Kühl in *Rechtfertigung auf Grund Glaubens und Gericht nach den Werken bei Paulus*, Königsberg, 1904.

Paul's language in order to explain all the facts. Others point out that the equivalence of reward and service is not mechanical or juridical, and that the deeds which come up for scrutiny at the end are the 'fruit of the Spirit.' In any case, St. Paul never regarded justifying faith as either morally indifferent or guaranteeing mechanically a good life. He retains judgment on the works of the Christian[*] as a justified man, on account of his strong sense of ethical responsibility. There may be a formal contradiction, but the significant thing is that both in 2 Co $5^{9f.}$ ('I am eager to satisfy him, whether in the body or away from it; for we have all to appear before the tribunal of Christ, each to be requited for what he has done with his body, well or ill') and in Ph $3^{9f.}$, where the possession of the Divine righteousness at the end does not exclude personal effort in the present,[†] the Apostle's religious experience is larger than the logical inferences of the strict righteousness-doctrine. To be justified by faith was God's gift. But it was more than a gift; it was a vocation, a career—*Aufgabe* as well as *Gabe*. Because it was the gift of a new relationship, the recipient had to work from it or with it scrupulously: 'Work strenuously at your salvation, for it is God who in his goodwill enables you to will this and to achieve it' (Ph 2^{12}). My aim, he adds, is 'to see if I too can attain the resurrection from the dead' (Ph 3^{11}), that being part and parcel of the Divine righteousness which depended on faith. Baur takes this last clause and writes opposite it, 'If there be anything that our apostle could not possibly have written it is that dubious *εἴπως καταντήσω εἰς τὴν ἐξανάστασιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν*, where his whole fellowship with Christ is put in question.' St. Paul could not have written it, unless he had been more than a Paulinist—a Paulinist of Baur's type. But he was a great Christian. He could conceive it possible that even he might be a reprobate, and he wished his churches to feel the same wholesome fear of themselves. He knew there was such a thing as receiving the grace of God in vain. Nothing would have been more out of keeping with his doctrine of assurance than a Christianized Pharisaism which counted lightly on final acceptance.[‡] It is not a proof of the unauthenticity of Philippians that he introduces this remarkable allusion to the subjective aspect of righteousness. On paper the collocation of this with the assurance of acquittal on the score of faith may seem heterogeneous, just as the cognate association of justification by faith with judgment to be passed on the conduct of Christians may appear an antinomy. But, while we learn to know St. Paul first on paper, the clue to the real St. Paul lies in the spiritual and ethical attitude towards the realities of God and human life, which can and must hold together in the Christian consciousness things which logically amount to a paradox.

The judgment on works, *i.e.* on the behaviour of Christians as justified men as well as on outsiders, implies the recompense of good conduct and service as well as the retribution upon evil. The good life is crowned, at the end (2 Ti 4^9). This was sometimes expressed by St. Paul as receiving God's 'praise,' *e.g.* in 1 Co 4^5 (almost in the sense of approval), where each faithful servant gets his proportionate meed of praise from God, when the final scrutiny upon the records of service takes place (cf. Ro 2^{29}). This shows that the equivalence of reward and service is not a mechanical equivalence or even a purely juridical verdict, but, as in the teaching of Jesus, a gracious act of God. This is confirmed by the fact that the deeds for which men are rewarded are done under the inspiring Spirit; they are the outcome of a process (Gal 5^{22} 6^8), and the very process is more than a human achievement. The Pauline doctrine thus differs from the Jewish conception of the judgment,[*] which tended to fix a man's fate by the tally of meritorious actions which he could produce at the end, one of these being faith or fidelity. To St. Paul, faith is the principle which inspires the whole process of conduct.[†]

The religious interest in this reward of service and conduct is expressed in the original form of the prayer in the *Te Deum*: 'We believe that thou shalt come to be our judge. We therefore pray thee, help thy servants, whom thou hast redeemed with thy precious blood; make them to be rewarded (not 'numbered'—the true reading is 'munerari,' not 'numerari') with thy saints in glory everlasting.' The tone of this petition recalls the spirit of St. Paul's emphasis on judgment or praise for the Christian at the end. He employs terms which literally are incompatible with his original view of justification, but he employs them in such a way as to urge ethical responsibility without compromising the grace of God or affording any ground for the unhealthy *καύχησις* which it was his relentless aim to eradicate from righteousness at any stage and in any form of the religious experience.

LITERATURE.—The linguistic data are stated fully in H. Cremer's *Bibl.-Theol. Lexicon of NT Greek*, Eng. tr., Edinburgh, 1878, pp. 183–200, and J. Morison's monograph, *A Critical Exposition of the Third Chapter of Romans*, London, 1866, p. 165, etc., by J. Massie in *Exp*, 1st ser., viii. [1880] 257–269, and in P. Feine's *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*², Leipzig, 1911, p. 338 f. The most notable of the special articles and monographs in recent years are: G. A. Fricke's *Der paulinische Grundbegriff der δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ*, do., 1888; an essay by H. Beck in *Neue Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, iv. [1895] 249–261; and a pamphlet by T. Häring on '*Δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ* bei Paulus,' Tübingen, 1896; G. Schnedermann's monograph on *Der israelitische Hintergrund in der Lehre des Apostels Paulus von der Gottesgerechtigkeit aus Glauben*, Leipzig, 1895; J. Barmby, in *Exp*, 5th ser., iv. [1896] 124–139; H. Cremer's *Die paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre im Zusammenhang ihrer geschichtlichen Voraussetzungen*², Gütersloh, 1900; J. Denney, in *Exp*, 6th ser., iii. [1901] 433 f., iv. [1901] 81 ff., 299 ff.; W. Lütgert's monograph on *Die Lehre von der Rechtfertigung durch den Glauben*, Berlin, 1903; K. Müller, *Beobachtungen zur paulinischen Rechtfertigungslehre*, Leipzig, 1905; J. H. Gerretsen, *Rechtvaardigmaking bij Paulus in verband met de prediging van Christus in de Synoptici*, Nijmvegen, 1905; E. Tobac, *Le Problème de la justification dans saint Paul*, Paris, 1908; and B. F. Westcott's *St. Paul and Justification*, London, 1913, in addition to those mentioned in the course of this article.

The subject is discussed by all the editors of Romans, and in treatises on NT Theology and on Paulinism, among which the following are particularly valuable: F. C. Baur's *Paulus*, Eng. tr., 2 vols., London, 1873–75, vol. ii. pp. 134–168; E. Reuss, *Hist. de la théologie chrétienne au siècle apostolique*³, Strassburg, 1864, Eng. tr., London, 1872–74, vol. ii. pp. 20 f., 171 f.; C. Holsten, *Das Evangelium des Paulus*, i. [Berlin, 1880] 67 f., ii. [do., 1898] 64 f.; E. Ménégoz, *Le Péché et la rédemption d'après saint Paul*, Paris, 1882, p. 160 f.; B. Weiss, *Biblical Theology of the NT*, Eng. tr., London, 1888, vol. i. p. 315 ff.; A. Sabatier, *The Apostle Paul*, Eng. tr., do., 1891, p. 297 ff.; G. B. Stevens, *The Pauline Theology*, do., 1892, pp. 40 f., 249 f.; A. B. Bruce, *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, Edinburgh, 1894, pp. 114 f., 147 f.; J. Bovon, *Théologie du nouveau Testament*², Lausanne and Paris, 1902–05, ii. 134–202; A. Seeberg, *Der Tod Christi*, Leipzig, 1895, p. 188 f.; W. Beyschlag, *Neutestamentliche Theologie*, Halle, 1891–92, Eng. tr., 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1895, vol. ii. pp. 94 f., 179 f.; A. Titius, *Der Paulinismus unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Seligkeit*, Tübingen, 1900, pp. 153–218; H. St. John Thackeray, *The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*, London, 1900, pp. 80–97; J. Denney, *The Death of Christ*, do., 1902, p. 163 f.; Emil Sokolowski, *Die Begriffe von Geist und Leben bei Paulus*, Göttingen, 1903, pp. 5 f., 67 f., 168 f.; M. Goguël, *L'Apôtre Paul et Jésus-Christ*, Paris, 1904, p. 294 f.; Shailer Mathews, *The Messianic Hope in the NT*, Chicago, 1905, p. 193 ff.; W. P. DuBose, *The Gospel according to St. Paul*, New York, 1907, p. 69 f.; Otto Pfleiderer, *Das Urchristenthum*², Berlin, 1902, Eng. tr., *Primitive Christianity*, 4 vols., London, 1906–11, vol. i. p. 344 f.; E. D. Burton, in *Biblical Ideas of Atonement*, Chicago, 1909, p.157 f.; H. J. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der neutest. Theologie*², 2 vols., Tübingen, 1911, ii. 131 f.; A. Garvie, *Studies of Paul and his Gospel*, London and New York, 1911, p. 153 f.; E. von Dobschütz, 'Die

---

[*] It is impossible (in face of Ro $2^{6f.}$ and 2 Co 5^{10}) to hold that he kept it for outsiders.

[†] Titius (*Der Paulinismus*, pp. 203–205) traces in Ph $3^{9f.}$ a weakening of the definitive character of justification, although he interprets Gal 2^{17} of the constant task which falls to the Christian—the task of maintaining his position as a justified man. Gal 2^{17} is a difficult link in a difficult chain of argument, but it probably means that even Jews who sought righteousness on Christ's terms had to confess they were sinners; they could not bring forward any racial privilege which would exempt them from the verdict that 'all have sinned' (Ro 3^{23}).

[‡] Cf. Pascal's saying: 'au lieu de dire, "s'il n'y avait point en Dieu de miséricorde, il faudrait faire toutes sortes d'efforts pour la vertu," il faut dire, au contraire, que c'est parce qu'il y a en Dieu de la miséricorde, qu'il faut faire toutes sortes d'efforts' (*Pensées*, ed. E. Havet, Paris, 1866, vol. ii. p. 103).

[*] But it is only fair to recall sayings like that of Rabbi Aḳiba (*Pirḳe Aboth*, iii. 19): 'The world is judged by goodness, and [yet] all is according to the [amount of] work.'

[†] From one point of view, he could say (2 Th $1^{5f.}$) that God considered it only right (*δίκαιον παρὰ θεῷ*) to reward Christian suffering with rest and relief hereafter; from another, he could suggest that the closing as well as the opening act of the Christian experience was one of God's grace (see above, p. 376). There is no real discrepancy between the two aspects.

Rechtfertigung bei Paulus, eine Rechtfertigung Paulus,' *SK* [1912] 38 f.; G. P. Wetter, *Der Vergeltungsgedanke bei Paulus*, Göttingen, 1912, p. 161 f.; A. de Boysson, *La Loi et la foi*, Paris, 1912, p. 225 f.; H. Weinel, *Biblische Theologie des NT*², Tübingen, 1913, p. 272 f.; J. G. Simpson, art. 'Justification,' *ERE* vii. 615–619; J. Weiss, *Das Urchristentum*, Göttingen, 1914, p. 384 f.

JAMES MOFFATT.

RING.—Rings on the fingers were among the ornaments worn by Jews, both by men (Gn $38^{18.\ 25}$ 41^{42}, Lk 15^{22}) and by women (Is 3^{21}). A warning against the wearing of rings by Christians is given in *Apost. Const.* i. 3. That it was needed we can see from the fact that in Ja 2^2 the Christian congregations are warned against paying undue respect to the man who comes into their assembly 'with a gold ring' (lit. 'golden-ringed'; his hands might be adorned with a number of rings). Clement of Alexandria, while forbidding to Christians such ornaments as are mere luxuries, makes an exception of the ring because of its use for the purpose of sealing.

RIVER (*ποταμός*, Ac 16^{13}, 2 Co 11^{26}, Rev 8^{10} 9^{14} 12^{15} $16^{4.\ 12}$ $22^{1.\ 2}$; the references to rivers in the Gospels are even fewer [cf. Mt 7^{25}, Mk 1^5, Lk 6^{48}, Jn 7^{38}]).—The Jordan is the only river in Palestine proper, worthy of the name. It is rightly called the Jordan, which probably means 'the Descender,' as it falls some 2,000 ft. in a distance of 100 miles. Among the other streams and mountain torrents in Palestine there are the Kishon, which drains Galilee westward; the Yarmuk and the Jabbok, which carry the waters of Bashan and Gilead into the Jordan; the Leontes and Orontes, which rise in Cœle-Syria and drain the great basin between Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon; and the Euphrates, greatest of all, forming the boundary of Palestine on the N.E.

The rivers mentioned in apostolic history carry us beyond Palestine. Certain references to rivers, indeed, are but figures of speech. That alluded to in Ac 16^{13} is best identified with the Gangitis, a tributary of the Strymon near Philippi. On its banks St. Paul and his companions found a place of prayer, with a small building possibly in connexion with it. According to Josephus (*Ant.* XIV. x. 23), the decree of Halicarnassus allowed the Jews 'to make their places of prayer by the seashore, according to the custom of their fathers.' Tertullian (*ad Nat.* i. 13) also, about A.D. 200, mentions 'prayers on the shore' as characteristic of the Jews (cf. Ac 21^5). The Jews in Philippi at that time were probably too few in number to possess a synagogue. This 'place of prayer,' being situated by a river, was convenient for ceremonial washings. In another passage (2 Co 11^{26}), St. Paul, in illustration of his unflinching Christian endurance, recounts the perils he had suffered in his missionary journeys from swollen and turbulent 'rivers,' which had been treacherous to ford or swim. Doubtless he had had many hazardous experiences of this character. When the rivers of Asia Minor and Palestine are in flood, to ford them is little less than a tragedy. The rains and melting snows keep most of them bridgeless.

Two references in the Book of Revelation are of similar import and may be considered together. In the first (8^{10}), when the third angel sounds, there falls from heaven a great star, burning as a torch, upon the third part of the 'rivers' and upon the fountains of waters. The star is called 'wormwood,' a bitter drug, typical of Divine punishment, and regarded as a mortal poison. In the second passage (16^4), the third angel pours out his bowl into the 'rivers' and fountains of waters, and they become blood. In consequence, there is no more drinking water. All nature is in convulsion, the special object of the Apostle being to announce the doom of Rome and of the worshippers of the Emperor.

There are three other passages in the Apocalypse which may very appropriately be discussed by themselves. In the first (Rev 9^{14}), the sixth angel with the trumpet is bidden to loose the four angels that are bound at 'the great river Euphrates,' that they may lead forth a mighty army to the sad disaster of Rome. The Euphrates, which in the olden time had been the ideal eastern boundary of Israel's territory, is here conceived of as the frontier between Rome and her enemies the Parthians. In a parallel passage (16^{12}) the sixth angel pours out his bowl on the Euphrates, and its waters are dried up that the way may be ready for the kings (of Parthia) to cross over (cf. $17^{12.\ 16}$). Both predictions have to do with the Roman Empire and its fate. In the remaining passage (12^{15}) the dragon casts water out of his mouth 'as a river' that the Imperial mistress (Rome) may be carried away as by a deluge. In all these passages the Seer is attempting to picture the marvellous deliverance of God's people from their Roman enemies. For the Roman armies under Nero threatened to sweep away Christianity in the wreck of the Jewish nation.

The most beautiful reference to 'rivers' in the whole Bible is yet to be discussed. It is found in Rev $22^{1.\ 2}$, 'And he shewed me a river of water of life, bright as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb, in the midst of the street thereof. And on this side of the river and on that was the tree of life, bearing twelve manner of fruits, yielding its fruit every month; and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations.' To the Seer of Patmos, the New Jerusalem would not be complete without the river of water of life. The original Paradise (Gn 2^{10}) possessed a river, and Paradise Regained must possess one too. Rivers, in the East especially, have the power to turn a wilderness into a garden of beauty and fertility; hence the river is here an apt symbol of life. Its waters are 'living waters' (Jer 2^{13}) and healing (Ezk 47^{1-12}), making 'glad the city of God' (Ps 46^4). In Ezekiel the life-giving stream issued from the Temple; now, inasmuch as the city is all temple, the river's ultimate source is from the presence of the king. The river and the street run side by side through the city, as the Barada and the street upon its left bank do to-day in the city of Damascus. Trees of life are placed in rows on either side of the intervening space. Both river and trees are within reach of every one. The river is no longer a mere boundary (Nu 34^6) or a highway for navigation (Is 18^2), nor are its banks even a place of prayer (Ac 16^{13}); it is rather a source of spiritual irrigation to immortals. Thus John uses the realistic though archaic language of Jewish piety to delineate the bliss of the Redeemed in a future state. In his picture the river becomes the symbol of the spiritual happiness of the followers of the Lamb; thus heaven is to possess all that Judaism had ever claimed or craved.

GEORGE L. ROBINSON.

ROADS AND TRAVEL.—The beginnings of travel as of so many other human institutions are hidden in obscurity. No doubt the search for food or better accommodation was a primary motive in early times. Soon would supervene that love of gain which was eventually to send the merchant princes of Rome on long sea-journeys to the bounds of the Empire and beyond.

So Horace, *Carm.* I. xxxi. 11 ff.:

'Mercator . . .
Dis carus ipsis; quippe ter et quater
Anno reuisens æquor Atlanticum
Impune.'

A later motive still would be curiosity, the desire to obtain knowledge. We learn, for instance, that Germanicus, the adopted son of the Emperor Tiberius, turned aside from his official journey to visit Egypt *cognoscendæ antiquitatis* (Tac. *Ann.* ii. 59, etc.). Indeed, Egypt was as much a show place in ancient times as it is now. Pliny the Younger tells us that in his day (about A.D. 100) people would take the longest journeys to see wonderful sights, while blind to the equally wonderful at their own doors. Journeys were also undertaken in those days for purposes of health. The inhabitants of low-lying coast towns resorted to the villages on the uplands in the hot season. There are multitudes of references in the Latin authors to the holiday-resorts near Rome, such as Præneste, Tibur, Tusculum, to which in the height of summer the jaded Roman resorted. Many journeys were made in pursuit of military or other official duty. There were, however, nearer analogies to the tours of apostles than those mentioned: for long, teachers of philosophy and rhetoric had been wanderers from place to place, and the ancients were also familiar with the wandering priests of various religious cults. Between these two classes stand the apostles like Paul.

1. Conveyances.—In ancient times we hear very little of walking, except for short distances. Dispatch runners, however, are sometimes mentioned as covering distances in an incredibly short space of time. Nor do we hear much of riding, except in the cavalry divisions of the army and in the formal reviews of the equestrian order, etc. Driving was the favourite method of locomotion on land. It was not permitted within the city of Rome itself. The streets were narrow, and any one who wished to be carried in the city had to be conveyed in a sedan-chair (*lectica*). On reaching a gate of the city the traveller entered the carriage which would be found waiting. It is a curious fact about Roman conveyances that nearly all the Latin words for them are borrowed from the Celtic language of the Gauls. It would seem, therefore, that most types of conveyance were obtained by the Romans from the Gauls. The favourite was the two-horsed carriage. Such it was, doubtless, that St. Paul took when wearied by his final long journey towards Jerusalem (ἐπισκευασάμενοι, Ac 21^{15}, means, 'having equipped [saddled] horses'; cf. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 302). From the mention of this detail here and here only, it may be inferred that his usual method was the healthiest, safest, and surest, namely, walking.

2. Roads.—(1) *Construction.*—The Roman system of roads has never been surpassed. Some account, therefore, of the method of their construction is of interest. Perhaps the most detailed description that has survived is that of Statius, in his *Siluæ* (iv. 3), describing the Via Domitiana, a road which the Emperor Domitian caused to be made between Sinuessa and Puteoli on the west coast of Italy. The problem there was of some difficulty, as the engineers had to deal with rivers, marshes, hills, and forests. The poet describes how on the old track the traveller was jolted, how the wheels stuck in the ground while the pole was high in air, how the populace had all the terrors of a sea-voyage on land, added to the discomfort of the painfully slow progress. The journey that once took a whole day now takes 'scarcely two hours'! First the track was marked out, then balks were cut through, and the earth was removed to a considerable depth all the way along. The bed thus obtained was then filled up with fresh material. This consisted of layers of sand and stones of various sizes. The stones were kept in position partly by means of dowels connecting one with another, partly by the use of wedge-shaped stones driven into interstices at the sides of the road. The building of the road involved extensive labour of various kinds. Hills had to be stripped of their trees, stones and beams had to be planed, pools had to be drained, the courses of streams to be diverted, bridges to be constructed, etc. Our own country provides many examples of Roman roads, some in excellent preservation. Sometimes one may have the chance of seeing a Roman road in section, for instance that between Alcester and Dorchester (Oxon.) in a quarry on Shotover Hill. The upper surface of the best roads consisted commonly of square blocks of basalt (*saxum silex*) placed angularly, with the corners pointing towards the sides and the direction of the road. Such blocks may be seen in position on the Appian Way near Terracina, at Tusculum as one ascends the hill, and also at Ostia, where the recent excavations have produced marvellous results.

(2) *Upkeep.*—The upkeep of the roads was naturally a matter of the greatest importance. The thoroughness of the initial construction was such that the ordinary upkeep was not so serious a matter as it would otherwise have been. Landslides and other accidents must have been comparatively rare, but everyone knows that even a good road, like a good house, requires careful watching, if it is to be kept in perfect condition. During the Empire such duties were entrusted to definite officials. Augustus in 27 B.C. took in hand the repair of the roads of Italy. In 20 B.C. he appointed *curatores uiarum*, who appear to have had a general oversight of the roads of Italy. In Claudius' time we hear of *curatores* of particular roads, men who had already held the prætorship. *Curatores* of equestrian rank are seldom found, and had charge only of the second-class roads. The prætorian *curatores* had under them *subcuratores.* The Italian roads seem for the most part to have been supported out of the public treasury, though the local authorities and the Imperial treasury had a share in the cost of the upkeep. We hear of *tabularii*, Imperial officials concerned with disbursements for this purpose (cf. Hirschfeld in the Literature). The streets of Rome itself were under the charge of another department.

(3) *Purpose.*—The original purpose with which the Roman roads were made was military, not commercial. It was not so much the army that followed in the wake of trade, as trade that followed the army. As soon as a particular district had been garrisoned by the Romans, it was a necessary part of the scheme of defence and subjection that the garrison should be connected with Rome by a road or series of roads, along which, in the event of a rising (*tumultus*) of the enemy, an army could be brought as rapidly as possible. But though military in their origin, such was the effectiveness of the *pax Romana* that for the most part these roads were used for political and commercial purposes, or for those of general travel.

Perhaps the most important use to which the roads were put in Imperial times was the service of the Imperial post. This was established by Augustus, perhaps on some Eastern model, for the effective dispatch of business. By the arrangement entered into between Augustus and the Senate, half the provinces were under the control of the Emperor, and he had his financial agents (*procuratores*) in the other half. Centralization of government was a feature of the Roman Empire from the first, and in the exaggerated form which it attained in the 4th cent. A.D. was one of the causes, probably the chief cause, of its disintegration. The Roman Emperors were as a class hard-working men who took administration seriously. Pliny the Younger tells that his uncle, the Elder

Pliny, used to help the Emperor Vespasian with his correspondence before dawn (*Ep.* iii. 5), it being the Roman practice to gain time by getting up early rather than by sitting up late. It is obvious, therefore, that the land and sea routes were both in constant use by Imperial dispatch-carriers. For this purpose the roads were all provided with *mansiones* or stopping-places, where the Imperial dispatch-carriers could obtain relays of horses and thus reach their destination as early as possible. The Imperial post was strictly reserved for Imperial purposes. Even governors of provinces were unable to use the service for their own ends unless they had received a *diploma* or passport from the Emperor himself entitling them to do so (Pliny, *Ep. ad Traianum*, 45, with Hardy's note [London, 1889]).

(4) *Milestones.*—The roads were provided with a system of milestones. The Roman mile was one thousand *passus*, and by a *passus* was meant a double-step, after which the feet were in the same relative position as at the first. As this measure was estimated at about 4·85 English ft., a Roman mile was 430 English ft. shorter than an English mile. All milestones in Italy were measured from the *miliarium aureum*, set up in the Forum at Rome by Augustus. Placed at every thousand *passus*, they measured about 6 ft. high on an average, and were cylindrical in shape, often with a square base belonging to the same block (as sometimes also in modern England). The stone was inscribed with the name, titles, and year (of office) of the reigning Emperor. Thousands of these stones have been discovered, and every year adds to the number. In the provinces systems of milestones counted from various important centres have been found.

(5) *Inns.* — Inns provided accommodation for travellers. From all accounts these seem to have been not only very humble in character, but also brothels at the same time. This is no doubt partly the reason why Cicero and other travellers in Republican times spent the nights of a journey either in their own country-houses or in those of their friends, as far as possible. Certainly it explains the apostolic insistence on hospitality (Ro 12^{13}, He 13^{2}, 1 Ti 3^{2}, Tit 1^{8}, 1 P 4^{9}). By 'hospitality' (φιλοξενία, lit. 'love of strangers [foreigners]') in such passages is intended the entertainment, not of fellow-citizens, but of strangers from a distance. The inns were no fit places for persons whose lives were dedicated to chastity and all holy living. From the scanty references to them in literature one can see that they were avoided by all respectable persons, as were the cook-shops of the cities ('dignitoso homini popinam ingredi notabile est,' pseudo-Augustine, *Quæstiones Veteris et Noui Testamenti CXXVII.* no. 102, § 5, ed. Souter, Vienna and Leipzig, 1908).

(6) *Perils of the road.*—From what has been said it will be gathered that the roads were on the whole safe, and this was indeed the case. The *pax Romana* told against brigandage as it told against revolt. But there were certain districts where brigandage was a real menace; one was the Isaurian mountains in the neighbourhood of Pisidian Antioch and Lystra. Nothing is said in the Book of Acts about this, but the general reference in 2 Co 11^{26} serves to fill out the Acts narrative (cf. Pelag. on 2 Co $11^{23\text{-}25}$: 'hæc in Actibus non omnia repperiuntur, quia nec in Epistulis omnia quæ ibi scripta sunt continentur'). Ramsay has suggested (*Church in the Roman Empire*^{3}, London, 1894, p. 24) that 'perils of robbers' refers to the journey from Perga in Pamphylia across Mt. Taurus to Pisidian Antioch and back again. That brigands played a considerable part in the life of the time is shown not only by the story of the Good Samaritan, but also by the frequent references to brigands as well as pirates in the Greek romances of the Early Empire.

(7) *Chief road-systems.*—We may now proceed to enumerate the chief road-systems of the Roman Empire, or rather those of which the apostles seem to have had some experience. The reader who desires a full, or approximately full, list will have to consult the works enumerated in the Literature. For our purpose, Britain, Germany, Spain, North Africa, Moesia, and Thrace may be left out of account. The remaining countries we shall take in order.

(*a*) In Italy the *Via Appia*, '*longarum regina uiarum*' (Stat. *Siluæ*, ii. 2, 12), deserves mention as the oldest of the great Roman roads, built by the censor Appius Claudius Cæcus in 312 B.C. It left Rome by the Porta Capena in the south, and passed by Aricia, Tres Tabernæ (Ac 28^{15}), and Forum Appi (28^{15}) to Tarracina (Anxur) (modern Terracina), the white cliffs of which are often referred to by ancient authors. Up to this point the road is perfectly straight, having been built over the marshland of the Campagna. Much of this land is now drained, but with as yet poor results to agriculture. The building of the road over this country was a great engineering feat for those days. After Tarracina its course is inland by Fundi to Formiæ, the fabled home of the Læstrygonian cannibals in the *Odyssey*, then to Minturnæ (Menturnæ), where the great Gaius Marius hid among the reeds in his days of adversity, then by Suessa Aurunca to Sinuessa, where it again reaches the sea. Turning inland again, it makes its way to Casilinum and then to Capua. It was here that St. Paul reached it by a road which ran between Capua and Puteoli (Ac 28^{13}). A generation after his time Domitian built the road called after him *Via Domitiana*, direct from Puteoli to Sinuessa, which saved the detour necessary before that time. After Capua the Via Appia takes its final inland course, which eventually ends in Brundisium (Brindisi) on the other side of the peninsula. The intervening chief stations are Calatia, Caudium, Beneventum, Æclanum, Venusia, near which Horace was born, and Tarentum, where the sea is at last reached. The terminus Brundisium is attained by a straight road across the 'heel of the boot.' The classic description of a journey on this road by the poet Horace and his friends (*Sat.* i. 5) will be referred to below. The importance of this Via Appia cannot be over-rated. By it almost every person who travelled between Rome and the East by sea had to go for part of his journey, whether he took ship at Puteoli on the west coast, or at Brundisium on the east. Such a traveller could avoid it only by travelling northwards and taking the overland route (the *Via Egnatia*) to Macedonia and Thrace, or else by following the *Via Ostiensis*, and taking ship at Ostia at the mouth of the Tiber.

Other Italian routes had their importance also. Perhaps the greatest of them was the North Road, called the *Via Flaminia*, which enters modern Rome by the Porta del Popolo, below the Pincian gardens in the N., and corresponds in its Roman part to the modern *Corso Umberto Primo*, the Bond Street of Rome. The Via Flaminia went by Falerii, Ocriculum (modern Otricoli, where the famous bust of Jupiter was found), Narnia, Interamna (where the Emperor Tacitus was born), Nuceria, to Fanum Fortunæ, where it reaches the Adriatic, then along the coast through Pisaurum to Ariminum (modern Rimini), its terminus. From Ariminum the *Via Æmilia* started, and went by Bononia (modern Bologna), Mutina (modern Modena), Parma, Placentia (modern Piacenza), to Mediolanium (modern Milano). A fourth road in Italy was a branch of Via Appia from Capua by Forum Populi and Thurii to Ad Columnam, whence the crossing to Messana (modern Messina) in Sicily was easy. A fifth, the *Via Aurelia*, ran along the west coast to Centum Cellæ (modern Civitá Vecchia), Pisa, Luna (famous for Carrara marble) to Genova.

(*b*) Routes in Gaul may be briefly referred to. After reaching Milan the traveller had a choice of various Alpine roads, built by Augustus and his successors. For Gaul he would probably take that by Susa and the Mont Génèvre. By this route the journey to Arelate (modern Arles) was only 395 Roman miles. Another road led by Augusta Prætoria (Aosta) and the Little St. Bernard to Vienna (modern Vienne, much less important than its ancient counterpart), and Lugudunum (modern Lyons) and through Genava (modern Geneva) and Vesontio (modern Besançon) to Argentoratum (Strasbourg, Strassburg). There were also important roads linking up the chief cities in Western Gaul. Gesoriăcum (Boulogne-sur-Mer) was the point from which crossings were made to Rutupiæ (Richborough) on the British coast.

(*c*) For Pannonia and Dalmatia (2 Ti 4^{10}) on the east side of the Adriatic the traveller went from Bononia (Bologna) to Patauium (Padova) and thence to Aquileia, if he desired a land route. The journey presupposed in 2 Ti 4^{10} would be undertaken across the Adriatic from Brundisium to Dyrrhachium (Durazzo), as also the journey to Nicopolis (Tit 3^{12}).

(*d*) The student of the Apostolic Age is more nearly concerned with the routes in the eastern provinces. In the province of Syria and neighbouring districts there were several well-marked routes. Taking Jerusalem as a centre, we may indicate several roads. There was the road 'going down from Jerusalem to Gaza' (Ac 8^{26}) in a south-westerly direction. It passed over ground which in apostolic times was very sparsely populated (Ac 8^{26}). It was doubtless by a branch road going off to the right that Philip found his way to Azotus (Ashdod) (Ac 8^{40}). The eunuch of the Candace would continue his way to Gaza, and then by the coast-road into Egypt, thence southwards to Abyssinia. Philip proceeded from Azotus through Joppa and Antipatris to Cæsarea (Ac 8^{40}) on the coast. The part between Cæsarea and Antipatris was the same as that gone over by St. Paul on several occasions (Ac 9^{30} 18^{22} 21^{8} 23^{33}; cf. $15^{3.\,30}$), passing through Lydda, where St. Peter had been in the early days also (Ac 9). The shortest route from Jerusalem to Damascus was to cross the Jordan and go *via* Gerasa. From Damascus there was a road passing through Cæsarea Paneas to Tyre, and another to Sidon.

(*e*) The land-journeys of St. Paul in the peninsula of Asia Minor have been finally fixed by the researches of W. M. Ramsay. We are not informed as to the way in which Barnabas and Saul journeyed from Antioch to Jerusalem (Ac 11^{30}), but there is little doubt that Saul was fetched from Tarsus to Antioch (Ac 11^{25}) by the coast-road passing within the bend between Asia Minor and the province of Syria. It was probably along the southern coast of the island of Cyprus that Barnabas and Saul journeyed between Salamis and Paphos. Reaching land at Attaleia in the province of Pamphylia they sailed up the river Cestrus as far as Perga. From there they took the road northwards by Adada to 'Pisidian' Antioch (described best in Ramsay, *Church in Roman Empire*^{3}, p. 16 ff.; cf. also *The Cities of St. Paul*, London, 1907, p. 247 ff., *Athenæum* for 12th Aug. 1911, p. 192 f., 'Iconium and Antioch' in *Exp.*, 8th ser., ii. [1911] 149 ff.). Then for part of the route they retraced their steps and journeyed eastwards to Iconium, then S.S.W. to Lystra, then S.E. to Derbe. The 'Imperial Road,' however, mentioned in the *Acta Pauli* in connexion with the Thecla legend, passed direct from Pisidian Antioch to Lystra, and did not touch Iconium (Ramsay's discovery, told in *Studies in the History and Art of the Eastern Provinces of the Roman Empire* [*Aberdeen Univ. Studies*, no. 20 (1906)], pp. 241–243). This road 'passed about seven or eight miles south-west of Iconium' (Ramsay). The return route taken by St. Paul and Barnabas from Derbe to Attaleia (Ac 14^{21-25}) was the same as the outgoing.

The second journey (15^{41}) was, as far as Tarsus, by the same route as St. Paul had taken when he was first brought to Antioch (Ac 11^{25}). We may conjecture that one of the 'churches' referred to in Ac 15^{51}, and nowhere else, was at Issos; for Issos was on this route. On leaving Tarsus St. Paul and Silas no doubt struck straight to the north by the historic road, which becomes the pass through the Taurus mountains known as the Cilician Gates (this route has been graphically described with illustrations by Lady Ramsay in *Travel*, vol. ii. no. 23 [1898] 494–498). On reaching the northern side of this great mountain range the travellers went by Podandos, Loulon, Halala (the later Colonia Faustiniana, Faustinopolis), Kybistra, and Laranda to Derbe. From Derbe they travelled by their old route to Lystra, Iconium, and 'Pisidian' Antioch. Between Iconium and Antioch they would pass through Vasada and Misthia. After Antioch they followed a direction new to them. It is probable that the direction taken was west to Lysias, then northward through Nakoleia to Dorylaion on the Tembrogios. There they were *κατὰ Μυσίαν* (opposite Mysia), and from there a road went N.N.W. to Nicæa in Bithynia, which was the province that they desired to visit. Dorylaion was a parting of the ways. 'The spirit of Jesus suffered them not' to go to Bithynia. They therefore took the other turning, went westwards along the left bank of the river Rhyndakos, through Artemeia, across the river Granikos, and then S.W. to Troas (Ac 16^{8}).

On arriving at Neapolis, the port of Philippi in Macedonia, they made their way by the Via Egnatia to Philippi itself (Ac 16^{12}). From there they travelled along the Via Egnatia to Amphipolis, Apollonia, and Thessalonica. This important road went from Apollonia and Dyrrhachium on the Adriatic Sea to the river Hebrus beside Kypsela. If the name be derived from the town of Gnathia or Egnatia in Apulia (Italy), as is generally believed, then it is clear that from early times it must have been regarded as the overland route from South Italy to the East. Even before the days of Roman pre-eminence it was evidently an important trade-route between the Adriatic and the Ægean and Black seas. In Cicero's time it was regarded primarily as a military road (for its direction see below). From Thessalonica St. Paul and Silas were spirited away to Berœa. From there St. Paul was hurried to the sea-coast, probably to the nearest harbour, as matters were urgent (17^{14}). From Athens (17^{15}–18^{1}) he went, by sea no doubt, to Corinth, and from there by the short land journey to the southern port of Corinth, Cenchreæ (18^{18}). Luke sketches the sea-journeys that followed, Cenchreæ to Ephesus, Ephesus to Cæsarea, with great rapidity (18^{19-22}). In 18^{23} the same journey is implied as is described in 15^{41} 16^{1-6}. 19^{1} takes St. Paul through a district where he had never journeyed before. 18^{23} has brought him as far as Pisidian Antioch, and then he is said to have crossed *τὰ ἀνωτερικὰ μέρη* and thus reached Ephesus (19^{1}). W. M. Ramsay has clearly explained what is meant by this phrase 'the higher-lying parts.' There was a well-recognized, important, and ancient route to Ephesus by Apollonia, Apamea-Celænæ, the Lycus valley, Colossæ, Laodicea, the Mæander valley, Antioch, and Tralles. St. Paul purposely avoided this route, probably because of fatigue, and thus never visited either Colossæ or Laodicea (cf. Col., *passim*). He chose the higher-lying, quieter, and healthier route over the hills, where the traffic was light. The unimportant places he passed through—Lysias, Metropolis, Seiblia, Dionysopolis, Teira, etc.—are never mentioned in sacred story. What route was taken by him from Ephesus to Macedonia (20^{1-2}) must remain uncertain, but it is probable that he coasted northwards to Troas and then repeated the journey of $16^{11ff.}$. Whether he took the sea-journey to Athens on this occasion also from the unknown port near Berœa is uncertain; but to Athens and Corinth he went. He then returned through Macedonia, no doubt by his former route, and once more back to Troas (Ac 20^{3-6}). A coasting voyage followed to Tyre (21^{3}) and Ptolemais (v.^{7}) and Cæsarea (v.^{8}). From Cæsarea he went by the old land-route to Jerusalem. It is specially mentioned that horses were hired for this stage (v.^{15}): St. Paul was weary in body and spirit, and knew the importance of arriving in Jerusalem as fresh as possible.

(*f*) We have thus followed all the land-routes along which St. Paul is known to have travelled. Before going on to refer to sea-routes, it will not be without interest to give some account of one or two land journeys by others recorded in ancient literature.

From *Cicero's* letters we are able to reconstruct some of his itineraries in the middle of the 1st cent. B.C. In 58 B.C. he was exiled from Rome. He journeyed south by the Appian Way, as far as Capua, and then took the road to the right referred to above, as far as Vibo Valentia in the country of the Bruttii. From there he found his way to Brundisium, from which he crossed the Adriatic to Dyrrhachium (*Att.* iii. 8). From there he reached Thessalonica on 22nd May, having gone east by the Egnatian Way referred to above. The complete course of the Via Egnatia was as follows: Dyrrhachium, Clodiana (where the branch from Apollonia met it), Scampa, Lychnidus, Scirtiana, Nicæa, Heraclea, Cellæ, Edessa, Pella (where Alexander the Great was born), Thessalonica, Apollonia, Amphipolis, Philippi, Neapolis, Porsulæ, Brendice, Tempyra, Doriscus, Dyme, Cypsela, Syracellæ, Apri, Bisanthe, Heræum, Perinthus, Selymbria, Melantia, Byzantium (later Constantinople). Cicero returned by the same way by which he had come.

The journey he took to his province Cilicia in 51 B.C. may also be followed with interest. He left Rome in the beginning of May and arrived at his villa at Arpinum (his birthplace), among the hills, about the 3rd May. From there he went by the Arcanum of his brother to Aquinum (afterwards the birthplace of Juvenal), and reached Minturnæ on the 5th. He then went by the Appian Way to his villa at Cumæ, and from there by Puteoli to his villa at Pompeii, reached at latest on the 9th. The 10th and 11th May were spent at the villa of a friend at Trebula, from which he went to Beneventum (11th May, evening), Venusia (night of 14th spent there), Tarentum (arrived 18th May, departed 21st May), Brundisium (arrived 22nd May, departed 10th or 11th June). The whole journey from Beneventum to Brundisium was of course on the Appian Way. From Brundisium he crossed the sea, and we hear of him at Corcyra (12th June), the Sybota Islands (13th June), and Actium (14th June). We next hear of him at Athens (arrived 25th June, left 6th July). On 6th July he sailed from the Piræus, the harbour of Athens, to Zoster, from there on 8th July to Ceos, on 9th July to Gyaros, on the 10th to Syros, on the 11th to Delos. He then went by Samos to Ephesus (arrived 22nd July, departed 26th July). On the 26th July he began his inland journey. His province, named Cilicia, comprised a very large territory, indeed the whole of what was afterwards Southern Galatia, as well as Lycia, Pamphylia, Cilicia (proper), etc. He proceeded along the great road already mentioned, and reached Tralles (27th July), Laodicea (arrived 31st July, departed 3rd August, early). Laodicea was the first city of the province on the west. Henceforth it was an official progress that he made. Neither the rate of his progress from place to place nor the actual time he stayed in each place can be fixed with certainty. The dates given by O. E. Schmidt (*Der Briefwechsel des M. Tullius Cicero*, Leipzig, 1893, p. 78) are not reliable (Ramsay in *Exp.*, 8th ser., ii. [1911] 149 ff., repeated in *The First Christian Century*, London, 1911, p. 145 ff.). The best account is by L. W. Hunter (aided by W. M. Ramsay) in *JRS* iii. [1914] 74 ff. It is probable that he travelled at the rate of about 21 or 22 English miles a day, and certain that he stayed at Apameia (for which he must have diverged from the main road) and Philomelion, about three to five days in each. At Laodicea Combusta he left the great road and took the branch to the right for Iconium (reached 23rd August). There he spent a considerable time getting his army together. From Iconium he marched towards Cybistra, but, on learning that his predecessor Appius Claudius was at Iconium, he returned there, only to find that he had gone. He resumed his journey (3rd Sept.) to Cybistra (reached 19th or 20th Sept.) and pitched his camp there. Leaving Cybistra on 22nd Sept., he crossed the Taurus range on 24th Sept. by the Cilician Gates, and on 5th Oct. reached Tarsus. Two days later he began his march to the Amanus range, and on 8th Oct. encamped at Mopsuestia. A later camp was at Epiphanea, whence Cicero on the evening of 12th Oct. made the ascent of the Amanus mountains, and next day defeated the enemy and was hailed as Imperator by his troops. He descended to Issus, and was encamped till 18th Oct. near Alexander's Altars. He then marched to Pindenissus, began its siege on 21st Oct., and captured it on 17th December. About the end of December he reached Tarsus again. He left Tarsus on 5th Jan. 50 and returned to Laodicea, no doubt by the same route as before (with the exception perhaps of the detour to Synnada), reaching it on 11th February. There he remained almost three months. On 7th May he returned to Tarsus by the old route (Apameia, etc.), and he arrived there on 5th June. From there he marched eastwards, making a demonstration in force, and returned to Tarsus not later than 17th July. On 30th July he left Tarsus, and, as it was the hot season, very probably by sea. We next hear of him at Side in Pamphylia, which suggests that he had got there by coasting. He left Side on 4th Aug. and arrived at Rhodes about 10th August. He wished to cross the Ægean before the season of the trade-winds (27th Aug.), but was compelled, on account of the unseaworthiness of his ship, to cast anchor at Ephesus. There he remained the whole of September. He left Ephesus on 1st Oct. and landed on the 14th at the Piræus. From Athens he took a land-journey across the Isthmus and then along the north of the Peloponnese to Patræ (modern Patras). He embarked there on 3rd Nov. and on the next day reached Alyzia in Acarnania. Early on 6th Nov. he sailed from there and travelled to Leucas (6th Nov.), Actium (7th and 8th Nov.), Corcyra (9th to 16th Nov.), Cassiope in Corcyra (16th to 22nd Nov.), across the Adriatic to Hydruntum (23rd Nov.) and to Brundisium (24th Nov.), having been absent from Italy seventeen and a half months. Leaving Brundisium on the 27th, he proceeded to Æculanum, Trebula (9th Dec.), Suessula, Naples, Pompeii (10th Dec. to 12th or 13th Dec.), Cumæ, Formiæ (16th Dec.), Lavernium (25th Dec.), back to Formiæ (25th Dec. to 1st Jan. 49). The outbreak of the civil war and Cicero's desire for a triumph alike kept him outside Rome (a general gave up his claim to a triumph if he entered the city walls). Cicero's further movements at this time were Tarracina (1st Jan.), Pomptinum (2nd Jan.), Alba (3rd Jan.), outside Rome (4th Jan.). Between 8th and 11th Jan. Cicero was given charge of the district of Capua in the interest of the Senate. On the 18th before dawn he left Rome in the direction of Antium, the route being by the Appian Way for the first stage. He was at Formiæ from about 20th to 22nd January. His later movements were to Minturnæ (22nd to 24th Jan.), Cales (24th Jan.), Capua (25th to 28th Jan.), back to Cales and Formiæ (29th Jan. to 3rd Feb.), then again to Capua (4th to 7th Feb.), Cales (7th Feb.), and again to Formiæ (8th to 17th Feb.). On 17th Feb. he journeyed to Cales, and on the 19th back to Formiæ, where he remained till 27th March, on which day he went to his villa at Arpinum among the hills. On 3rd April he arrived at his brother's Laterium (Arcanum). After 7th April he journeyed to the coast: on 13th April at latest he was at Cumæ. On 12th May he went to Pompeii, but on the morning of the next day returned to Cumæ, where he remained till, soon after 19th May, he moved to Formiæ. On 7th June he left Italy by sea for the East, probably for the villa of Atticus in Epirus, where he in all likelihood spent the summer. Before the end of the year 49 he joined Pompey's camp at Dyrrhachium. It is not necessary to follow him further, but it has been instructive to trace Cicero's movements through his letters during these three important years. It is safe to say that of no other man's movements before the 19th cent. do we know as much in detail as of Cicero's.

Early in the year 37 B.C. a journey was taken from Rome to Brundisium for political purposes. The poet *Horace* and others were in the retinue of the diplomatists. In *Sat.* i. 5 Horace gives an account of the journey. It is true that he modelled the satire on an earlier one of the old satirist Lucilius on a similar topic, but this fact in no way interferes with the interest of the account. The journey need not have occupied more than nine days (Ovid, *Ep. ex Ponto,* IV. v. 5–8), but this party, moving leisurely, took thirteen days. The itinerary, according to the latest reconstruction (in Paul Lejay's edition of the *Satires,* Paris, 1911, p. 146), was as follows:

First day . . .	Rome to Aricia :	over	16	Roman	miles.
Second day . .	Aricia to Forum Appi :	„	27	„	„
Night of second to third day .	On the canal :	„	16	„	„
Third day . .	To Tarracina :	„	3	„	„
Fourth day . .	(1) Tarracina to Fundi :	„	13	„	„
„ . .	(2) Fundi to Formiæ :	„	13	„	„
Fifth day . . .	Formiæ to Bridge of Campania :	„	27	„	„
Sixth day . .	(1) Bridge of Campania to Capua :	„	17	„	„
„ . .	(2) Capua to Caudium :	„	21	„	„
Seventh day .	(1) Caudium to Beneventum :	„	11	„	„
„ . .	(2) Beneventum to Trivicum :	„	25	„	„
Eighth day . .	Trivicum to Asculum Apulum :	„	24	„	„
Ninth day . .	Asculum Apulum to Canusium :	„	35	„	„
Tenth day . .	Canusium to Rubi :	„	23	„	„
Eleventh day .	Rubi to Barium :	„	23	„	„
Twelfth day . .	Barium to Gnatia :	„	37	„	„
Thirteenth day.	Gnatia to Brundisium :	„	39	„	„

3. Sea-Routes.—We have seen from the experiences of Cicero and other travellers that land-journeys could be performed with a safety and a certainty that are truly astonishing. There was a similar security about journeys over the Mediterranean. The Mediterranean was practically closed to traffic in the five winter months, November to March. Also coasting voyages were, where possible, preferred to voyages right across the sea. These facts, taken in conjunction with the small size of the vessels, account for the safety of ancient navigation. Greek sailors steered by the Great Bear, and Phœnicians by the Lesser Bear (Lucan, *Bell. Civ.* iii. 219), but it was a common custom to put in to harbour at night and sleep on shore. Examples of both kinds of voyages are to be found in the Acts of the Apostles.

The best plan to follow in describing the principal sea-routes of the Mediterranean will be to select several examples, all from the 1st cent. A.D., of sea-journeys that were actually taken. Philo the Jew, in his *in Flaccum,* v. (ed. Mangey, ii. p. 521), describes most graphically the journey of Herod Agrippa from Rome to Syria, when he went to take over the kingdom conferred upon him by Gaius in A.D. 40. 'As he was about to set out, Gaius counselled him to avoid the direct voyage from Brundisium to Syria, as it was long and wearisome, and to wait for the periodic winds and take the short route *via* Alexandria. He said that the merchant vessels from that port were quick sailers, and that the steersmen were most skilled, being like charioteers driving horses trained to contests, and taking an unswerving course straight to the goal. And he obeyed, as he was at once his overlord and the advice he gave him seemed to be to his advantage. So, travelling down to Puteoli, and seeing Alexandrian ships at anchor, all in trim for setting sail, he went on board with his family, had a good voyage, and a few days later arrived in sight of port, unexpected and undetected' (cf. ch. xiii. [Mangey, ii. p. 533] for another voyage from Puteoli to Alexandria, which also took only a few days [ὀλίγαι ἡμέραι]). The same voyage was taken by M. Mæcius Celer, sent by the Emperor Domitian as a *legatus legionis* to command a legion in the province of Syria about A.D. 92 (Stat. *Siluæ,* iii. 2). A straight course between Puteoli and Alexandria was from May to September the regular course for the corn-ships which brought corn from Egypt to Italy. The ships kept to the south of Crete. Pliny speaks of a record passage of nine days, and it is mentioned that the accession of the Emperor Galba was known at Alexandria within 27 days (*Companion to Latin Studies,* p. 427). Only favoured persons were allowed to travel by these ships. The corn-fleet flew a special topsail. When the appearance of this sail in the offing warned the people of Puteoli that the great corn-fleet was approaching, a general holiday was immediately proclaimed (Seneca, *Ep.* 77, § 1).

In the winter the open sea was avoided. The ships sailed across from Alexandria to Myra, and thence, keeping to the northerly side of the Mediterranean as much as possible, made their way to Italy. According to the Bezan text (Ac 21^1), St. Paul found at Myra a ship to which he transferred on his last journey to Syria. Myra was a harbour of the greatest importance for the Levant traffic, and from there vessels sailed straight across to Syrian ports as well as to Alexandria. St. Paul's ship, being a large one, probably cut straight across the Levant from Myra to Tyre, past the west promontory of Cyprus. From Tyre it coasted to Ptolemais and to Cæsarea (vv.$^{7.8}$). The last voyage, to Rome, began at Cæsarea. There St. Paul and his company embarked on a ship going to Adramyttium in N.W. Asia Minor and calling at several ports on the way. They went by Sidon (27^3), past the east coast of Cyprus (because of contrary winds), and along the coast of Cilicia and Pamphylia to Myra in Lycia (v.^{5}). There they left the Adramyttian ship and trans-shipped to an Alexandrian vessel (with figure-head 'Castor and Pollux') bound for Italy. By slow coasting, in the teeth of a west wind, they passed Patara and Rhodes and came opposite Knidos, and from there made for the east end of Crete and the promontory Salmone. Thence they coasted along the southern side of the island, arriving at Fair Havens, near the city Lasea, about the middle of the south coast. They had already suffered the penalty of those who dared to voyage in winter, and there was a movement in favour of passing the winter in the harbour of Phœnix farther on. A strong east wind, however, got hold of the ship, which was driven relentlessly before it, and they passed south of the little island of Clauda (Cauda). As the wind's force was unabated, they undergirded, furled sail, and threw overboard some of the cargo, and then the tackle. On the fourteenth day after leaving Fair Havens they landed at Malta (Ac 27^{27} 28^{1}). From Malta they sailed to Syracuse, tacked between Sicily and Italy, and eventually reached Puteoli. See, further, art. SHIP.

St. Paul had of course taken many voyages before this eventful one. Not all, or at least not all their details, are recorded in Acts. For he mentions (2 Co 11^{25}) that he had been thrice wrecked and had passed a night and a day on a raft. This happened earlier in his life than the last voyage. Some of his shorter voyages have been referred to earlier in this article. One of the most constant voyages taken in ancient times was that across the Ægean between Corinth and Ephesus. This was one stage on a great Oriental trade-route: from Brundisium to Patræ and then to Lechæum, the northern port of Corinth, then over the Isthmus of Corinth on the ὁλκός, which carried those vessels bodily to the other (southern) harbour Cenchreæ (Ac 18^{18}). The journey straight across the Ægean brought one to Ephesus. Thence there was a great land trade-route to the Far East. The ease and regularity of this crossing of the Ægean must be remembered in arguments about the number of the Apostle's visits to Corinth. Cicero's slow voyage in the Ægean from the Piræus to Ephesus, referred to above, is a contrast to the direct route Corinth-Ephesus.

We are indebted to Philo for a reference to another Ægean trip (*in Flacc.* xviii., xix. [ed. Mangey, ii. pp. 538–541]). L. Avillius Flaccus, prefect of Egypt from A.D. 32 to 37, was, during the latter part of his period of government, guilty of such injustice, especially against the Jews, that he was removed to Italy, and tried in Rome. His property was confiscated, and he was banished to the Ægean island of Andros. Soon after (in 38 probably), he was there, by the Emperor's order, put to death. Philo describes his journey. He was taken from Rome by the Appian Way to Brundisium, whence he sailed across the Adriatic and up the Gulf of Corinth to Lechæum, the northern port of Corinth, crossed to Cenchreæ the other port, and sailed from there to the Piræus. The boat was small, and the wind blew strong, and he suffered greatly on this part of his journey. He then coasted along Attica as far as the promontory of Sunium. Rounding Sunium, he passed the small islands of Helene, Kianos (?), and Kythnos, 'and the others that lie in a row,' eventually reaching the larger island Andros. He had been destined for the bleak island of Gyaros, much used as a place of deportation (cf. Juvenal, *Sat.* I. i. 73, with Mayor's note [^{4}London, 1886]), but a friend had interceded for him, and he was sent to Andros instead.

The large use of the Gulf of Corinth in ancient times ought to be mentioned. The project of a canal through the Isthmus of Corinth was often mooted, but never completed. The voyage round the south of Greece was greatly dreaded, on account of the danger of being wrecked on Cape Malea. So much was this the case that Malea became a proverb for extreme danger, and anyone who had rounded it was a sort of hero in his own eyes and those of everyone else. Pliny the Younger describes to the Emperor Trajan (*Ep.* 15 [26]) how he had gone to Ephesus to take up the government of his province (about A.D. 111–113) ὑπὲρ Μαλέαν, and Flavius Zeuxis, a merchant of Hierapolis in Phrygia, records on his tombstone that he had sailed seventy-two times past Malea from Asia to Italy. Pliny's ultimate destination was Bithynia-Pontus, and his plan was to reach his province from Ephesus, partly by the help of coasting vessels, and partly by the use of carriages (*loc. cit.*)—the reasons he gives are the periodic winds and the heat respectively. He could under ordinary circumstances have done the whole of the rest of his journey either by land or by sea.

The chief lesson to be derived from a study of ancient navigation is that, small as the vessels were, and primitive as were the methods of navigation, the ancients made a marvellously skilful use of such facilities as they had. The Mediterranean was crowded with craft of all kinds. There were recognized routes for particular journeys, as in modern times. Sailings were as regular, relatively, as in our own day. The sea was for the most part free from piracy in the Apostolic Age. In the matter of sea-voyaging as in the conditions of land-travelling, in the universality of the Greek speech, and in the pacific attitude of the Government, the 1st cent. was fitted, as no succeeding century has been, for the propagation of the gospel in Mediterranean lands, which were at that time pre-eminent in the world.

LITERATURE.—On ancient travel generally: **L. Friedländer**, *Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire*, Eng. tr. of 7th ed., i. [London, 1908] chs. vi. and vii., pp. 268–428 (notes in vol. iv. [1912]) (an 8th ed. of the original has been begun [Leipzig, 1910]); **C. A. J. Skeel**, *Travel in the First Century after Christ*, Cambridge, 1901; **W. M. Ramsay**, 'Roads and Travel (in NT),' in *HDB* v. (of peculiar value, as coming from one who has had unequalled experience as a traveller in the lands specially concerned), *St. Paul the Traveller*, London, 1895, and other works; on the officials in charge of roads and on the Imperial post: **O. Hirschfeld**, *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diocletian*^{2}, Berlin, 1905, pp. 190–204, 205–211, 258–264, etc.; there is an excellent survey of roads and sea-routes (with map) in **H. Stuart Jones**, *Companion to Roman History*, Oxford, 1912, pp. 40–51 (on p. 51, other literature); cf. also **F. H. Marshall** and **R. C. Bosanquet** in *A Companion to Latin Studies*, ed. Sandys, Cambridge, 1910, pp. 208–210, 421–435 (also with bibliography); Pauly-Wissowa, artt. 'Cursus Publicus,' 'Egnatia Via'; an interesting map of the Pauline world (vitiated, in the eyes of the present writer, by its support of the North-Galatian view), in **A. Deissmann**, *St. Paul: a Study in Social and Religious History*, Eng. tr., London, 1912; **James Smith**, *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*^{4}, do., 1880; on ancient ships: **Cecil Torr**, *Ancient Ships*, Cambridge, 1894; **W. W. Tarn** in *JHS* xxv. [1905] 137, 204.

A. SOUTER.

ROBBERS OF CHURCHES.—This is the AV rendering of the word ἱερόσυλοι used by the town-clerk of Ephesus on the occasion of the riot described in Ac 19. 'For ye have brought hither these men, which are neither robbers of churches, nor yet blasphemers of your goddess' (Ac 19^{37}). The term 'churches' according to the Elizabethan usage could be applied to pagan temples. The RV substitutes the word 'temples' for 'churches,' but this is also a mis-translation, and there is strong evidence in favour of Ramsay's view that the passage should be translated thus—'guilty neither in act nor in language of disrespect to the established religion of the city.' The term ἱερόσυλος could now apply to any person guilty of any form of action disrespectful to the established worship.

Instances of the narrower, more literal meaning of the term occur in Ro 2^{22} and in 2 Mac 4^{42}. In the former passage St. Paul asks: 'Thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou rob temples?' 'Dost thou rob temples, and so, for the sake of gain, come in contact with abominations without misgiving?'

(Cf. Denney, *EGT*, 'Romans,' London, 1900, p. 600.) In the latter passage, the term 'church-robber' is applied to Lysimachus, brother of Menelaus the high priest, who was killed in a riot (170 B.C.). He and his brother had committed sacrilege by stealing the sacred vessels, and this conduct provoked the disturbance. 'Thus many of them they wounded, and some they struck to the ground, and all of them they forced to flee: but as for the church-robber himself him they killed beside the treasury.'

LITERATURE.—**W. M. Ramsay**, *St. Paul the Traveller*, London, 1895, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, do., 1893; **J. T. Wood**, *Discoveries at Ephesus*, do., 1876. R. STRONG.

ROBBERY.—When St. Paul enumerates in his Second Letter to the Corinthian Church the dangers through which he has passed in the prosecution of his missionary labours he includes *κινδύνοις λῃστῶν*, 'perils of robbers' (11^{26}). There can be little doubt that, while this peril may have existed on many of the routes in Asia Minor, it existed in a special degree on that through the Taurus mountains by which St. Paul reached Antioch. However valuable for health reasons the journey to the higher land may have been, it involved positive dangers, 'perils of rivers' not less than 'perils of robbers.' While the Roman authorities had set themselves the task of suppressing brigandage, and visited upon brigands the stern punishment of crucifixion, it was obviously impossible to make that suppression complete, especially in mountainous or relatively obscure districts. Augustus discovered how hopeless was the task of rooting out the brigands of the Pisidian mountains. Travellers who could afford it usually adopted the wise precaution of having an escort.

Epigraphic study, associated chiefly with the names of Sterrett and Ramsay, has served to give interesting evidence of the insecurity which prevailed amid the Taurus heights. Patrokles and Douda, for example, set up an epitaph in memory of their son Sousou, a policeman who was slain by robbers, while there is evidence also for the existence of an official—the *stationarius*—who had to lend assistance in the capture of runaway slaves, a class from which the ranks of the mountain robbers might be most easily recruited.

Emphatic statements respecting the prevalence of robbers during the stormy period preceding the fall of Jerusalem, and an account of the measures adopted by Felix in consequence, may be found in Josephus—'as to the number of the robbers he caused to be crucified, and of those who were caught among them, and whom he brought to punishment, they were a multitude not to be enumerated' (*BJ* II. xiii. 2).

LITERATURE.—**C. A. J. Skeel**, *Travel in the First Century after Christ*, Cambridge, 1901; **J. R. S. Sterrett**, *Epigraphic Journey in Asia Minor*, Boston, 1888; **W. M. Ramsay**, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, London, 1893, p. 23 f. art. 'Roads and Travel (in NT)' in *HDB* v. R. STRONG.

ROBE.—See CLOTHES.

ROCK (*πέτρα*, Ro 9^{33}, 1 P 2^{8}, 1 Co 10^{4}, Rev $6^{15.16}$; cf. Ac 27^{29}, Jude ^{12}).—Of the physical features of Palestine, rocks form a conspicuous part. Rock walls and escarpments, deep gorges and desolate crags, caves, fastnesses, and mighty boulders, are common in many portions of the country. Allusions to them on the part of the biblical writers were, therefore, inevitable. Symbolically they stood for solid foundations (Mt 7^{24}), for confession of the Deity of Christ (16^{18}), and for Christ Himself (1 Co 10^{4}). Among the rocks mentioned in Scripture are Sela (Jg 1^{36}, RV), Oreb (7^{25}), Etam (15^{8}), and Rimmon (20^{45}). Precipitation from a rock was one form of execution (2 Ch 25^{12}; cf. Lk 4^{29}).

Of the four principal references to rocks in apostolic history, those in Ro 9^{33} and in 1 P 2^{8} may appropriately be considered together. Both St. Paul and St. Peter quote and combine the same two prophetic passages (Is 8^{14} 28^{16}), adapting the LXX version of them so as to show that Israel had failed to attain unto God's true law of righteousness, because they sought it not by faith but by works. Because they had not apprehended the wisdom of God's salvation in Jesus Christ, St. Paul declares that he had become unto them 'a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence.' St. Peter probably had St. Paul's statement (Ro 9^{33}) before him when he wrote, for his use of the two passages from Isaiah is practically the same. He tells his readers that they are stumbling through disobedience, and failing to obey what they must recognize is true. Instead of availing themselves of the blessing of the gospel offered them, they are refusing to submit to its influence, and so come into collision with the power and authority of Christ. Both apostles boldly apply to Christ what is spoken by the prophet of Jahweh, and they point to the prophet's words as a prediction of their own people's spiritual blindness and consequent failure. As Jahweh is a firm foundation to those who trust in Him, so is Jesus; but to those who disbelieve, both He and His Son may be a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence.

A more difficult passage is that contained in 1 Co 10^{4}, 'And did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of a spiritual rock that followed them: and the rock was Christ' (*ἔπινον γὰρ ἐκ πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθούσης πέτρας, ἡ δὲ πέτρα ἦν ὁ Χριστός*). There is a Rabbinical legend, which can be traced back as far as the 1st cent. A.D., to the effect that the rock of Rephidim (Ex 17^{6}; cf. Nu $20^{2\text{ff.}}$), 'globular, like a bee-hive,' rolled after the camp in Israel's wanderings, and supplied them with water. But in the face of Nu 21^{5}, which must have been known to the Apostle, it is scarcely likely that St. Paul believed this. Rather he adapted it, stating explicitly that the rock which followed them was a 'spiritual,' *i.e.* a supernatural, rock, and that Christ was a rock. The manna was literally 'food from heaven' to him (1 Co 10^{3}; cf. Ps 78^{24}), and so were the water and the rock (Ps $78^{15\text{ff.}}$); and both the water and the manna were a foreshadowing of the Christian sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper (1 Co $10^{2.16}$). St. Paul's argument is briefly this: 'all' ate of the same spiritual food (v.^{3}), and 'all' drank of the same spiritual drink (v.^{4})—the manna and the water being intended to sustain the spirit as well as the body—but only two (Caleb and Joshua) recognized the spiritual presence of Christ, who in His pre-existent state was ever with Israel in their gathering of the manna and beside every cliff which Moses struck. Philo had already identified the rock of Dt 8^{15} with the Wisdom of God, and the rock of Dt 32^{13} with His Wisdom and Word; hence it was easy for St. Paul to take another step and identify the smitten rock with Christ, the Rock spiritual. A parallel to this mode of interpretation may be found in He 11^{26}, where the Apostle represents Moses as 'accounting the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt.' See also art. METAPHOR.

In a passage in Acts (27^{29}), St. Paul and his ship companions are described as fearful of being driven ashore on 'rocky ground' (*τραχεῖς τόποι*, literally 'rough places'). While a different expression is used here in the Greek, the reference is evidently to rocks, upon which it would be hazardous to let their vessel strike. In Jude ^{12}, also, a kindred expression (*σπιλάδες*) is used, in a similar but metaphorical way. 'These are they who are hidden rocks in your love-feasts,' etc. The RV translates σπιλάδες by 'spots,' and this has the support not only of the Vulg. *maculæ*, but also of the parallel passage in 2 P 2^{13}. Hidden, or sunken, rocks is an eminently appropriate metaphor by which to describe the ungodly character of those who, like Balaam and Korah, were inclined to mar the fellowship of Christian believers.

The only other passage remaining to be discussed is that contained in Rev $6^{15.\ 16}$, in which the Seer pictures the struggle of the Church, and of God's judgment upon her enemies. At the opening of the sixth seal, the wicked are depicted as terrorized by an earthquake, and as hiding in the caves and rocks of the mountains, to escape the wrath of the Lamb. It is the dreadful Day of the Lord which is about to come. Panic seizes troubled consciences. The end is near. The wicked, even the rich and the mighty, princes and captains, bondmen and freemen, hide themselves, calling to the mountains and rocks to fall on them and hide them from the face of Him that sitteth on the throne and from the wrath of the Lamb (cf. Is 2^{19}, Hos 10^{8}, Lk 23^{30}).

George L. Robinson.

ROD.—1. An instrument of punishment or correction.—The term denotes an instrument of punishment or correction.

(*a*) In his enumeration of the hardships and sufferings endured by him in the course of his apostolic labours, St. Paul employs the verb ῥαβδίζειν, 'to beat with rods,' to describe the punishment to which he was subjected on three occasions by Roman magistrates (2 Co 11^{25}). 'The rods' was the customary expression for Roman scourging. In the one instance recorded in the Acts, the scourging was inflicted by the lictors (ῥαβδοῦχοι, tr. 'sergeants' in AV and RV, lit. 'rod-holders') by order of the *duumviri* ($16^{22f.\ 35.\ 38}$). It was the duty of the lictors to carry the *fasces*, consisting of rods bound in the form of a bundle, with an axe in the middle which projected from them. These, usually made of birch, were the instruments with which St. Paul and Silas were cruelly maltreated at Philippi.

(*b*) The term is used figuratively in 1 Co 4^{21} to denote the stern treatment called for in the event of continued recalcitrancy on the part of Church members, chastisement with the rod being a familiar method of enforcing obedience and submission to parental authority (cf. v.$^{14f.}$).

2. The symbol of sovereignty.—The 'rod' or sceptre is also used as the symbol of sovereignty (He 1^{8}; cf. Ps 45^{6} 110^{2}). Quotations in the Apocalypse (12^{5} 19^{15}) from Ps 2^{9}, which represents the theocratic king as ruling (ποιμανεῖς, LXX) the nations with a rod of iron, are applied to the mediatorial reign of Christ, in which His servants also share ($2^{26f.}$). The rod of empire, regarded as a shepherd's staff, is transformed into an instrument of penal authority which subdues or crushes all opposition (cf. 1 Co $15^{24f.}$).

W. S. Montgomery.

ROLL.—See Scroll.

ROMAN EMPIRE.—The purpose of this article is to sketch the growth of the Roman Empire from its small beginnings down to about the middle of the 1st cent. A.D. The Empire did not stop growing at that date, but its later history hardly belongs to a Dictionary of the Apostolic Church.

1. Origins.—Rome, according to the opinion now commonly held, began with a settlement on the Palatine Hill on the left bank of the Tiber, some twenty miles from its mouth. This settlement occupied what was afterwards spoken of as *Roma Quadrata*, 'Square Rome,' from the shape of the outline of the walls. It was a community of shepherds, who, along with their wives, families, and property, were protected from an enemy by the strong walls surrounding the town. Hill towns are still a feature of Italy. Other hills in the neighbourhood seem to have been occupied by similar communities, and there can be no doubt that these communities found it advisable to make an alliance with one another against their common enemies. Such an alliance had a religious sanction, and we find in early times a festival of the Septimontium in existence, the seven mountains being the Capitolinus, Palatinus, Aventinus, Cælius, Oppius, Cispius, Fagutal (the three last spurs of the afterwards named Mons Esquilinus). (The later list of the [proverbial] 'seven hills' is not precisely the same, but consists of the first four followed by the Mons Esquilinus, the Collis Viminalis, and the Collis Quirinalis; this list is purely geographical, and has no religious significance.) The result of an attack on these combined communities by the hardier Sabines from the hills to the north and east appears to have been the defeat of the Romans, and the absorption within the population of a strong Sabine element. This fresh element led to the strengthening of the power of the united peoples. A further absorption seems to have taken place as the result of struggles with their northern neighbours on the banks of the Tiber, the mysterious Etruscans, who were believed to have come from Lydia in Asia Minor through Thrace to Italy. The presence of certain Etrurian customs as well as the ancient 'Etrurian street' (*Vicus Tuscus*) in Rome proves their influence on the young city.

2. Rome under the kings.—During this early period Rome was undoubtedly governed by kings, who were heads of the army and of religion as well as of civil affairs. We cannot, however, trust all the details given by ancient historians of the events which occurred during the regal period. The broad outline may be trusted. The later kings were of Etrurian stock, and are a sign that this element in the population had become dominant. The meeting-place of the various hill communities which combined to make Rome was naturally the hollow between the hills, in the immediate vicinity of the Palatine and the Capitoline. As this place was liable to be inundated by the Tiber, a splendid scheme of drainage was carried out in the *Cloaca Maxima*, which survives in part to the present day. Towards the end of the regal period Rome joined the other cities of Latium in a league, in which she was destined to become the predominant partner. The meetings of the league were held on the Alban Mount. But for this league Rome could never have conquered Italy. The existence of the league made it possible gradually to do so. First the tribes nearer at hand like the Volscians were conquered.

3. Rome under the prætors.—After the expulsion of the last king, Rome was governed by two rulers, with the name 'generals' (*prætores*, changed in 367 B.C. to *consules*, 'men who consult [the Senate]'). Much of the history of this early period consists of dissensions between the patricians (the ruling class) and the plebeians (the dependent class). Some modern historians think that these two classes represented different tribes. In any case, the dissensions almost destroyed the community. Had it not been for Rome's lucky star, the growing community would have been strangled. The constitution of the Republic was in fact being slowly hammered out by these quarrels.

The invasion and burning of Rome by a northern Celtic race, the Gauls, in 390 B.C. mark the beginning of authentic Roman history. The Romans bought temporary peace from them, but were tormented for a number of years by their incursions.

The lower classes suffered deep distress at this time, with which legislation endeavoured, not unsuccessfully, to cope. In the year 287 B.C. the struggle between the orders finally ceased. They were now practically on terms of equality. From this hour dates the beginning of Rome's power to deal with foreign affairs.

4. Samnite Wars.—But we are anticipating. The period 367 to 290 B.C. was one of great struggle. The Romans were now united at Rome and had secured the predominance in the Latin league, when they were called upon to fight the most dangerous enemy they had yet had to deal with. The long contest was for supremacy in Italy. The Samnites inhabited the central area of Italy, the Appenines, but frequently over-ran the rich plains at their feet. The war began by their attack on the Sidicini, a neutral people between Campania and Samnium. Campania supported the Sidicini and Rome supported Campania. The Romans were victorious in this first war (343–341) at Mt. Gaurus, but concluded peace with the Samnites because of internal dissensions and difficulties near home. This war was followed by war with the Latins (340–338), in which the Samnites fought on the Roman side. The contest was to decide whether the Latins should be subjects of Rome or not. It was fought in Campania, and by 338 B.C. the Romans had proved complete victors. In that year the league was dissolved, and special arrangements were made with individual parties to the old league. Assistance lent by the Samnites to Greek cities in Campania was the occasion of the second Samnite war (326–304). During the first five years the Romans were for the most part successful. This period was followed by a one year's truce, which was broken before its end. In 321 the two Roman consuls sustained a disgraceful defeat at the Caudine Forks, a pass in Campania, and the army had to pass under the yoke. For several years afterwards fortune favoured the Samnites, but in 314 the consuls scored a decisive victory. This was followed by others, interrupted only by an Etruscan war in 311. In 304 the Samnites asked for peace, which was granted, and they were admitted to alliance with Rome. About 300 the Roman power seemed established in central Italy. In the third and last Samnite war (298–290), however, Rome had to face a coalition of Etruscans, Senonian Gauls, Umbrians, and Samnites. In 295 the desperate battle of Sentinum was fought, which resulted in a victory for Rome. The Samnites, however, continued to struggle on, until in 290 they finally gave up the contest. Rome's mastery in Italy was now assured, though it took about a quarter of a century more to subdue the whole peninsula.

5. Conquest of Greek cities of South Italy.—The next stage in Rome's career of battle was carried out in connexion with the Greek cities in the south of Italy. The people of Tarentum called in the assistance of a Greek filibuster, Pyrrhus of Epirus, who gave the Romans trouble from 281 to 275 B.C., in which year he returned to Greece finally defeated. In 272 Tarentum fell. Soon after, every nation in Italy south of the 44th parallel of latitude owned Rome's supremacy. She was now the first power of the Western world, and one of the first powers of the ancient world. But empire was not her intention. She gave the cities of Italy self-government, and as far as possible incorporated them with the Roman State. The free inhabitants of Italy consisted now of (*a*) Roman citizens, residents in Roman territory and in *coloniæ*, and individuals in *municipia* on whom citizenship had been conferred; (*b*) inhabitants of *municipia* (certain country towns) who had the citizenship of Rome (*i.e.* the right of trading and intermarriage) but not the right of voting or of holding office; (*c*) *socii* (allies), divided into two classes—(i.) *Latini*, who stood in a relation to Rome like that of the parties to the old Latin league, and had the capacity for acquiring Roman citizenship, by going to Rome or (later) by holding a magistracy in their own towns; (ii.) the free and allied cities, comprising all the rest of Italy, which had a military alliance with Rome, regulated either by *fœdus* (formal treaty) or by *lex data* (a charter).

6. First and Second Punic Wars.—The signal career of Rome in extra-Italian conquest begins with the First Punic War (264–241 B.C.). At this period Carthage, in the Tunis district, was mistress of the western Mediterranean. Rome was not as yet a naval power, but amongst her new Greek subjects (or allies) in southern Italy there were many traders by sea, and these had to be protected. Carthage had by means of mercenary troops conquered Sardinia and Corsica, and now aimed at the possession of Sicily. The western part, having been already planted with colonies from her parent city of Tyre, fell an easy prey to her, but the rest of the island was studded with Greek cities, which were not prepared to give up their free constitutions for the oligarchical tyranny of Semitic barbarians. The city of Messana (modern Messina) in the N.E. part of Sicily was the immediate cause of the outbreak of war between the Romans and the Carthaginians. Messana was at the time in the possession of Italian mercenaries, called Mamertini, who had conquered and taken possession of the city some time before. They grew great enough to menace the power of Hiero, the Greek king of Syracuse. He shut them up in their city, and they appealed for help to Rome. If Rome had refused, they would have appealed to Carthage. This fact determined the Roman people—for the Senate hesitated greatly, knowing the responsibility this fresh step would entail—to give the support the Mamertini sought. The Carthaginians must not be allowed to occupy a place so close to Italy. But the delay had allowed the admission of a Carthaginian garrison, by whose means peace had been concluded with Hiero. The Romans could thus have retired altogether from the situation, had not a Roman legate persuaded the Mamertini to expel the Carthaginian garrison. Hiero and the Carthaginians next proceeded, to lay siege to Messana, and the Romans declared war against them (264). The contest, with breaks, was fated to last for about one hundred and twenty years. Rome had to build a fleet. She was for the most part victorious throughout the first war, but Regulus, who had invaded Africa, the territory of the Carthaginians, was defeated and taken captive. The battles in this war were for the most part naval, and a final naval victory in 242 made it possible to reduce the Carthaginian strongholds in Sicily (241). By the terms of the peace Carthage had to evacuate Sicily and the neighbouring islands. Thus was the first Roman 'province' formed (see under PROVINCE).

The Second Punic War did not begin till 218. It differed from the first chiefly in two respects. In the interval Carthage had conquered Spain and thus had a new base of operations, and the second war was fought on land. In 238 the Carthaginians had had to fight their own rebellious mercenary troops, and Rome took advantage of this state of affairs to demand Sardinia and Corsica, which were made into a second province. This is probably the only instance of unjustifiable acquisition of territory in Rome's long history. Illyrian and Gallic wars occupied the rest of the interval. North Italy had been thus opened up (the Via

Flaminia had been built from Rome to Ariminum in 220 B.C.). Hannibal in 218 left New Carthage and crossed the Rhone and the Alps. He defeated the Romans successively at the Ticinus and Trebia (Dec. 218) in North Italy, at the Trasimene lake in Etruria (217), and at Cannæ in Apulia (216). The fidelity of Rome's most important allies in Italy, the inability of Hannibal's army to conduct successful siege operations, and other factors preserved Rome at this crisis. The further stages of the war may be compared with the later phases of the South African War. The Roman army was broken up into many small portions, leading strategic points were well garrisoned, and flying columns were dispatched over Italy. Capua, Tarentum, and Syracuse (in Sicily) were in turn lost and recovered. A Roman attempt to divert Hannibal's attention by attacking Spain was attended with disaster, but Hasdrubal, who came from Spain to join his brother Hannibal, was signally defeated by the Romans at the Metaurus (207). Hannibal then retired to the very south of Italy. Meantime the youthful P. Scipio had conquered a great part of Spain. On obtaining the province of Sicily (205 B.C.) he crossed over into Africa. Hannibal, who had been recalled in consequence, was defeated by Scipio at the battle of Zama (202). By the treaty of next year the war was brought to an end, and Carthage lost all her foreign possessions.

7. Macedonian Wars.—The possession of Sicily, Sardinia and Corsica, and Spain (or rather the Spains, for the Romans always distinguished between Hither and Further Spain), the last of which was made into two provinces in 197, made the Romans the greatest power in the ancient world. Philip, king of Macedonia, had been an ally of Hannibal. His attack on the two towns Oricum and Apollonia on the Illyrian side of the Adriatic, which had recently come into the possession of the Romans, drew Rome into the vortex of Eastern politics. The Romans at the close of the First Macedonian War (214–205) made peace with Philip, so that they might be left free to deal with Africa. The Second Macedonian War was declared in 200, and was brought to a successful end by the battle of Cynoscephalæ (197). In the following year Greece was declared free from the yoke of Macedon. Discontent among Rome's Greek allies led to war with the Seleucid king Antiochus, ally of Hannibal and Philip, who crossed to Greece by invitation. Having been defeated by the Romans at Thermopylæ (191), he returned to Asia and was there defeated again, at Magnesia (190). He was compelled to give up all his Asia Minor dominions north of Mt. Taurus. Soon after, the Galatians (Celts) of Central Asia Minor were defeated, and Asia was organized (188). The Romans did not take over Asia at this time, but strengthened the power of the king of Pergamum and that of the State of Rhodes, to keep Antiochus out. About the same period the Gauls in the north of Italy had to be subdued, and from this time (191) Cisalpine Gaul was a Roman province. After the Ligurian War Roman influence reached as far as the Alps instead of the Apennines.

Rome's protectorate over the East did not yet pass unquestioned. Perseus, son of Philip and his successor as king of Macedon, had been making preparations against Rome. The Third Macedonian War ended with victory for the Romans at Pydna (168). The Macedonian monarchy was finally overthrown, but Rome, following her usual policy in the East, did not annex the country but divided it into four districts, each under an oligarchical council. Stirrings and dissensions in Greece and Macedonia led in 146 to the destruction of Corinth by Mummius, and the constitution of the first eastern province, Achæa, which comprised both countries.

8. Third Punic War.—In the same year the Third and last Punic War resulted in the siege and destruction of Carthage and the formation of the province of Africa, consisting of her former territory. The province of Asia was constituted on the death of Attalus, king of Pergamum, in 133 B.C., having been left by his will to the Roman people (129). About 121 B.C. Gallia Narbonensis was made a province, on the conquest of the southern portion of Transalpine Gaul, between the Alps and the Pyrenees. It must not be supposed that there was complete peace in all these territories from the moment they were formally annexed. Many of Rome's wars, which have to be passed over without mention in this article, were connected with the consolidation of a power already defined.

9. The Social War.—A most important event was the Social War (90–89 B.C.), the result of which was that the territory of the city-State Rome now stretched from a point a little to the north of Florence as far as the extreme south of Italy. All freeborn persons within that area were now *cives Romani*, with all that that implied.

10. Mithradatic Wars.—Soon after, the Romans had to meet one of the direst enemies in all their long history, Mithradates (120–63), king of Pontus, south of the Black Sea. His father by favour of the Romans had been given Phrygia also, but this the Romans took from the son in his minority. The war between Mithradates and the Romans was due to the former's aggressions and his interference with the kingdoms protected by the Romans. He kept the whole of the Near East in a ferment. The first stage (88–84) was concluded by a peace, according to the terms of which Mithradates agreed to give up his conquests. The Second Mithradatic War was entirely due to the aggression of a Roman general Murena (83), and was with some difficulty concluded by a peace in the next year. Mithradates now seriously trained his army to meet the Roman style of warfare. The Third and last War was begun in 75 B.C., when King Nicomedes of Bithynia left his country by will to the Roman people, and Bithynia was in consequence declared a Roman province. Mithradates supported a claimant to the throne, and the war began. Roman armies sustained defeats. Tigranes, king of Armenia, joined Mithradates, and the combined forces needed the best generalship the Romans had to cope with them. Lucullus distinguished himself greatly, but the result was fruitless, and in 66 Lucullus had to make way for Pompey, who had just defeated the Cilician pirates. Pompey succeeded in defeating Mithradates and in conquering Armenia. He reduced Pontus and thereafter Syria (64) to the state of Roman provinces. There was now a chain of Roman provinces from the Black Sea to the Euphrates, but client States were retained along the frontier.

11. Acquisition of Gaul.—The next stage in the growth of the Roman Empire is the acquisition of Gaul, which corresponds roughly to modern France, by the generalship of Gaius Julius Cæsar (58–49 B.C.). Cæsar was one of the three most powerful men in the State, but was without means, and was anxious to obtain a command which would enable him to emulate Pompey's achievements in the East and eventually obtain supreme power. By the arrangement of the coalition in 60 he obtained the provinces of Cisalpine Gaul and Illyricum for five years (58–54). Transalpine Gaul was shortly afterwards added. The details of Cæsar's stubborn campaigns need not be here entered into. In addition to conquering the whole of Transalpine Gaul (except Gallia Narbonensis, already a Roman province), he twice crossed the Rhine and twice entered Britain. His period of command was extended for a further five years. His conquests secured Rome a northern frontier and saved the Empire for centuries.

12. Civil War.—In 49 B.C. civil war broke out, and for a number of years there could be no thought of extending the Empire. During the civil war, the eastern provinces, roughly speaking, were on Pompey's side and the western on Cæsar's; later, Antony held most of the east against Octavian.

13. Rome under the Emperors.—In 31 B.C. Egypt was acquired by Octavian, and henceforward the Roman Emperors reigned there as kings. About the same time Octavian re-organized the eastern provinces. On 16th Jan. 27 B.C. the provinces were apportioned between the Senate and Augustus (see PROVINCE). Though the greater part of Spain had long been part of the provincial system, the hardy tribes of the north-west, the Cantabri and Astures, had never been subdued. Between 26 and 20 B.C. Augustus and Agrippa succeeded in quelling them, and a new province, Lusitania, was formed. On the death of the client-king Amyntas in 25 B.C. all the northern and western part of his kingdom was taken over and made into the province Galatia. The boundaries of this province changed with the changing sphere of duty which covered all the central part of Asia Minor. It retained its importance down to A.D. 72, when Cappadocia became a consular province with an army, whereas in A.D. 17 it had been created merely a procuratorial province. Augustus spent 21–19 B.C. regulating the East, and in 16–13 visited Gaul. There he aimed at fixing the north-west frontier of the Empire. His first intention was to fix the limit at the Elbe and the Danube. The tribes of the Tyrol, the Rhaeti, Vindelici, and Norici were conquered in 15, and the Alpine tribes in 14–13. After a number of campaigns the dream of an Elbe frontier had to be given up, and the Rhine was reluctantly substituted. The Rhine-Danube frontier is much longer than the other, and was therefore much more difficult and expensive to defend. The reign of Tiberius (A.D. 14–37) saw the annexation of Cappadocia, as has been said. Gaius (Caligula) (37–41) pursued a somewhat retrograde policy. He restored to Antiochus of Commagene the realm which Tiberius had taken from his father. A similar policy was pursued in Palestine. In Thrace the former kingdom of Cotys was given to his son Rhœmetalces, and further territory in Thrace was added to it. To Polemo was gifted Pontus Polemoníacus, and to Cotys, younger brother of Rhœmetalces, lesser Armenia. Mauretania was taken over and afterwards (under Claudius) divided into two provinces, named Cæsariensis and Tingitana. In Africa the legion was taken from the senatorial proconsul and put under the command of a special *legatus*. Under Claudius (41–54) many important administrative changes were made in the provinces. In Germany and Pannonia the extensive operations resulted in no addition to the Empire, but Thrace was at last made a province under a procurator in 46. Lycia was united to Pamphylia as a province under one governor in 43. Macedonia and Achaia, which under Tiberius had been governed by an Imperial *legatus*, were restored to the Senate as two separate provinces. In 44 Judæa, which had been for a time under the rule of Herod Agrippa, was put under a procurator.

The most interesting event of Claudius' reign is, however, the annexation of Britain. Britain had been invaded twice by Julius Cæsar, but had never been conquered, still less annexed. It was reserved for Claudius to make the southern half of England into the province Britannia, which he visited in person. The Roman forces numbered between 40,000 and 70,000 and were under the command of A. Plautius Silvanus. The first objective seems to have been Essex and Hertford; Camalodunum (Colchester), the capital of the Trinovantes, was taken and made the capital of the new province. Plautius, the conqueror of the province, remained till 47 as *legatus Augusti pro prætore*. During this period the Romans penetrated at least as far as Somersetshire. At the end of Plautius' command the country comprised within a line drawn from Bath through Silchester, as far as London, with a loop enclosing Colchester, was Roman. Plautius' successor, P. Ostorius Scapula (47–52) conquered the Iceni and drew a line of forts across the country from Gloucester to Colchester. His greatest achievements were along the Welsh border. A fresh advance was made under Nero (54–68), when Suetonius Paulinus was appointed governor (59). His first two years were probably spent in subduing North Wales. An insurrection meantime broke out among the Iceni in the East. On the death of their king their territory had been added to the province. A rising of the Iceni and Trinovantes, who massacred 70,000 Romans and their allies, recalled Suetonius to the East. He took a terrible vengeance. The after history of the province is full of interest, but cannot be pursued here. For the Armenian wars of Nero see under NERO. His reign saw the addition of two provinces to the Roman Empire, *Pontus Polemoniacus* and *Alpes Cottiæ*.

LITERATURE.—The best large history is **T. Mommsen**, *Römische Geschichte*, vols. i.–iii. (Republic), vol. v. (Provinces under Empire), last ed., 1904, Eng. tr. in 7 volumes (5 vols. 'Republic,' best ed., 1894; 2 vols. 'Provinces,' best ed., 1909); the best small histories are **H. F. Pelham**, *Outlines of Roman History*^{4}, 1903; and **J. B. Bury**, *A History of the Roman Empire*^{2}, 1896; on a smaller scale still, but very good, are **W. Smith**, *A Smaller History of Rome*, new ed., 1898; **M. A. Hamilton**, *A Junior History of Rome to the Death of Cæsar*, 1910. There are maps of 'Imperium Romanum' in Kiepert's *Atlas Antiquus* (no. 12), 1885, Perthes' *Atlas Antiquus*, 1895; **Murray's** *Handy Classical Maps*; **Smith**, *op. cit.*, p. 344; **Bury**, *op. cit.*, pp. 83, 103. There is a handy list of Roman provinces with details in *Companion to Latin Studies*, ed. Sandys, 1910, pp. 401–409. On the fascinating subject of the Roman northern frontier the best account in English is **E. G. Hardy**, *Studies in Roman History*, 2nd ser., 1909, pp. 1–129; further details in German and Austrian journals specially devoted to the subject. On Britain see **F. J. Haverfield**, *Romanization of Roman Britain*^{3}, 1915, and, for details of individual sites, his contributions to the *Victoria County History*, 1900 ff.; on Roman London his classic art. in *JRS* i. [1911–12].

A. SOUTER.

ROMAN LAW IN THE NT.—The student of Christian origins cannot neglect the influence which the law of the Roman Empire had on the infant Church. The marvellous talent of the Roman authorities for organization, and especially their wise adaptability, which saved them from enforcing a rigid uniformity in legal details in all the countries which they conquered, were to a large degree instrumental, under Divine providence, in furthering Christianity throughout the Empire. Though the Emperors and their officials became, at a comparatively late date (see below, 4) persecutors, yet there can be no doubt that the Roman system of law and organization was a most powerful help to the apostles in preaching the gospel. In this article we may trace the various direct and indirect allusions to that system in the Christian literature of the apostolic period.

1. Administrators of the law.—The greater part of the Roman world was divided into provinces, which were either senatorial, *i.e.* under the rule of the Roman Senate, or imperatorial, *i.e.* under the direct rule of the Emperor. The older and settled provinces usually came under the former head, and those in which there was danger from external enemies usually under the latter; but there were not infrequent exchanges between Emperor and Senate, and a province might be at one date senatorial and at another imperatorial. It is therefore a good test of accuracy in a historical writer to examine whether he names the Roman governor rightly in any given incident (see below).

(*a*) *Senatorial provinces.*—Such a province was governed by a *proconsul* (ἀνθύπατος, Ac 13$^{7\mathrm{f.}\ 12}$ 19^{38}; cf. 18^{12}, ἀνθυπατεύοντος). St. Luke rightly calls Sergius Paulus in Cyprus a proconsul (13^{7}), for shortly before St. Paul visited the island it became a senatorial province, though it ceased soon afterwards to be such. An inscription found in N. Cyprus by Cesnola has 'in the proconsulship of Paulus' (Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, p. 74, who quotes D. G. Hogarth, *Devia Cypria*, London, 1889, p. 114). St. Luke also rightly speaks of Gallio as proconsul of Achaia (18^{12}). This province had gone through many changes: having been at one time a separate province, at other times joined to Macedonia, it had from A.D. 15 been a joint imperatorial province, but in A.D. 44, before St. Paul came to Corinth, had again been disjoined from Macedonia and had become senatorial (Ramsay, *HDB* i. 23). The senatorial provinces mentioned in the NT are: Macedonia (senatorial after the time of Claudius); Achaia; Asia (the western part of Asia Minor); Bithynia-Pontus, a united province in NT times (part of ancient Pontus was joined to Galatia, part given to the Polemonian kingdom; see below, *c*); Cyprus (see above); Crete-Cyrene, a joint province. In Ac 19^{38} the plural ἀνθύπατοι is used; the meaning is not that there were more than one proconsul at Ephesus at a time, or that the proconsul's counsellors were called by this name (a conjecture for which there is no evidence), but that 'there are such things as proconsuls.'

(*b*) *Imperatorial provinces.*—Such a province was ordinarily governed by a *proprætor* (in full, *legatus Augusti pro prætore*; in Greek, ἀντιστράτηγος or πρεσβευτής). Neither of these Greek names is found in the NT, but several imperatorial provinces are there named: Syria-Cilicia-Phenice, a joint province;[*] Galatia; Illyricum (Ἰλλυρικόν),[†] N.W. of Macedonia and W. of the provinces of Moesia Superior and Thracia, which are not referred to in the NT, and do not contain any of the places there mentioned; Pamphylia; Lycia. (The last two were joined together in A.D. 74: Lycia is mentioned in Ac 27^{5} as a separate province [cf. 1 Mac 15^{23}]; Patara [Ac 21^{1}] was within it.)

Some imperatorial provinces were governed by *procurators*, such as Judæa (when it was not a dependent kingdom) and Cappadocia, though Judæa was not perhaps strictly a 'province'; the governor of Egypt was called a *prefect*. Both these names are used in other senses. A procurator (ἐπίτροπος or διοικητής, in the NT more loosely ἡγεμών, Mt 27^{2}, Ac 23^{24} 24^{1} 26^{30}, etc., and so Josephus, *Ant.* XVIII. iii. 1, though this word is used generally of Roman governors[‡] as contrasted with semi-independent 'kings' in Mk 13^{9} and Mt 10^{18}, Lk 21^{12}; cf. 1 P 2^{14}) was of a rank inferior to that of a proprætor. He was in most respects vested with full power, but was in some degree in a subordinate relation to a neighbouring governor; thus, Judæa was more or less under Syria, Cappadocia under Galatia.

(*c*) *Subject kingdoms, etc.*—In addition to the Roman provinces, there were in apostolic times a considerable number of semi-independent kingdoms, and also of petty princedoms or 'tetrarchies'—this word having lost its original meaning of 'rule over a fourth part.' Of the former class we notice the dominions of Herod the Great and of his grandson Herod Agrippa I. (who died A.D. 44, Ac 12^{23}); these were kings of all Palestine. Another such kingdom was that of Polemo (Πολέμων) to the east of Pontus; this kingdom existed up to A.D. 63; one of the Polemos married Berenice or Bernice (Ac 25^{13}). A third such kingdom was Lycaonia Antiochi (between Galatia and Cilicia), which is indirectly alluded to in Ac 18^{23}, where St. Paul is said to have gone through τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν, *i.e.* he visited first that part of Lycaonia which was not part of the subject kingdom but was incorporated in the province Galatia, and then he went through Phrygia or 'the Phrygian' [region] (ct. 16^{6}, τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν, which by the grammatical construction must mean 'the region which was both Phrygian and Galatic,' *i.e.* that part of Phrygia which was incorporated in the province Galatia; cf. Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 210). Herod Agrippa II. was king (or tetrarch) of Chalcis in Cœle-Syria (the Lebanon), and afterwards of Northern Palestine; in Ac 25^{13} he is called 'Agrippa the king,' and the word 'king' is emphasized in these chapters; he died A.D. 100. Herod Antipas was also popularly called 'king' (Mk 6^{25}, Mt 14^{9}), but he was really tetrarch (Mt 14^{1}) of Galilee (Lk 3^{1}, τετρααρχοῦντος) and Peræa (Jos. *Ant.* XVII. viii. 1). Archelaus succeeded his father Herod the Great in Judæa and Samaria as 'ethnarch,' without the title of king, though St. Matthew uses the verb βασιλεύειν of him (2^{22}). Herod Philip was tetrarch of Ituræa and Trachonitis, and Lysanias of Abilene (Lk 3^{1}). The existence of these kings and tetrarchs was due to the wise tolerance of the Romans, and it paved the way for direct Roman rule, and indirectly for the spread of Christianity.

Against the decisions of both governors and kings there lay an *appeal* to the Emperor. That of St. Paul is recorded in Ac 25$^{11\mathrm{f.}}$ (cf. 28^{19}), but it is disputed whether it was from the Sanhedrin to the Roman tribunal or from Festus to Cæsar. The latter view seems best to suit the circumstances of the case. The appeal need not necessarily have been granted; but as we see from Agrippa's remark in 26^{32}, once it was allowed, the prisoner could not be released.

(*d*) In 19^{31} the *Asiarchs*, officials in the province of Asia, are mentioned. But the Asiarch was not, strictly speaking, an administrator of the law. In the provinces there were organized associations of cities, having to a great extent a religious character, though having also some relation to the law. Such an association was called 'commune' (τὸ κοινόν). Each 'commune' was presided over by an officer named after the province; thus he was called Asiarch in Asia, Galatiarch in Galatia, etc. He was president of the games, and had an undefined influence in civil affairs. The plural 'Asiarchs' in 19^{31} perhaps implies that past holders of the office retained the title. For these offices see the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, xii., and Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, pt. ii., 'Ignatius'^{2}, London, 1889, iii. 404 ff.

2. Administration of the law. The Romans did not enforce a rigid uniformity of law throughout the Empire. When they conquered a country and incorporated it as a Roman province, they found in many cases an excellent system of law in force, and they retained much of it. This was especially the case in Greek cities, and above all in Asia Minor, where the people were particularly tenacious of old customs. Just as the Romans did not force the Latin language on Greek countries, but recognized the Greek language and made use of it, reserving Latin for State occasions, so they used much of pre-existing Greek law and custom. Thus at Ephesus, a 'free' city, we find, in addition to the Roman proconsulship, a Greek constitution. There was a senate (βουλή), and also the popular assembly (δῆμος, 19^{30}; also called ἐκκλησία, vv.$^{32. 41}$) which met regularly three times a month and (when required) in extraordinary session; and this popular assembly had its clerk (γραμματεύς), a very important official, whose influence over it was great, as this chapter shows (vv.$^{35-41}$). Inscriptions of Roman date in Greek cities show the continuance of Greek institutions (for these statements see Rackham, *Acts*, p. 362 ff., and Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 131 ff., *Gal.*, pp. 132 ff., 181 f.). At Athens, also a 'free' city, we find a Greek institution, the court of the Areopagus ($17^{19. 22}$), the members of which were called 'Areopagites' (v.^{34}). This, however, was not a court of law, and St. Paul was not on his trial before it on a criminal charge. It was rather a University court, 'in the midst of' which (v.^{22}) the Apostle made his defence as a teacher. The scene has been taken by F. C. Conybeare (*HDB* i. 144) and others, with the AV text in v.^{22} (but not AVm), to have been on Mars' Hill outside the city, whence the court derived its name, but Ramsay with more probability (*St. Paul*, p. 244 f.) places it in the city itself, in or near the Agora or market-place. 'In the midst of Mars' Hill' as a topographical expression would hardly be possible.

---

[*] Syria and Cilicia are joined in Gal 1^{21}: τὰ κλίματα τῆς Συρίας καὶ τῆς Κιλικίας, tr. in AV and RV 'the regions of Syria and Cilicia.' St. Paul's habit of using the Roman names for provinces is here illustrated, for Ac 9^{30} says that he was sent from Jerusalem 'to Tarsus,' *i.e.* to Cilicia. Ramsay (*Gal.*, p. 277 ff.) would with ℵ* omit the second τῆς in Gal 1^{21}; as Lightfoot says (*Gal.*^{5}, London, 1876, *in loc.*), 'the words τὰ κλίματα seem to show that "Syria and Cilicia" are here mentioned under one general expression, and not as two distinct districts,' though he seems to be in error in saying that they were at the time under a separate administration. For the meaning of κλίματα see Ramsay, *loc. cit.*

[†] The usual Greek name of this province is Ἰλλυρίς or Ἰλλυρία, but St. Paul as a Roman citizen uses a Latin form in Ro 15^{19}, as does the historian Dio Cassius twice (Ramsay, *Gal.*, p. 276 f.). This province is also called Dalmatia in 2 Ti 4^{10}, this name (which had previously been given to South Illyricum only) taking the place of the other during St. Paul's lifetime (Ramsay, *ib.*).

[‡] In Lk 2^{2} the verb ἡγεμονεύω is used of Quirinius' office in Syria, in 3^{1} of Pilate's procuratorship; in 3^{1} ἡγεμονία is used of the 'reign' of Tiberius.

In non-Greek countries which passed under Roman rule, Roman law and organization were more speedily adopted, as there was less of previous civilization to withstand them. But in Palestine, as in the Hellenized districts, local law survived to a considerable extent, even when Roman procurators had displaced native kings. Power was left to the Sanhedrin in Judæa, and, though that body had no jurisdiction in Galilee and Samaria, local synagogues outside Judæa were allowed by the civil authorities to exercise a good deal of authority over their members (C. Bigg, *ICC*, 'St. Peter and St. Jude,' Edinburgh, 1901, p. 25). The Sanhedrin could not inflict capital punishment without leave of the procurator (Jn 18^{31}), but the latter often applied Jewish law, and this seems to be the meaning of Festus' proposal to send St. Paul to Jerusalem, to be tried in his presence indeed, but by Jewish law (Ac 25^{9}). The sentence would be the procurator's, and the appeal would be from him to the Emperor (see above, **1** (*c*)). The stoning of Stephen was no doubt an illegal murder (Ac 7^{58}), and other deaths of Christians would fall under the same head (5^{33} 22^{4} 26^{10}); but the Sanhedrin could arrest persons, and inflict imprisonment and flogging ($5^{18. 40}$ 22^{4} 26^{10}; cf. 2 Co $11^{24f.}$, Mt 5^{22}). In 9^{2} 26^{12} the synagogue at Damascus is requested by the Sanhedrin to exercise its powers (cf. 22^{19}, Mk 13^{9}). In the semi-independent kingdoms Roman law found its way less speedily, and only as the local kings deemed it practicable to spread Western ideas. The position of Herod the Great in this respect is well drawn by Ramsay (*Was Christ born at Bethlehem?*, London, 1898, ch. ix.), who suggests that the king was allowed to carry out the enrolment which took place at the time of our Lord's birth in such a way as to conciliate Jewish prejudices, by giving it a tribal character which it did not possess in the other parts of the Empire.

On the other hand, the Romans founded **colonies** in various parts of the Empire, chiefly for military reasons; their inhabitants were Roman citizens, and Roman law was observed in them more strictly; the city officials were named in Roman fashion *duoviri*, *quæstores*, *ædiles*, *prætores* (the magistrates in Greek cities were called στρατηγοί or ἄρχοντες, and in Ac $16^{20. 22. 35f.}$ St. Luke gives the former as the translation of 'prætores' at Philippi, a Roman colony). In colonies there was no Senate (βουλή), but there were *decuriones* (Ramsay, *Gal.*, pp. 117, 182); the language used in the municipal deeds is shown by inscriptions to have been Latin (*ib.*). The colonies mentioned in the NT are: Antioch of Pisidia (Ac 13^{14}), Lystra (14^{6}), Philippi (16^{12}, where alone of NT passages κολωνία is found), Corinth (18^{1}), Ptolemais (21^{7}). Iconium (13^{51}) did not become a colony till Hadrian's time (Ramsay, *Gal.*, pp. 123, 218). Here it may be remembered that Roman law gave special privileges to 'citizens.' **Citizenship** (πολιτεία, 22^{28}) was not conferred on all the inhabitants of the Empire till A.D. 212. Even the inhabitants of 'free' cities were not Roman citizens, or 'Romans,' as citizens proudly and tersely called themselves (16^{21} $22^{25ff.}$); but citizenship might be acquired by purchase, in the corrupt times of the Emperor Claudius, though at a high price (22^{28}), or by birth, as in St. Paul's case (*ib.*). The law protected citizens from flogging, and St. Paul asserts this right in 16^{37} 22^{25}; it exempted Jews who were also Roman citizens from the jurisdiction of the Sanhedrin and of the synagogues, though St. Paul did not always assert his exemption (2 Co $11^{24f.}$), and it gave them an appeal from a death sentence by a provincial governor (*HDB* iv. 292). In Ac 16^{37} 22^{25} the word ἀκατάκριτος ('uncondemned') does not imply that the Apostle could have been flogged after trial, which is not the case; the want of trial merely suggests the possible excuse of ignorance which the officials might have urged: St. Paul says that they *ought* to have investigated. Ramsay (*St. Paul*, p. 225) suggests that the Apostle spoke in Latin and used the phrase *re incognita* ('without investigating our case'), and that St. Luke rendered it loosely by ἀκατάκριτος.

3. Illustrations in the NT drawn from Roman or Roman-Greek law.—The following illustrations have been gathered from Galatians by Ramsay, though his conclusions have not in all cases been universally accepted. In particular, his deductions from a Roman-Syrian law-book of the 5th cent. of our era have been objected to, because of its date. But the deductions agree well with the NT, and it is highly probable that the law-book, which is of the nature of a compilation, re-echoes in a large degree the old Seleucid law.

(*a*) *Roman and Greek wills.*—The Greek will once properly executed and recorded—the recording took place in the testator's lifetime—was irrevocable, and so it is in Gal 3^{15}, where St. Paul applies the custom to the Jewish covenant or testament, while at that time a Roman will was revocable by the testator, for it was a secret document and was not recorded (Lightfoot denies that a will is intended in Gal 3^{15}, and translates 'covenant'). In He $9^{16f.}$ the will is of the Roman kind; it can take effect only after the death of the testator. The inference is that among those to whom Galatians is addressed the Romans left the older local (Greek) law on the subject untouched, and that the persons addressed therefore lived in a district that was highly Hellenized; while the persons addressed in Hebrews (Jewish Christians in Palestine, or possibly in Rome?) had received Roman law in this respect (Ramsay, *Gal.*, pp.

350 ff., 364 ff.). See also ADOPTION, § 2; HEIR, § 2.

(*b*) *Law as to coming of age.*—Here, again, Greek and Roman law differed. In Gal 4^{2} the father names the date at which the heir comes of age. In Roman law a child was under a 'tutor' till he was 14 years old, when he could make a will and dispose of his own property; then under a 'curator,' who managed the property, till he was 25. The distinction was not known at Athens, but it is found in provincial Greek cities. In 4^{2} the 'tutor' (ἐπίτροπος) and the 'curator' (οἰκονόμος) are both mentioned. But though in this respect Galatia followed Rome, it did not do so in the other respect, for the father is said to appoint (*i.e.* by will) the term during which these officers should have authority over his son (Ramsay, *Gal.*, p. 391 ff.). See HEIR, § 2.

(*c*) *Law as to the position of children.*—In this matter the Greek and the Roman law agreed, but they differed from the Hebrew law. A son of the master of the house by a slave mother was, by Greek and Roman law alike, a slave; but, according to Hebrew law, the status of the father ennobled the child, who was free. Thus Dan and Asher were not slaves, though their mothers were. Hence the illustration of Gal 4^{21-31} about the two sons of Abraham, the son of Hagar being born 'unto bondage,' would appeal to the Galatians, who lived under Roman-Greek law, while it would not appeal in the same way to one who was brought up without reference to that law (Ramsay, *Gal.*, p. 434).

4. Attitude of the law to the Christian Church.—The Roman law recognized Judaism, though it was not the State religion, as a *religio licita*; it was tolerated, and no one could be punished for being a Jew. But no religion which was not recognized by the State was lawful, and as Christianity had never been so recognized it was from that fact a *religio illicita*. It has, however, been disputed when the Roman law in this respect was first actively put into force. Many writers, especially in Germany, treat Trajan as the first real persecutor, maintaining that before his time Christianity was confused with Judaism, and that Nero and Domitian were merely capricious persecutors of individuals. A damaging indictment of this view is made by Lightfoot (*op. cit.* i. 1–17). There is no doubt that at the very first Christians were looked upon merely as Jews (*e.g.* Ac 16^{20}). At Corinth Gallio treats the question before him as one of Jewish law (18^{15}). St. Paul could hardly have held his favourable view of the State organization and of its power for furthering the gospel had it been otherwise. But it seems highly probable, if not certain, that at least from the time of Nero Christianity was looked upon as a distinct sect, and therefore as illegal. Tacitus (*Ann.* xv. 44) clearly treats it as having been a distinct religion in the time of Nero; he mentions its followers as 'those whom the common people used to call Christians'—the use of the imperfect 'appellabat' shows that he is not, as has been alleged, projecting the ideas of his own time into that of the middle of the 1st cent. (he himself was born *c.* A.D. 55). Suetonius, who was a few years younger than Tacitus, calls Christianity 'a novel and malignant superstition' (*Nero*, 16). Even had there been confusion between the two religions in Nero's time, by the time of Domitian, when Emperor-worship was enthusiastically pressed, and the Imperial policy thus became directly antagonistic to Christianity, there could be no possibility of confusing the two. The Jews themselves were active in making the distinction manifest to the authorities. In Ac 19^{33} the Jews put forward Alexander for this very purpose. And it is inconceivable that they would allow a confusion so injurious to themselves to continue. It was not necessary that a distinct edict against Christianity should have been put out, and it is quite possible that no such edict was issued until Trajan's time; the very fact that Christianity had never been recognized by the State made it unlawful. Nor is this argument weakened by the fact that there was not a continuous persecution of the Christians on the part of the Roman authorities in the 1st century. The law was there, though it was not always enforced. The same thing happened in the 2nd and 3rd centuries, and there is no dispute that Christianity was then regarded as an unlawful religion. The Church benefited by more than one interregnum of peace.

Light is thrown on the attitude of the law to Christianity by 1 P $2^{12.20}$ 4^{14}. Here St. Peter alludes to Christians being accused of crimes (2^{12}, a verse which recalls the infamous offences imputed to them in later days, the 'Thyestean banquets' and 'Œdipodean intercourse'—*i.e.* cannibalism and incest; cf. the letter of the martyrs of Vienne and Lyons given in Eus. *HE* v. 1, and Justin, *Apol.* i. 26, etc.), and also to their suffering when they do well (2^{20}), and 'for the name (ἐν ὀνόματι) of Christ' (4^{14}). Bigg (*Com.* on 2^{12}), who upholds an early date for the Epistle, maintains that this does not show that the State had as yet systematically declared against the Church; Ramsay (*The Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 245 ff., 290 ff.) thinks that these passages show that the Epistle belongs to the latter part of the 1st century. In either case Christianity is represented as an unlawful religion, and Christians suffer 'for the name' (*i.e.* for being Christians, without any moral crime being attributed to them). Thus at least before the time of Domitian all confusion with Judaism must have ceased. The same thing may be gathered from the Apocalypse, which (at any rate in its present form) is probably of the time of that Emperor.

It is agreed by all that the law in the time of Trajan regarded Christianity *per se* as unlawful. In his letter to Pliny the Emperor says that Christians are not to be sought out, but that if they are accused and convicted they are to be punished, though not if they apostatize (see the text in Lightfoot, 'Ignatius'², i. 53 f.). But there is no trace whatever of a new policy having been instituted by Trajan.

The law condemned secret societies, and this was perhaps the chief cause of Trajan's attitude to Christianity. He was energetic in suppressing clubs and gilds; whether religious or not, and whether in themselves innocent or not, he considered them dangerous as being liable to be used for political purposes (see the examples collected by Lightfoot, *op. cit.* i. p. 18 ff.). The meetings of the Christians for Eucharist and Agape would at once rouse his antagonism. Pliny, in his letter to Trajan (*Ep.* 96), therefore reports the assemblies of the Christians 'on a fixed day before light,' but emphasizes their innocent character: at the first meeting (*i.e.* the Eucharist) they bound themselves by an oath (*sacramento*) not to do wrong; at the second (*i.e.* the Agape, held later in the day) they met to take food, 'promiscuum tamen et innoxium'; but the latter assembly was discontinued after Pliny's edict, because he had forbidden gild meetings (*hetœrias*) according to Trajan's command. Pliny apparently considered that the Christians were no longer a gild, because they gave up their common meal; he probably did not understand the nature of the Eucharist (there seems to be some confusion about his use of the word *sacramentum*), or at any rate he did not consider that it came under this head.

LITERATURE.—**W. M. Ramsay**, *A Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, London, 1899, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, do., 1895, *The Church in the Roman Empire before A.D. 170*, do., 1893; **E. Hicks**, *Traces of Greek Philosophy and Roman Law in the NT*, do., 1896; **W. E. Ball**, *St. Paul and the Roman Law*, Edinburgh, 1901; **R. B. Rackham**, *The Acts of the Apostles*^{2} (*Westminster Commentaries*), London, 1901. On the attitude of Roman law to the Church see **H. B. Swete**, *The Apocalypse of St. John*^{2}, do., 1907; **C. Bigg**, *The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude* (*ICC*), Edinburgh, 1901; **J. B. Lightfoot**, *The Apostolic Fathers*, pt. ii., 'Ignatius'^{2}, London, 1889, i.

A. J. MACLEAN.

ROMANS, EPISTLE TO THE.—1. Date and destination.—The Epistle is usually supposed to have been written to Rome ($1^{7.\ 15}$) from Corinth during the visit of Ac $20^{3f.}$, *i.e.* towards the close of the third missionary journey. The year will depend upon the general scheme of chronology adopted for St. Paul's life; *c.* A.D. 58 is the usual date. The grounds on which this view is based are:

(1) The reference to the collection for the saints ($15^{23ff.}$). This is prominent in 1 and 2 Cor. (1 Co 16^1, 2 Co 8^3), which belong to the same period of St. Paul's life, and is mentioned incidentally in Ac 24^{17} as forming part of the purpose of the final visit to Jerusalem. According to Ro 15 the collection is nearing completion, and St. Paul is about to start for Jerusalem; this points precisely to the circumstances of Ac 20.

(2) Ac 19^{21} shows that the Apostle had in mind at this time a visit to Rome, which again corresponds exactly to the indications afforded by Ro $15^{23ff.}$; cf. 1^{10}.

(3) Timothy and Sosipater (16^{21}) were with St. Paul at this period (Ac 20^4). The fact that the other travelling companions of Ac 20 do not happen to be mentioned creates no difficulty; they may have had no connexion with Rome, or they may not yet have joined St. Paul.

(4) Phœbe, a 'deaconess' of Cenchreæ, the port of Corinth, is prominently mentioned (16^1); possibly she is the bearer of the Epistle.

(5) Gaius is the Apostle's host (16^{23}), and we hear also of a Gaius at Corinth, evidently in close personal relation to St. Paul, since he was one of the few baptized by him (1 Co 1^{14}).

(6) We hear of Erastus, chamberlain of the city (16^{23}); in 2 Ti 4^{20} we read that an Erastus was left at Corinth, which may thus have been his home.

Some of these indications are slight; (3) cannot be pressed, and the force of the references to Gaius and Erastus is weakened by the frequency of the names. But the first two cross-correspondences are very strong, and the data fit in so exactly with what we know of St. Paul's movements at this period that the commonly accepted placing of the Epistle might be regarded as indisputable, if it were not that it rests upon an assumption which may be questioned, as taking for granted its integrity. The indications come from the last two chapters; did these form part of the original Epistle? In particular, even if ch. 15 is accepted, can we safely use ch. 16?

2. Integrity.—There are here two distinct, though possibly related, problems to be considered: (*a*) the original destination of ch. 16, (*b*) the existence of a short recension of the Epistle.

(*a*) *Was ch. 16 originally addressed to Rome?*—We are at once struck by the fact that though St. Paul has never visited Rome, and in the body of the Epistle betrays no detailed acquaintance with local conditions, yet according to 16^{3-16} he seems to have a large number of friends there. Indeed the list of persons greeted is longer than in any other Epistle, and personal details are mentioned freely in a way which suggests a considerable knowledge of the work of the church. It is therefore widely held that vv.$^{1-23}$ (the concluding doxology offers a separate problem which will be considered under (*b*)) would be more in place if addressed to some church where St. Paul had made a long stay. Ephesus best satisfies the conditions at this period, and indeed two features point to it directly.

(1) In v.^{5b} we find a greeting to Epænetus, who is called 'the firstfruits of Asia.'[*] Of course he may have moved to Rome, and St. Paul may be commending him to his new home, but the words are more naturally explained as addressed to the church of which Epænetus is the oldest member; and in 'Asia' St. Paul first preached at Ephesus.

(2) Of greater significance is the reference to Prisca and Aquila ('Salute Prisca and Aquila . . . and the church in their house,' $16^{3f.}$). We learn from Acts that they had come from Rome to Corinth, where they had met St. Paul; thence they accompanied him to Ephesus (Ac 18) and remained there. In 1 Co 16^{19}, written from that city shortly before the date usually assigned to Romans, they are there still, and St. Paul sends a greeting from them and from the church in their house; similarly in 2 Ti 4^{19} he sends greetings to them, again at Ephesus. Hence Ephesus evidently became their home. It is of course possible that at the time when Romans was written they might have returned temporarily to Rome to settle their business affairs; their expulsion perhaps left them but little time to put them in order; but the strange thing is that when they were in Rome only for a short visit their house should there, as well as at Ephesus, be the meeting-place of the local church.

These facts, then, suggest that the verses are really a fragment of a letter addressed to Ephesus. It may be added that the sudden outburst in v.$^{17ff.}$ is certainly surprising if meant for Rome; it is severe and emphatic in tone, and suggests that St. Paul is speaking of an existing danger, not of something which may happen, and yet the body of the Epistle gives no hint of the presence there of false teachers of this type (see § **4**).

On the other side the attempt is made to rebut these arguments by considerations derived from inscriptions and from archæological evidence.[†] It is pointed out that most of the names in this chapter can be paralleled from inscriptions found in Rome; it is not suggested that these refer to the actual people mentioned by St. Paul, but that 'such a combination of names—Greek, Jewish, and Latin—could as a matter of fact be found only in the mixed population which formed the lower and middle classes of Rome' (Sanday-Headlam, p. xciv). We have, however, to allow for the fact that the *corpus* of Roman inscriptions has been greater than those of other places. As inscriptions, *e.g.* from Asia Minor, are studied and catalogued, more and more of the names of this chapter are found in them too, so that the argument is somewhat precarious.[‡] Again, much stress cannot be laid on the attempts to trace on antiquarian grounds evidence of an early connexion of Prisca and Aquila with Rome. It is possible that the households of Aristobulus and Narcissus (vv.$^{10.\ 11}$) may refer to the slaves of the Imperial household inherited from Aristobulus, the grandson of Herod the Great, and to those of the Narcissus who was executed by Agrippina, but again the names are common, and, as Lake points out, we should expect οἱ Ναρκισσιανοὶ instead of οἱ Ναρκίσσου, words ending in *-ani* being usually transliterated. The most that can be said is that while these expressions suit Rome, they do not positively demand it.

---

[*] AV 'firstfruits of Achaia' rests on poor MSS evidence, and is contradicted by 1 Co 16^{15}, where Stephanas is so described.

[†] See the discussions in Lightfoot, *Philippians*^{4}, London, 1878 (detached note on 'Cæsar's Household,' p. 171 ff.), Sanday-Headlam, *ICC*, 'Romans'^{5}, pp. xciv ff., 418 ff., with criticisms in K. Lake, *Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, London, 1911, p. 330 ff.

[‡] 'To describe the personal names in Rom. xvi. as specifically Roman on the strength of inscriptions found in the city of Rome is about as safe as to describe *Wilhelm*, *Friedrich*, *Luise* as specifically Berlin names because they are found on Berlin tombstones. The names referred to are found swarming in inscriptions, papyri, and ostraca all over the Mediterranean world' (Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, Eng. tr., London, 1911, p. 278, n. 1). Similarly G. Milligan, *The New Testament Documents*, do., 1913, p. 183, n. 1.

Our conclusion may be that, though it is not impossible that this section may be an integral part of the Epistle, it is more probable that it was addressed to a church St. Paul had visited, and that the indications point to Ephesus. No doubt this conclusion would be more readily accepted if it were possible to give a reasonable explanation of the way in which the chapter came to be attached to this particular Epistle; a suggestion will be made when we come to deal with the next problem. Meanwhile it need only be added that those who regard the verses as misplaced often see in them a letter,[*] or part of a letter, commending Phœbe (see v.^{1}) to Ephesus (Renan, etc.). Gifford[†] and others suggest that it may have been written to Rome after St. Paul's first imprisonment there; this would explain the large circle of acquaintances (but not the references to Aquila and Prisca, or Epænetus), and it might easily become attached to the earlier letter. It should be clearly understood that very few critics question the Pauline authorship of the chapter; the doubt is whether it is in its right place.

(*b*) *The short recension.*—This problem is not a little complicated, and its study requires some knowledge of the principles of NT criticism. It will be best to state the facts before proceeding to discuss the solutions which have been offered.

(1) *Evidence that a recension of the Epistle existed which omitted chs. 15, 16.*—It should be understood that no extant MS omits these chs.; the evidence is indirect. (*α*) In the *breves* or chapter-headings[‡] of the Codex Amiatinus of the Vulgate (a system found in many other MSS) the 50th 'chapter' clearly describes Ro 14^{15-23}, and the 51st, and last, the doxology (16^{25-27}), the remainder of 15 and 16 being omitted. In the same way the *breves* of Codex Fuldensis point to a similar text, without the doxology, while the concordance, or harmony, of the Pauline Epistles found in the Codex Morbacensis unmistakably implies the use of the Amiatine *breves* based on the short recension.

(*β*) Neither Cyprian, Tertullian, nor Irenæus quotes from the last two chs.;[§] 'the argument from silence,' often so dangerous, is here significant. (i.) We should expect Cyprian in his *Testimonia* to use Ro 16^{17} under the headings which refer to the duty of avoiding heretics; (ii.) Tertullian (*adv. Marc.* v. 14) quotes 14^{10} as occurring *in clausula, i.e.* in the closing section, of the Epistle, while he does not use against Marcion any of the obvious passages from 15–16, or accuse him of having cut them out of the Epistle.

(*γ*) Origen does in fact say that Marcion 'removed' (*abstulit*) the final doxology and 'cut away' (*dissecuit*)[‖] the last two chapters. This agrees with the evidence from Tertullian just quoted, though, as we have said, he does not accuse Marcion of tampering with the text; their copies apparently agreed.

(*δ*) In the group of MSS DEFG, which seem to come from a common ancestor, it is argued that the text of the last two chs. is so different from that of the rest of the Epistle that somewhere in the line of transmission there must have come a MS containing only 1–14, which was supplemented from some other source for chs. 15–16. It is probable that this archetype also omitted the doxology.[*]

(2) *The position of the final doxology.*—It should be carefully noted that there is no break in thought between chs. 14 and 15 (our present chapter divisions are late and do not always correspond to breaks in the sense), and the chs. as they stand offer a reasonably connected sequence of thought, except for the fact that there seem to be several distinct endings—15^{33}, $16^{20.\,25-27}$. But when we come to examine the textual phenomena the case is even more complicated. In some MSS and Fathers (Chrysostom, Theodoret, etc.), representing the Antiochene text, the last three verses, which it will be convenient to refer to as 'the doxology,' are found at the close of ch. 14; Origen also knew of codices in which this was the case. A few authorities, including A, have it both there and at the end. FGg and a few other authorities omit the doxology altogether, as we know was the case with Marcion. The variation in the position of 'the Grace' (16^{20}), which is inserted in some MSS after 16^{23} and in TR by a natural conflation in both places, is additional evidence of the existence of copies which did not end with the doxology.

It will be understood that the evidence for the doxology after 14^{23} is also evidence for the existence of a short recension, since the doxology cannot have stood originally between 14^{23} and 15^1, making a complete break in the sense. Its position there can only imply that the Epistle ended, or was supposed to end, at that point.

(3) *Omission of the address to Rome.*—There is evidence that the text used by Origen and Ambrosiaster omitted ἐν Ῥώμῃ ('in Rome') in $1^{7.\,15}$, and read ἐν ἀγάπῃ ('in love'), which is actually the reading of G.[†] It should be remarked that these authorities coincide with part of the evidence for the short recension, a point which may or may not be significant.

We have, then, these three textual phenomena—the existence of a short recension of the Epistle; the displacement, or omission, of the doxology; and the omission of the words 'in Rome'—together with the doubt attaching to the original destination of 16^{23}, though it is not yet clear how far they are all connected. The primary problem is to explain the short recension and the displacement of the doxology, which do undoubtedly stand in close relation to one another. Any solution must account for the fact, to which attention has already been called, of the close connexion of thought between 14^{23} and 15^1. How then did the Epistle come to be truncated at this point, and the doxology to be inserted there? This consideration seems fatal to views such as those which regard chs. 15–16 as altogether unauthentic (Baur), or as belonging to a different recension of the Epistle made by St. Paul himself (Renan, Lightfoot, Lake). It is very difficult to believe that it ever ended with 14^{23}, with or without the doxology.

The most popular explanation, therefore, is that adopted tentatively by Sanday-Headlam, following

---

[*] According to Deissmann (*Light from the Ancient East*, p. 226), 'there is no lack of analogies for a letter of recommendation plunging at once in medias res and beginning with "I commend."' He suggests that the short letter to Ephesus followed that to Romans in the letter-book (a book containing copies of letters sent or received) of Tertius, St. Paul's amanuensis.

[†] For this and other theories see Moffatt, *LNT*, p. 138.

[‡] It must be remembered that the 'chapters' or sections referred to are not our present chapters.

[§] According to Moffatt (p. 140), Clement of Alexandria and Origen are the only Ante-Nicene Fathers who do so.

[‖] On the whole, it is not probable that this means merely 'separated off' or 'cut about.' Hort tries to explain away Origen's evidence, but he has not been generally followed; see Sanday-Headlam, p. xc; Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, London, 1893, p. 287 ff. (including a paper by Hort).

[*] Lake, *Earlier Epistles*, p. 341; Sanday-Headlam, p. xcviii.

[†] For details see Lake, *op. cit.*, p. 346, who supplements Sanday-Headlam, *ad loc.*, by calling attention to the fact, discovered only in 1897, that the scholiast of cod. 47 was really using Origen. Lightfoot (*Biblical Essays*, p. 287) points out that Rufinus' Latin text of Origen also implies the omission.

Gifford. They suppose the short recension, with the consequent confusion of text, to be due to Marcion. They point out truly enough that the opening verses of ch. 15 contradict his teaching entirely, and that he could not possibly have admitted them. He therefore cut them out, as Origen apparently says, and it is supposed that this influenced later orthodox practice. 'When in adapting the text for the purposes of church use it was thought advisable to omit the last portions as too personal and not sufficiently edifying, it was natural to make the division at a place where in a current edition the break had already been made.'* The doxology was afterwards replaced at the end of ch. 14, while Marcion is also supposed to be responsible for the omission of the words 'in Rome,' which he struck out as an unimportant local allusion.

The theory has, however, been criticized by Lake.† It implies that Marcion had a greater influence than is altogether probable on the formation of the canon of the Pauline Epistles and on the text of the NT; von Soden's estimate of the extent of this influence has not been generally accepted. Further, Tertullian seems to have used the short recension, and his *corpus* was independent of Marcion's; this fact and the widespread nature of the evidence for the omission of the last two chs. suggest that catholic collections of the Epistles, containing only the short recension, existed before Marcion. The charge that he cut the chs. out may only mean that they did not in fact stand in the copies he used.

As to his supposed responsibility for the omission of the reference to Rome, Lake points out that it is clear from the recently discovered Marcionite prologues that he did in fact describe the Epistle as 'to the Romans' in the usual way.

To these criticisms we may add others which are no less damaging. What evidence is there of any serious manipulation of the Epistles in order to fit them for ecclesiastical use? There is, *e.g.*, no trace of the omission of 1 Co 16, which is equally local and personal. And if this was done in the case of Romans, how came the doxology to be re-inserted? It can have come only from a MS which had the complete ending, and in that case surely 15^{1-13}, which is in every way suited for public reading, would have been restored at the same time.

Lake himself has a fresh theory. He suggests that the original Epistle consisted of chs. 1–14, with or without the doxology, and without the mention of Rome; this was sent as a circular letter, dealing with the Judaistic propaganda, to churches St. Paul had never visited, and belongs to the same period as Galatians. The latter Lake regards as the earliest of the Pauline Epistles, written before the Council of Ac 15. Later on St. Paul sent a copy of the letter to Rome, adding ch. 15, and ch. 16, if it really belongs to the Epistle. It is obvious to compare the relation of Ephesians, also regarded as a circular letter, to Colossians, written at the same time and closely resembling it. The theory has the advantage of accounting for the partial identity of the witnesses for the omission of the last two chs. and of the reference to Rome, and it is also attractive to those who, like the present writer, agree that Galatians is the earliest Pauline Epistle, since it accounts for the similarity of style and language between it and Romans, but it still seems to fail at the crucial point. It does not explain the break after 14^{23}, since it is very difficult to believe that the Epistle ever ended there, whether with or without the doxology, which Lake indeed is inclined to regard as unauthentic. The close is too abrupt, and 15^{1-13} does not read as an afterthought. Further, ch. 1, even without the reference to Rome, gives the impression of being addressed to a particular church; it is more definite in tone than Ephesians.

The present writer is inclined to suggest a fresh theory, based on a hint given by Lake himself. He calls attention to the fact that in the Muratorian Canon Romans stood last of the Epistles to the Churches, and that it was also last in Tertullian's, Cyprian's, and Origen's collections. We may remark that, being the longest and most important of the Epistles, it might equally well stand first, as in our own canon, or last, as in these, there being no attempt at chronological order in either. There is also good ground for regarding the doxology as not genuine. Its length and its position at the close of the Epistle are without parallel in the letters of St. Paul, and the language is to some extent un-Pauline (see Moffatt, p. 135). No doubt this would not be sufficient to justify our rejecting it if there were no other grounds for suspicion. But the fact of a passage being found in different places in our MSS always suggests the possibility that it is a later addition (cf. the 'Pericope' in Jn $7^{53ff.}$), so the internal and the external lines of evidence here confirm one another. As Lake points out, it is a habit of scribes to add doxologies at the close of books or collections of books (cf. the doxology at the end of each book of the Pss.); this doxology may therefore have been inserted to mark the close of the Pauline *corpus*. We may, however, go further, and find here the key to the whole problem. (1) The Epistle may have originally ended with 15^{33}; the short prayer is quite in keeping with St. Paul's practice. (2) The last page of the MS or roll was lost, leaving only chs. 1–14 (cf. the lost ending of Mk.). (3) To this, standing at the end of a collection of Pauline letters, the doxology was added. (4) The lost conclusion was then copied in from some other source, and ch. 16, a genuine fragment of the Pauline correspondence, was also added as a sort of postscript to the *corpus*. (5) It was realized that the doxology was out of place, and it was transferred to the end, whether regarded by now as an integral part of the Epistle or not. If the process seems complicated, it will be seen that each step, with the exception of (1) and the first part of (4), is in fact represented by some part of our evidence; the variations are themselves so many that any theory which is to account for them must be somewhat complex. It may be added that the theory can in fact be presented in a simpler form if we regard ch. 16 as an integral part of the Epistle. We need only suppose, then, that the last two chs. were lost, the doxology added after ch. 14, and then transferred to the end of ch. 16 when the missing chs. had been replaced.

It is true that this hypothesis offers no explanation of the omission of the words 'in Rome.' But, as we have seen, the attempts of Sanday-Headlam and Lake to bring them into connexion with the short recension are not very successful; it only remains, therefore, to regard this as a primitive textual error, or perhaps as a deliberate omission made in order to 'catholicize' the Epistle.

Since the discussion of these textual phenomena has been of necessity somewhat long, it may be well to point out their bearing on the general view of the date and destination of the Epistle. Roughly speaking, they leave it unchanged on any theory which regards ch. 15 as genuine, whether belonging to a first or to a second edition. Rome remains as the destination, and the closing period of the third missionary journey as the date. The rejection of ch. 16 only removes the reference to Corinth as the place of writing. It must, however, be remembered that if Lake's view that the Epistle was not originally intended for Rome be accepted, the reference of the details of the Epistle to the circumstances of the Roman Church will fall to the ground.

---

* Sanday-Headlam, p. xcvii.

† *Earlier Epistles*, p. 350 ff.

3. Authenticity.—The Pauline authorship of the Epistle is practically undisputed, except by the Dutch School. But since their views have found no foothold even among the most advanced critics, it does not seem necessary to discuss them here. The curious English reader may find them stated by W. C. von Manen in *EBi*, *s.v.* 'Romans (Epistle),' with a refutation in the same Encyclopædia by P. W. Schmiedel, *s.v.* 'Galatians'; see also R. J. Knowling, *Witness of the Epistles*, London, 1892, p. 133 ff., *Testimony of St. Paul to Christ*, do., 1905, p. 34 ff., and Lake, *Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, p. 421 ff. The external evidence for Romans is in fact peculiarly strong. It begins with 1 Peter, and perhaps with Hebrews and James (see § 9), and clear traces, though without definite quotation, are found in Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, and Justin Martyr (see full quotations and references in Sanday-Headlam, p. lxxix ff.; Moffatt, p. 148). Marcion (*c.* A.D. 140) is the first to mention the Epistle by name; from the time of Irenæus onwards we have numerous direct quotations. In the Muratorian Canon it stands the last of the seven Epistles to the Churches.

4. Purpose of the Epistle.—It seems obvious at first sight to look for the object of the Epistle in circumstances connected with the Roman Church. Most of St. Paul's letters are in fact *pièces d'occasion*, called forth by special difficulties or dangers arising in churches in which he is interested; the Epistles to Galatia and Corinth are the outstanding examples. Accordingly, attempts have been made (Baur, etc.) to reconstruct from hints afforded by the Epistle the conditions of the Christian community in Rome, and the relations existing between its Jewish and Gentile elements; the 'strong' and the 'weak' of chs. 14, 15 are identified with parties supposed to have arisen there; and from these features so discovered the main purpose of the Epistle is deduced. It will not be denied that this method is justifiable in certain cases, but it is questionable whether it gives us the right point of view from which to approach this particular Epistle. For Romans is distinguished from the other Epistles just named by two important features. (*a*) It is addressed to a church which St. Paul has not founded, or even visited. He must therefore have been dependent upon reports received from others for any knowledge of its difficulties or of the various influences at work. No doubt such reports were available (?Prisca), but (*b*) the Epistle itself does not suggest that it was written in view of them. There is no hint in it* that St. Paul's purpose is to counteract errors or divisions which he has reason to believe have actually arisen. Indeed, he seems to safeguard himself from being supposed to do so (15^{14}), and suggests that his object is the imparting of a spiritual gift (1^{11} 15^{15}). He does not insist on his authority as an apostle except in the opening section. What he does insist on is his desire and frustrated attempts to visit Rome (1^{13} $15^{22\text{ff.}}$). It would appear, therefore, that the letter is intended partly to take the place of this visit, and partly to prepare the way for it, if it should be possible in the future. Remembering the circumstances under which it was written, we can hardly doubt that the writer was acutely conscious that the visit might in fact never take place. Already we have hints of the premonitions as to the result of the journey to Jerusalem (15^{31}), which soon became still more defined (Ac 20^{22} $21^{10\text{ff.}}$). St. Paul realized the outstanding importance of Rome and a church there both at the moment and still more for the future. He may well have felt that in case he should never be able to go there himself he would wish that church to have some permanent record of his teaching. The Epistle is not a formal compendium of Paulinism, but it is the longest and most carefully thought-out statement of his views on certain points, and we may conjecture that, though addressed to Rome, St. Paul had in mind the possibility of its penetrating to other churches.* In other words, the letter does not arise primarily from a desire to meet a particular situation in the Roman Church; it arises from the wish to put it and others in possession of his views in some more or less permanent form. Apart from the few personal references, it might have been equally well written to any church, and we can draw few conclusions from it as to the circumstances of the Roman Church in particular. The Epistle, however, remains of the greatest value as affording material for the reconstruction of the thought and conditions of Apostolic Christianity. It tells us the kind of questions St. Paul found men asking generally, the difficulties they felt, and the forms of error to which they were exposed. For the particular examples he had in mind we should probably look to the churches he knew, or even to the church in which he happened to be writing, rather than to Rome.

In the light of these considerations we may examine two questions which have bulked large in discussions of the Epistle.

(*a*) *Was St. Paul writing to Jews or to Gentiles?*—Certain passages imply clearly that he has Gentiles in mind; *e.g.* $1^{5\text{f.}}$, 'Among all the nations [*i.e.* Gentiles, ἔθνεσιν] . . . among whom are ye also'; v.^{13}, 'That I might have some fruit in you also, even as in the rest of the Gentiles'; 11^{13}, 'I speak to you that are Gentiles.' But the curious thing is that there are other sections in which the writer seems to associate his readers no less decisively with himself as fellow-Jews—4^{1}, 'Abraham, our forefather according to the flesh'; 7^{6}, 'We have been discharged from the law'; 9^{10}, 'Our father Isaac.' Further, the general argument of the Epistle presupposes acquaintance with Jewish Scriptures and ways of thought, and is addressed to Jewish as much as to Gentile Christians. In Galatians, on the contrary, St. Paul addresses his readers as those who have *not* been under the Law, though in 1 Co 10^{1}, written to a Gentile church, he speaks of 'our fathers.' The obvious conclusion is that in Romans he has both Jews and Gentiles in mind, and the combination is made easier when we remember that many of the latter approached Christianity by way of the Synagogue, while some would even have been proselytes. A. Robertson, (*HDB* iv. 298^{b}) suggests that these predominated and 'gave the tone to the community,' *sc.* of the Christian Church in Rome. If, however, what has been said above holds good, we shall be cautious about drawing from the Epistle conclusions as to the composition of the Roman Church. Baur, followed by Mangold and others, argues that it was predominantly Jewish and a stronghold of Judaistic Christianity. In this, however, he has not been generally followed, and *a priori* considerations confirm what we gather from our sources as to the origin of the Roman Church, leading us to suppose that it contained both elements. The Epistle implies that the relation between Jew and Gentile Christians would be likely to arise in that church, but it does not suggest that it was a burning question, as in Galatia, or that Judaistic teaching had already obtained a strong footing there.

---

* Except 16^{17}, on which see § 2 (*a*).

* Note, however, that it is not 'a circular letter' (see § 2 (*b*)); the references to Rome in both ch. 1 and ch. 15 are quite definite so far as they go.

(*b*) *What teaching is St. Paul combating in chs. 14, 15?*—In other words, who are 'the weak' and 'the strong'? In these chs. St. Paul discusses questions as to food and the observance of days. 'One man hath faith to eat all things: but he that is weak eateth herbs' (14^{2}); 'One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike' (v.^{5}); 'It is good not to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor to do anything whereby thy brother stumbleth' (v.^{21}); 'We that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak' (15^{1}). Here again it has been assumed that the reference is to definite parties or sects existing in Rome, and the attempt has been made to identify them on this basis. It is suggested that the ascetics were Judaizers (Origen, etc.), but the obvious difficulty arises that the reference is not to scruples about eating things offered to idols as at Corinth,* but to abstinence from meat and wine altogether, which was in no way characteristic of the party of the circumcision. More probable is the view that Essene † practices are referred to (Liddon, Lightfoot, Gifford), or vegetarian ascetics of the type mentioned by Seneca; Baur suggests Ebionites, who seem, however, to belong to a later period. Any of these ideas may have been in St. Paul's mind, but the point is that it is by no means certain that he was referring to any particular sect in Rome; he mentions abstinence from meat as 'a typical instance of excessive scrupulousness' (Sanday-Headlam, p. 402). We conclude that the whole passage is probably due not to anything which St. Paul has heard of as going on in Rome, but to tendencies which he has found at work in the churches he knows, and particularly in Corinth, where he is perhaps writing.‡ The passage is not an answer to a question or a report, but he knows that errors which have arisen in the Church at large are sure to be represented sooner or later in Rome.

In the light of these considerations we may also answer the question as to

(*c*) *How far Romans is a true letter.*—Deissmann (*Light from the Ancient East*, p. 225), arguing on the basis of the recently discovered papyri and the light thrown by them on the language and methods of NT writers, has gone very far in the denial of any literary character to the Epistles; § 'The letters of Paul are not literary; they are real letters, not epistles; they were written by Paul not for the public and posterity, but for the persons to whom they are addressed. Almost all the mistakes that have ever been made in the study of St. Paul's life and work have arisen from neglect of the fact that his writings are non-literary and letter-like in character.' He admits that Romans is at first sight least like a letter, but he still persists in including it in his category: 'Here also, therefore, if we would understand its true significance, we must banish all thought of things literary' (p. 231). No doubt the warning is valuable against exaggerations; no one of the Epistles, not even Romans, is a theological treatise in which the epistolary form is adopted as a mere literary device; in their interpretation we must always allow for the personal factor and also for the special circumstances in which they were produced. At the same time Deissmann has carried his thesis too far. We may quote on the other side one who is equally qualified to speak from the point of view of the new discoveries: 'The letters of St. Paul may not be epistles, if by that we are to understand literary compositions written without any thought of a particular body of readers. At the same time, in view of the tone of authority adopted by their author, and the general principles with which they deal, they are equally far removed from the unstudied expression of personal feeling, which we associate with the idea of a true letter. And if we are to describe them as letters at all, it is well to define the term still further by the addition of some such distinguishing epithet as "missionary" or "pastoral." It is not merely St. Paul the man, but St. Paul the spiritual teacher and guide who speaks in them throughout' (Milligan, *The New Testament Documents*, London, 1913, p. 95).

If this applies generally, it applies with special force to Romans, which has in it something both of the manifesto and of the homily.

5. The primitive Roman Church.—The bearing of the Epistle on the composition of the Roman Church and its supposed parties has already been discussed (§ 4). It remains to put together what we can gather as to the character of the community addressed by St. Paul. Since the time of Pompey (63 B.C.) there had been considerable settlements of Jews in Rome, and Latin literature is full of references to them, mostly of an unfavourable character (see quotations in Sanday-Headlam, p. xix ff.). We may therefore safely assume that there would also be in Rome large numbers of those proselytes and 'God-fearers,' attracted by the monotheism and ethical teaching of the Synagogue, from whom St. Paul and early Christian missionaries in general drew many of their converts. The importance of the Jewish community also implies frequent direct contact between Rome and Jerusalem (cf. the connexion of the Herods with the Imperial Court). There was a synagogue of Roman *libertini* at Jerusalem (Ac 6^{9}), and strangers from Rome, 'Jews and proselytes,' are mentioned among the first hearers of the gospel on the day of Pentecost (2^{10}). It is not unreasonable to trace the first beginnings of Christianity in Rome to this fact. But possibly more important was the constant intercourse between such cities as Ephesus and Corinth and the capital. A Christian church would be founded there almost imperceptibly, owing to the visits and migrations of converts, each of whom, after the manner of the first generations of Christianity, became a centre of missionary effort. There is at any rate no evidence of any definite propaganda in Rome on the part of Peter or any other of the apostles before the period of our Epistle. The stories of an early preaching of Peter (*q.v.*) in the capital are comparatively late and unsupported. Our oldest authorities speak only of his martyrdom there at a later date. The evidence of Romans itself is certainly against any idea that he had visited Rome before the writing of the Epistle. It is true that the interpretation of 15^{20} is not undisputed, Lake and others seeing in the 'hindrance' the fact that the church had actually been founded by another—presumably St. Peter. But a careful reading of the passage shows that v.^{22}, 'wherefore I was hindered these many times from coming to you,' refers to the urgent necessity under which St. Paul had lain of preaching in other districts first, not to the objection of intruding on another's foundation. He clearly implies that the 'hindrance' has now been removed; he has, in fact, 'no more any further place in these regions'; *i.e.* he has done his work. On the other hand, the objection that Rome was another man's foundation would be valid permanently, and it is most improbable that in these circumstances St. Paul would even have written to the Roman Church, at any rate without making the least reference to St. Peter's work and position there. There would not, however, be the same objection to writing to or visiting a community in which Christianity had simply sprung up, as it were, of itself.

---

* It is in fact doubtful whether these Corinthian 'Puritans' were Judaizers at all, at any rate of the ordinary type; see Lake, *Earlier Epistles*, p. 219 ff.

† It is not, however, quite certain that these practised vegetarianism; see Lietzmann, *Com. ad loc.*, for the various traces of this type of asceticism in different quarters.

‡ For scrupulousness as to days see Gal 4^{10} and Col 2^{16}, where meat and drink are also mentioned; for these cf. 1 Ti 4^{3}.

§ Cf. also the same writer's *Paulus*, Tübingen, 1911, p. 4 ff., Eng. tr., London, 1912, p. 9 ff.

The remark of Suetonius (*Claud.* 25) that Claudius 'Judæos, impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes, Roma expulit' (confirmed by Ac 18^{2}) may well be an indication of the existence of Christianity in Rome *c.* A.D. 52.* It is true that 'Chrestus' may be the name of an actual individual (it was a common slave name), but more probably it represents 'Christus,' in which case we have a hint either of some Messianic disturbance of a general character or else, more specifically, of troubles arising between Jews and Christians owing to the preaching of Jesus as Christ. The Roman historian might easily suppose from hearing the name that Christus, or Chrestus, was the actual ringleader. It may be that the reminder in Ro $13^{1ff.}$ of the duty of proper submission to the civil power has a special reference to this event; Christians are to hold aloof from every type of lawless action, and from anything which might lead, however unintentionally, to collision with those responsible for law and order. Lake, however (*Earlier Epistles*, p. 392 ff.), suggests that the passage is more general and refers to the danger of being mixed up in the agitations and abortive rebellions of the Zealots. It is at any rate important as reflecting the Pauline and Lucan attitude to the Imperial power, in strong contrast to the hostility of the Apocalypse. And, written to Rome, it might have a considerable apologetic value if a copy of the Epistle chanced to come into the hands of anyone connected with the Court.

We may now consider what light is thrown by the Epistle on the circumstances of the Roman Church. It has already been pointed out that it is precarious to argue too definitely from it to the conditions supposed to exist at Rome, and we must bear in mind that the destination of ch. 16, with its personal references, is doubtful. But, whether this ch. refers to Rome or to Ephesus, it is equally valuable as giving some indication of the wide spread of Christianity at this period among different classes and races. Slaves and freedmen are largely, but not exclusively, represented. If Narcissus is the freedman of Claudius, and Aristobulus (v.^{10}) the grandson of Herod the Great (see § 2 (*a*)), it is interesting to find that Christianity had reached their households, *i.e.* their slaves and entourage. But if these identifications be rejected, we then probably have the names of prominent and presumably more or less wealthy members of the church. The ch. also suggests that the community is organized in groups and household churches, and this harmonizes with other indications afforded by the Epistle which, in common with others of the same period, has no reference to a developed ministry. We hear only generally of men who prophesy, teach, exhort, and rule ($12^{6ff.}$), mentioned in a way which leaves it doubtful whether permanent officials are intended. Such a stage of development would be very natural in Rome, if the church had not been founded by any leading missionary but had grown up more or less haphazard. In ch. 16 the importance of the work of women is noticeable; Mary, Tryphæna and Tryphosa, and Persis are mentioned; Prisca is prominent, and Phœbe is the servant or deaconess (διάκονος) of the church at Cenchreæ; it is, however, questionable whether a definite official is meant.

Of the sacraments, baptism is taken for granted, but there is no reference to the Eucharist. Though prophecy and, in St. Paul's own case, miracles are mentioned, we do not hear of the startling gifts so prominent at Corinth. Disputes as to the relative value of *charismata* seem to lie in the background of $12^{3ff.}$, but this may only be a reflexion of St. Paul's general experience, and need not imply the actual existence of such quarrels in Rome in particular. The whole picture of church life in chs. 12, 13 is markedly sober and practical; the Christian has his trials (8, 12^{12}), but definite persecution is excluded by 13^{4}. The importance of hospitality in the primitive Church is well known; the duty would be specially urgent in Rome, whither so many travellers came (12^{13}).

6. The bearing of the Epistle on the personal history of St. Paul.—Romans is primarily important as marking a definite stage in the development of Christian doctrine, and it has comparatively little to offer with regard to the external history of St. Paul's life. There are, however, a few scattered indications which it may be well to group together. Its chief interest is with regard to the form his teaching had come to take; we find but few of those intimate personal touches in which 1 and 2 Cor. are so rich. Ch. 7 is no doubt autobiographical in the sense that it is based on personal experience, probably of struggles before conversion. At the same time the 'I' seems to be typical of the divided soul in general and not to refer to St. Paul specifically. The passionate outbursts in $9^{1ff.}$ 10^{1} throw a strong light on St. Paul's burning patriotism. It has been remarked that if he had not spent himself in the service of Jesus he would have shed his blood with other natives of Tarsus on the walls of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. As has been pointed out (§ 1), the Epistle touches the narrative of Acts at two points.

(1) It emphasizes St. Paul's strong desire to visit Rome (cf. Ac 19^{21}). Without any unworthy flattery it helps us to realize the importance he attached to that city and to its church, an importance natural to a Roman citizen who worked along the great roads and concentrated on the great towns of the Empire, and who understood to the full the opportunity afforded by the Pax Romana for the spread of Christianity. The Epistle underlines this particular feature in the Apostle's missionary policy. Whether the journey to Spain of which he speaks (Ro 15^{28}) ever took place must remain doubtful, though it may be covered by the expression of Clement of Rome (*Ep. ad Cor.* i. 5) that he reached 'the western limit of the world.' The Muratorian Fragment also speaks of a visit to Spain, but on that we can lay little stress.

The phrase 'even unto Illyricum' (15^{19}) is difficult. It seems that it does not imply an extension of St. Paul's missionary activity to the east coasts of the Adriatic, of which there is no hint in Acts, but merely that when he was in Macedonia he found himself on the border of Illyricum; this, when he wrote, formed the western limit of his preaching.

(2) The other important point of contact is the reference to the collection for the saints ($15^{25ff.}$), which appears as the main motive for the visit to Jerusalem. We see from the Epistle St. Paul's anxiety as to his reception and his keen desire that the gift should be favourably received. Romans itself is in a sense an eirenicon between Jew and Gentile, both within and without the Church (see esp. chs. 11–13), and the purpose of the Epistle is therefore in harmony with that of

---

* Under Nero (A.D. 54) the Jews again exerted considerable influence in the capital.

the visit to Jerusalem, showing that at this period St. Paul was taking particular pains both to secure unity within the Church and, if it were possible, to win over the nation as a whole.*

We should not pass over the incidental reference in 15^{19} to St. Paul's power of working miracles. It is not known what event is referred to in 16^{4}; it can hardly be the riot of Ac 19^{23}.

7. Analysis.—(*a*) *Introduction* (1^{1-17}).

1^{1-7}. Extended greeting.

1^{8-17}. Congratulations and personal notes, leading up to statement of the writer's Gentile apostleship and the theme of the Epistle—'the righteous shall live by faith.'

(*b*) *Righteousness* (1^{18}–5).

1^{18-32}. Even the Gentiles might have known God, but they have not; sin has followed ignorance, and God's anger is just.

2^{1-11}. God's judgment is universal and is only delayed in mercy (*n.b.* vv.$^{9-11}$, taking up the thought of 1^{16} and emphasizing the similarity between Jew and Gentile).

2^{12-16}. Not the possession of the Law but the doing of it is the crucial question from the point of view of God's judgment.

2^{17-29}. Do the Jews keep the Law? Certainly not. This suggests that we must look deeper to discover the true Jew and the true circumcision, which turn out to be spiritual.

3^{1-8}. Preliminary objections. What is the advantage of the Jew (the answer is not given till chs. 9–11)? Man's disobedience does not invalidate God's promises, nor may this fact be made an excuse for sin.

3^{9-20}. Universal sinfulness proved by an appeal to Scripture, as it has already been proved by the appeal to experience.

3^{21-31}. God's real method of salvation is by faith in Jesus Christ. It is connected with His death. This faith brings full forgiveness of sin and justification; it excludes all idea of personal merit and is essentially universal.

4^{1-25}. The principle considered in relation to Abraham. He was justified by his faith, not by his actions, and that before the institution of circumcision. Nor did the promise come through the Law. His faith was shown by his acceptance of the promise of a son. These facts make him the father of all believers, of whatever race (vv.$^{11.\ 12.\ 16.\ 23\text{ff.}}$).

5^{1-21}. The results of this new righteousness by faith. It carries with it the assurance of present free access to God and the hope of final salvation, guaranteed by the love of God displayed in the death of Christ. The work of Christ stands in strong contrast with the effects of Adam's fall (vv.$^{12-21}$).

(*c*) *Sanctification* (chs. 6–8).

6^{1-14}. Our baptism is a death unto sin; it therefore implies a constant conflict against evil (some interpret this passage as implying that theoretically at least the Christian cannot sin; see § 8).

6^{15}–7^{6}. This truth illustrated by the double metaphors of emancipation from slavery and of marriage.

7^{7-24}. What, then, is the position of the Law? It brings the occasion and the possibility of sin, though not itself sinful. To it is due the inward struggle in the self between good and evil ('flesh'), from which we are delivered by Christ (this section apparently refers not to the experience of the Christian but to that of the unregenerate man).

8^{1-17}. The work of the Spirit, bringing deliverance from the 'flesh' (vv.$^{1-9}$), the guarantee of bodily resurrection (vv.$^{11-13}$), of sonship and final glory.

8^{18-39}. The sorrows and yearnings of creation point forward to a future deliverance (vv.$^{18-26}$). In our present weakness we are sustained by the Spirit, and the certainty of God's final purpose for us, a purpose which nothing can hinder.

(*d*) *The problem of the rejection of Israel* (chs. 9–11).

9^{1-5}. The problem stated in its personal and general bearings.

9^{6-13}. From the first there was a progressive selection and rejection; the promise was not to all the actual descendants of Abraham.

9^{14-29}. The principles of this selection rest on the will of God as Creator (Pharaoh, and the metaphor of the potter); against these the creature has no right of complaint. The OT shows that God's choice was to embrace Gentiles as well as Jews (vv.$^{24-29}$).

9^{30}–10^{21}. Israel chose the wrong way of attaining righteousness (9^{30}–10^{3}), yet its attainment was near and easy. The universal preaching of the gospel has brought to Israel both opportunity and warning.

11^{1-10}. But after all the true Israel has always been a remnant, or small fraction, of the whole.

11^{11-36}. Their very fall has the purpose of opening the way to the admission of the Gentiles. Yet they too must beware of presuming on their position (the olive tree); the rejection of the Jew is only temporary, till the final purpose is worked out. This is one of mercy to all, based on the methods of God's working, which are unfathomable by man.

(*e*) *Practical exhortations* (chs. 12–15^{13}).

12–13. Miscellaneous exhortations, centring round the idea of peace and unity, including sections on the right use of spiritual gifts and the attitude to the civil power.

14–15^{7}. The practical problem of the relation of the weak brother to the strong within the Church.

15^{8-13}. Both Jew and Gentile have their place in the purpose of God (the return to this topic is apparently dictated by the need of insisting on unity).

(*f*) *Conclusion* (15^{14}–end).

15^{14-33}. Personal explanations; motive of the Epistle; visits to Rome and Jerusalem, and the collection for the saints.

16^{1-16}.* Greetings to various friends.

16^{17-20}. A warning against false teachers.

16^{21-23}. Greetings sent by St. Paul's companions.

16^{25-27}. Doxology.

8. The argument of the Epistle.—The problem to be solved is the method by which man may attain righteousness. The underlying idea in this is not merely salvation, regarded as something external—the winning of certain privileges and the escape from punishment. It is an inner state of the man, bringing him into a right relation to God. No doubt in virtue of this he will escape the wrath of God's righteous judgment (2^{5} 5^{9}), but this is not the primary thought. St. Paul's answer may be best understood if we approach it from the point of view of his own spiritual experience.† In this we can trace three main elements.

(*a*) There is the consciousness of his own sin and impotence; the Law had not helped him in the past to attain the righteousness he desired; it had only brought the sense of failure and of guilt, and this experience was general both with Jew and with Gentile (2. $7^{7\text{ff.}}$ 8^{3}).

---

* On this point, which has an important bearing on the reiability of the view of St. Paul's character and policy presented n Acts, see A. Harnack, *Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels*, Eng. tr., London, 1911, pp. 64, 72 ff.

* On the question whether this ch. in fact forms part of the Epistle see § 2 (*a*).

† Attempts have been made, *e.g.* by Schweitzer (*Geschichte der paulinischen Forschung*, Tübingen, 1911, p. 192), to deny the influence of St. Paul's experience, and in particular of his conversion, on his thought. It is true he does not make many direct references to this, but it is impossible to read such an Epistle as Romans sympathetically without realizing that the experience of himself and his converts is always in the background.

(*b*) On his surrender to Christ at his conversion he became conscious of an entire breach with the past and of a completely new point of view. The death and resurrection of Christ have introduced a new factor into the relation between God and man ($3^{24\text{ff.}}$ 4^{25} $5^{8\text{ff.}}$ $8^{32\text{ff.}}$). The starting-point is now what He has done, not what man can succeed in doing for himself. But this work of Christ does not remain something external to the believer; transactional theories of the Atonement and unethical views of salvation have always been based on the isolation of the work, generally the death, of Christ, regarded as a past event which the believer has only to accept. To St. Paul the Christian is identified with Christ and shares in His death, burial, and resurrection (6. $8^{10\text{f.}}$); this truth is absolutely central in his teaching. The term which he applies to this identification of the self with Christ is 'faith.' It is well known that to him faith is not the intellectual acceptance of a creed, but a personal surrender to a new power; the believer is a new creature; he is in Christ and Christ in him (see Sanday-Headlam, pp. 102, 162); faith is inseparable from the mystical union. The external method by which the union is effected is baptism. With regard to this it must be remembered that to St. Paul and to the first Christians in general baptism was always the accompaniment of a definite conversion and change of life, by which the convert died in a very real sense to the old past, turning his back not only on its sins, but on its religious beliefs and practices, its habits of life, and very often on its friendships and social ties. The primary result of this new experience is a sense of forgiveness or justification (3^{24}, etc.); the believer, having died to the sinful past, can now be 'treated as righteous' before God; he starts afresh * (see, further, JUSTIFICATION).

(*c*) The third element is the sense of new power which comes from the union with Christ. This may be described as sanctification through the Spirit, or as a present sharing of the resurrection of Christ ($6^{4.\ 11}$ 7^{4} 8^{10}); it is very difficult to trace any real or final distinction between the Spirit and Christ (cf. the interchange of terms in Ro 8). That the sense of the possession of the Spirit is primarily based on experience comes out most clearly in the question of Gal 3^{2}, which is the starting-point of St. Paul's argument, 'Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?' It is common ground that a new force has come into the convert's life; the only question is whether it is to be ascribed to the gospel or to the Law. This new power, then, is inseparably connected with the conversion experiences and with faith, though it does mark a development which for certain purposes may be distinguished from them; *i.e.* sanctification is not the same as justification; it is the fruit which grows from this root. But the closeness of the connexion avoids all danger of the unethical conclusions which some were ready to draw from St. Paul's teaching (Ro 6^{1}). The life of righteousness must follow; in a certain sense it is unthinkable that the Christian can continue in sin,† and practical moral injunctions fill the latter part of the Epistle. But the stress is not on works as the starting-point; St. Paul always goes deeper down to the power and motive from which they will inevitably spring.

It is in the light of these doctrines that we may best understand St. Paul's attitude to what is superficially the central problem of the Epistle, viz. the relation between Jew and Gentile. It is obvious that considerations such as a man's physical descent and his obedience to external requirements such as circumcision and a ceremonial Law, or indeed any law, considered as such, become irrelevant. Experience was in fact proving daily that the new life was open to the Gentile at least as freely as to the Jew. But at once there arose a difficulty. It requires some effort of sympathetic imagination to enter into the feelings of a Jew brought up to regard his people as the favourites of God, and the Law as the Divine means by which life was to be won. No doubt he might hope for the Gentiles to be converted to Judaism, but if they could obtain all the privileges of the Messianic kingdom without this, what became of his Scriptures with their promises to the children of Abraham? Why had God chosen them or given the Law at all? St. Paul, as a Jew, was bound to meet the objectors on their own ground; he appeals to the Scriptures themselves, to the story of Abraham justified by faith before the giving of circumcision or the Law (ch. 4), and to the purpose of the Law as revealing sin. He argues on the analogies of slavery and marriage that its sway is abolished by the death to the old self (7^{1}), and, more effectively, he shows its practical failure (v.$^{7\text{ff.}}$). It is well to admit frankly that St. Paul's arguments do not always appeal to us so directly on these points; he is arguing as a Rabbi brought up to use a certain method of interpretation, which is not our own to-day. The real proof of the truth of his position lies in the appeal to spiritual experience and history, and that is even stronger than when he wrote. The supreme value of the Epistle is to be found in the imperishable passages, such as chs. 6–8, in which the facts of the spiritual life are described in language which must remain classical for all time.

There still, however, remained the problem of God's choice of the Jews and their apparent abandonment. Under this new method of salvation, which has been proved from the Scriptures themselves to be the right one, what is the meaning of the past history of Israel and what is to be its fate in the future? Chs. 9–11 deal specifically with these difficulties,* resuming the question of 3^{1}. In them St. Paul shows that there had always been a principle of selection and rejection in God's dealings with His people, a principle resting on His inscrutable will (ch. 9). And in fact the Jews were themselves to blame; they had adopted a wrong method of seeking righteousness, in spite of the teaching of their own Moses, and when the Messiah came they rejected Him, though they had full opportunity of hearing the message (ch. 10).

---

* It may be noted that under the pressure of this vivid experience St. Paul sometimes goes very far in the sharpness with which he draws the line between the regenerate and the unregenerate man; he hardly regards the new life as the quickening of a spark which already burns, however feebly, in all men; it is an entirely new thing *ab extra*. It is true that in Ro 7 he represents the flesh and the spirit as already in conflict before conversion, but at other times the natural man would seem to be abandoned to 'the flesh' ($8^{4\text{ff.}}$). From such a point of view it must be either one or the other; they cease to be two tendencies at work in every one. See FLESH.

† It has sometimes been argued, on the basis of expressions in Ro 6 and 8, as well as in other Epistles, that St. Paul expected the Christian to be actually sinless, an idea of which we have traces in 1 Jn. and in Hermas. Observation of life in the early Christian communities must have at once made it difficult to hold any such theory, and it is contradicted by the whole tone of the exhortations of the Epistles. The expressions which suggest it belong to the sharp dichotomy between the regenerate and unregenerate already noticed; they are part of the theory of the Christian life, unhappily at once negatived by experience. St. Paul found, in fact, that it took more to kill the 'old Adam' than he had expected; the crucifixion of the flesh and the old self was a gradual process, not something completed at a definite moment. This truth has an important bearing on the difficulty which arises from the slow working of the leaven of Christianity.

* Baur regarded these as the central portion of the Epistle, for the sake of which all the rest was written; this, however, is to go too far, though it is probable that they are not an afterthought or an appendix, as the modern reader is sometimes inclined to think.

Finally, so far as the future is concerned, God's casting off of His people is only temporary; it is a stage in the conversion of the Gentile world, and in the end both Jew and Gentile will be united in Christ. This again rests on the unfathomable purpose of God. The chs. are among the most difficult of the Pauline Epistles (2 P 3^{16}). In $9^{10\text{ff.}}$ St. Paul states the Divine sovereignty in a way that seems to leave little room for free-will. The difficulty is eased, but not removed, by the reminder that he is dealing with nations and not with individuals. The only real answer is that in ch. 10, as elsewhere in his Epistles, especially in his ethical teaching, he insists no less strongly on human responsibility and the power of choice. He is dealing with one of the ultimate problems of thought, and for the moment, after his manner, isolates a single element. It is a mistake to look in his teaching for any detailed theory on the problems of metaphysics; nor does he ever answer the question as to the *final* fate of the heathen or of 'vessels prepared for destruction.' It must be admitted, however, that the principle of the appeal to the absolute rights and unchallengeable will of God as Creator has its dangers. It cannot hold good as against those questionings which come from man's moral sense of justice, since, if all that is best in our human instincts of truth and goodness does not rest in the end on corresponding elements in the Divine nature, we have no means of knowing God at all and no criterion of right and wrong.

It may be added that considerable light is thrown on St. Paul's argument here and throughout the Epistle by a study of contemporary Jewish literature and especially of *4 Ezra*. There is no question of any direct connexion, but we see in such a book how the problems with which St. Paul deals were the problems which occupied the minds of other thoughtful Jews, particularly after the fall of Jerusalem. We find the same questions as to the choice and apparent rejection of Israel, the power of sin and its relation to the Law (*4 Ezr.* iii., iv., v. 23 ff.). There is the same emphasis on Adam's sin and its effects on his descendants (iii. 7, vii. 11), and the same contrast between the choice of Jacob and the rejection of Esau (iii. 16). Stress is laid on man's universal sinfulness (vii. 46) and the general absence of 'good works' (viii. 31), while in ix. 7 works and faith are coupled as alternative means of salvation. The solution of the problem is based both on the inscrutability of God's ways and on trust in 'the goal of the love that I have declared unto my people' (v. 40, viii. 47 ff.), a two-fold doctrine found in similar contexts in St. Paul; cf. Ro $9^{14\text{ff.}}$ $11^{33\text{ff.}}$ $8^{35\text{ff.}}$. The greatest contrast with St. Paul's teaching—assuming, of course, the absence of the Christian solution—is to be found in the narrow nationalism of the writer. The world has been created for Israel's sake; the nations are but spittle and a drop on a bucket (vi. 55 ff.); the writer can even rejoice over the fewness of the saved (vii. 60 ff.), and the supremacy of the Law remains unchallenged (iii. 19 ff., ix. 31 ff.); it 'perishes not but abides in its glory,' in spite of the fact that it is unable to save the sinner who transgresses it; his fate can only be acquiesced in as deserved.

A further question, which can only be raised here, is how far, side by side with such Jewish influences, we may trace the influence, possibly unconscious, of Greek and Oriental pagan thought. Christianity, when it passed from Jerusalem to Antioch, and then into the Græco-Roman world, found itself in an atmosphere seething with a variety of religious ideas; particularly important are those connected with Astral Stoicism and the mystery-religions. Many of its converts must have come from such systems. They found in the new religion the redemption, the new birth, the union with the Godhead, and the hope of immortality they had sought elsewhere in vain. We should expect *a priori* that the language and mode of thought to which they had been accustomed would leave some mark on Christianity.* With regard to Romans, the question arises specially in relation to ch. 6 (see, *e.g.*, Lietzmann, *ad loc.*; Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, Leipzig, 1910, p. 100 ff.), but it can be answered only when considered in its bearings on the whole development of Pauline theology and early Christian thought. It is still *sub judice*, and hasty answers are to be deprecated, but the student should bear it in mind as one of the factors which may have to be taken very seriously into account.

9. Literary relationships.—(*a*) *Other Pauline Epistles.*—Romans stands in the same group as Gal. and 1 and 2 Cor., the four being known as the *Hauptbriefe*, or central letters of the Pauline *corpus.*† It is connected with them in style, language, and thought, and with 1 and 2 Cor. in date also, being written shortly after them. Many would add that it is also related in date to Gal., though the present writer believes that the latter is in fact the earliest extant Pauline Epistle, having been written before the Council of Ac 15. A discussion of the question would be out of place here; the only point with which we are concerned is that Romans is certainly later than Galatians.‡ The two deal with the same subject—the relation of the gospel to the Law, and the position of the Gentile Christian in the Church. The parallel is worked out in detail by Lightfoot (*Galatians*^{5}, London, 1876, p. 45 ff.); cf. especially Gal $3^{6\text{-}10}$ and Ro $4^{3\text{-}15}$; in fact, most of Gal 3 may be paralleled in Romans. Lightfoot on the strength of this puts the writing of Gal. a few months before that of Romans. This conclusion, however, is not necessary, since it is quite possible for a writer to repeat himself very closely on the same subject after the lapse of several years, if his views were fairly formed at the earlier date. The important point is the difference between the two Epistles, which Lightfoot himself fully admits: 'The Epistle to the Galatians stands in relation to the Roman letter as the rough model to the finished statue; or rather, if I may press the metaphor without misapprehension, it is the first study of a single figure, which is worked into a group in the latter writing' (*ib.* p. 49). And this difference is generally admitted. Gal. is definitely controversial, written red-hot to convince waverers and recover backsliders in the midst of a pressing crisis. Romans is not indeed an academic treatise, but it is the calm and studied statement of a position reached during years of debate. It is worth noting that some of the arguments of Gal. which are most after the Rabbinical manner and are least convincing are in fact dropped in Romans, *e.g.* the allegory of Hagar, and the argument derived from the singular of 'seed' (Gal 3^{16}). In Ro $4^{13\text{ff.}}$

---

* A good example of the influence of terms (though in this case the idea behind them is rejected, not accepted) may be found in the difficult 'height' and 'depth' of Ro 8^{38}. Lietzmann points out that *ὕψωμα* and *βάθος* are technical astrological expressions for the ascension and declination of a star. Remembering how fate and the stars were connected in the religious ideas of the day, we may develop this hint and suggest that St. Paul implies that among the forces conquered by Christ is that tyranny of fate, astrologically conceived, which must so often have made life a burden. Similarly, the 'powers' (*δυνάμεις*) which immediately precede (separated, be it noted, from the angels) may be the supposed influences of the stars.

† See Sanday-Headlam, p. lviii, for list of words peculiar to the four.

‡ Clemen, however, with a special chronology of his own, puts it earlier (*Chronologie der paulinischen Briefe*, Halle, 1893).

the 'seed' is interpreted in the natural way of Abraham's descendants in general. A comparison of the two Epistles by no means excludes the possibility of some considerable interval between them.

(*b*) *Other books of the NT.*—(1) *The Epistle of St. James.*—Here again we have certain resemblances in language (Sanday-Headlam, p. lxxvii), accompanied, however, by an apparent contradiction in teaching. Both quote Gn 15^{6} ('Abraham believed God,' etc.; Ja 2^{23}, Ro 4^{3}, etc.), but draw from it opposite conclusions, St. James arguing that Abraham was justified by works and not by faith. There are really two distinct questions. (i.) Is there any direct literary relation between the two? The date of James is most uncertain; it may be one of the earliest or one of the latest of the books of the NT, and, therefore, if there is indebtedness, it would be very difficult to say which of the two was the borrower. But in fact the general parallels in language are not sufficient to prove that either had the other's work before him. They are mostly commonplaces of Jewish and Christian teaching, and, if any further explanation were required, it might—on the supposition of the apostolic authorship of James—be found in personal intercourse between the two writers. The common quotation seems at first sight more significant, but it ceases to be so when we remember that this text was frequently used in Jewish discussions (Lightfoot, *Galatians*^{5}, p. 158 ff.; Sanday-Headlam, p. 104). Of course if St. James be placed late the case is then somewhat altered, and it becomes possible that the writer knew Romans and was attempting to answer either it or exaggerated deductions drawn from St. Paul's teaching.

Apart, however, from the question whether either writer is intending to controvert the other or not, it is important to ask (ii.) how far the two points of view are really exclusive. It at once becomes obvious when we look below the surface that the two mean different things by faith.[*] St. Paul with his conception of faith could never have said that the devils believe and tremble. St. James is on the level of the plain matter-of-fact man, insisting on conduct, not on profession. St. Paul goes deeper down to the springs of conduct. The two do represent different points of view, but they are not necessarily contradictory. St. Paul would probably have accepted all that St. James said, granting his use of the terms, but would have argued that it did not go to the root of the matter. St. James would probably have been quite ready to agree with St. Paul, when he had explained what he meant, with the mental reservation that he was not quite sure that he understood him. There is certainly room for both within the Church's canon.

(2) *1 Peter.*—Here the literary relationship is far stronger and indeed almost indisputable. The parallel passages may be seen in Sanday-Headlam, p. lxxiv ff. Their conclusion is as follows: 'Although equal stress cannot be laid on all these passages the resemblance is too great and too constant to be merely accidental. In 1 P 2^{6} we have a quotation from the O.T. with the same variations from the LXX that we find in Ro 9^{33}. Not only do we find the same thoughts, such as the metaphorical use of the idea of sacrifice (Ro 12^{1}, 1 P 2^{5}), and the same rare words, such as *συσχηματίζεσθαι*, *ἀνυπόκριτος*,[†] but in one passage (Ro 13$^{1-7}$, 1 P 2$^{13-17}$) we have what must be accepted as conclusive evidence, the same ideas occurring in the same order.' And their verdict that 1 Peter is the borrower must be accepted on every ground. We are not here concerned with the possible bearing of this fact on the question of the authorship of that Epistle; we need only point out that it makes it probably the earliest external witness to the existence of Romans.

(3) It may be added that there are fairly close resemblances between Ro 4$^{17-21}$ and He 11$^{11.\ 12.\ 19}$, and between Ro 12^{19} and He 10^{30}, where Dt 32^{35} is quoted with the same variations from the LXX. Jude$^{24f.}$ is also of the same type as the doxology of Ro 16$^{25ff.}$; on this see § **2** (*b*).

(*c*) *Writings outside the NT.*—(1) *Wisdom.*—Here we pass to a book which undoubtedly influenced St. Paul. The main parallels are found in Ro 1$^{20-29}$ (the attack on idolatry), which is closely similar to various passages in Wis 13 and 14, and in Ro 9$^{19-23}$, for which cf. Wis 11^{21} 12$^{10.\ 12.\ 20}$ 15^{7}. In each case the passages will be found in full in parallel columns in Sanday-Headlam (pp. 51, 267). On the other hand, the contrast between Ro 2 and Wis 15$^{1ff.}$ is most instructive. In the latter passage the writer boasts of the freedom of the Jew from idolatry; St. Paul's words gain in force if read as a retort to this. Further, while Wisdom distinguishes between the principles and motives of God's chastisement of Jews and heathen, very much to the favour of the former, St. Paul teaches that both are ultimately on the same level.

(2) *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.*—Here again a long list of parallel passages will be found in Sanday-Headlam, p. lxxxii f., and also in R. H. Charles's ed. of the *Testaments*, London, 1908, p. lxxv ff. To take a single example, we may compare with Ro 12^{21} *Test. Benj.* iv. 3, 'By doing good he overcometh evil' (*οὗτος τὸ ἀγαθὸν ποιῶν νικᾷ τὸ κακόν*). Sanday-Headlam suppose the *Testaments* to be the borrower, but they are now very generally assigned to an earlier date (Charles, *c.* 100 B.C.), and we may accept Charles's verdict, 'It will be clear that St. Paul was thoroughly familiar with the Greek Translation of the Testaments,' with the conclusion that his Epistles are sometimes dependent on that version. It need only be remarked that the parallels in Romans do not stand alone.

LITERATURE. — For literature dealing with the Pauline Epistles and theology in general, see under PAUL. The literature on Romans itself is very large: reference may be made to art. 'Romans,' *HDB* iv. 306; to the list of Commentaries in Sanday-Headlam, *ICC*, 'Romans'^{5}, Edinburgh, 1902, p. xcviii ff.; and to J. Moffatt, *LNT*, London, 1911, p. 130. Among the best for general purposes may be mentioned E. H. Gifford, *Speaker's Commentary*, iii., London, 1881; C. J. Vaughan, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*^{3}, do., 1870; B. Jowett, *Epistles of St. Paul to the Thess., Gal., and Rom.*^{3}, do., 1894; J. B. Lightfoot, *Notes on Epistles of St. Paul* (covering Ro 1–7), do., 1895; F. Godet, *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, Eng. tr., Edinburgh, 1881–82; J. Denney, *EGT*, 'Romans,' London, 1900; and, above all, Sanday-Headlam, *ICC*.

Of German Commentaries the best are perhaps Meyer-Weiss, *Der Brief an die Römer*^{9}, Göttingen, 1899; A. Jülicher, in *Schriften des NT*, do., 1907; H. Lietzmann, in *Handbuch zum NT*, Tübingen, 1910 (valuable for quotations from contemporary literature).

Of studies we may mention H. P. Liddon, *Explanatory Analysis of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, London, 1893; F. J. A. Hort, *Prolegomena to St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans and Ephesians*, do., 1895; H. C. G. Moule, *Expositor's Bible*, 'Romans,' do., 1894; C. Gore, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, 2 vols., do., 1899–1900.

Reference may also be made to the artt. in the Bible Dictionaries. Literature on special points has been indicated in the course of the article.

C. W. EMMET.

ROME.—Any attempt to describe Rome in the middle of the 1st cent. could be made only by one alike endowed with sympathetic imagination and equipped with minute erudition. Such an attempt has been made, not altogether unsuccessfully, by F. W. Farrar in his *Darkness and Dawn* (London, 1891), as well as by other writers. In this article it has seemed best to mention one or two points in which Rome of that period differed from a modern great city, and to follow this up by giving some account of certain important buildings of the early

---

[*] See Sanday-Headlam, p. 102 ff.

[†] See Ro 12^{2}, 1 P 1^{14}; Ro 12^{9}, 1 P 1^{22}.

Empire, whether they actually date from the later Republic or not. The writer has not rigidly excluded those that belong to a period somewhat later than Nero, but he has as far as possible confined his attention throughout to buildings of which actual remains exist. He has been indebted to standard works mentioned in the Literature, but has himself seen everything which he describes.

The population of Rome at the time St. Paul reached it, about A.D. 60, may be estimated roughly at from 1,500,000 to 2,000,000, of which a very large proportion were slaves. The streets of the city were for the most part narrow, and no vehicles were allowed inside the city walls except the wagons necessary for building purposes. The traveller who did not walk was conveyed in a sedan chair or on horseback to one of the city gates, where his carriage was awaiting him. The public buildings were magnificent, but many of the dwelling-houses, three or more stories high, were in a state of dangerous disrepair. Crassus, the great financier of the 1st cent. B.C., owned much of this property, and derived a large fortune from it. Martial and Juvenal, towards the end of the 1st and the beginning of the 2nd cent. A.D., describe the perils to the pedestrian from falling tiles, etc. The dangers to the health of slum dwellers were to some extent obviated by the open-air life commonly led, by the porticoes which gave protection from sun and rain, by the theatre, amphitheatre, circus, etc. There was no proper lighting of the streets at night. Active life was supposed to end at sunset, and those who were abroad after dark were accompanied by torch-bearers, as the Londoners of the 18th cent. by link-boys. Not till the time of Augustus was there any police in Rome, but the riots of the 1st cent. B.C. had shown the necessity, and Augustus divided the city into wards (*regiones*), and established an excellent police system, of which archæological remains have been found.

Palatine Hill.—There is a general consensus of opinion that the original Rome, *Roma Quadrata* ('Square Rome'), was on the Palatine Hill only—the hill of Pales, the shepherds' god. It is with the S.W. angle that the earliest legends of Rome are mostly associated. It was there that the basket was found containing the twins Romulus and Remus, after it had been washed ashore by the Tiber. There also was the lair of the she-wolf that suckled the twins, etc. The Palatine Hill is kept for the most part sacred from modern buildings, and is almost entirely covered by ruins of buildings belonging to various epochs. Excavation is still going on, but seemingly no attempt is made to check the growth of vegetation. In the Republican period the Palatine became a fashionable residential quarter. Here was the house of Cicero. On his exile in 58 B.C. the house was destroyed and the site confiscated, but in the next year it was restored to him. The Emperor Augustus was born near the N.E. corner, and various rooms of a house belonging to his wife Livia are still shown on the hill, with the frescoes on the inside walls. Under the Empire practically the whole of the hill was converted into a huge Imperial residence. The process was begun by Augustus, who acquired a valuable property which had once belonged to the orator Hortensius, and added to it by the purchase of adjoining properties. There the Imperial palace was built. Fire and destruction worked upon this and other buildings, and we cannot with certainty identify remains on the hill as belonging to buildings of a particular date. What one sees is great masses of brick-work, with arched roofs. The bricks are square, and very thin as compared with those of to-day. The surviving edifices impress one greatly by their size and strength, but by nothing else. The whole looks excessively shabby. The explanation is that what we are now looking on is only the inner core of the building proper. In the heyday of their existence all these shabby brick buildings were encased in marble. The marble, in the course of ages, has been stripped off, partly in the interests of the decoration of Christian churches, and partly to be pounded down and made into lime. There is a well-known saying of Augustus that he found Rome built of brick and left it made of marble. On seeing these ruins it occurred to the present writer that what was meant by this saying was simply that he had covered brick buildings with marble. The Imperial palace on the Palatine was successively altered or enlarged, as the tastes or requirements of successive Emperors demanded. One most important building must be mentioned before we leave this hill, or mountain, as the Romans called it (see ROMAN EMPIRE), namely, the temple and precinct of Apollo on the N.E. part of the hill. The decoration of the temple was magnificent. In a double colonnade connected with it were statues of each of the fifty fabled daughters of Danaus, and there also were the Imperial libraries of Greek and Roman literature, one of the earliest public libraries in Italy, splendidly equipped by Augustus not only with manuscript books but also with busts of the great authors.

Capitol.—In modern times the Capitoline Hill is disfigured on the southern side by a hideous barrack-like erection with a campanile, called the Campidoglio, and on the other peak, the Arx, there is being erected an enormous monument to commemorate united Italy. The great ornament of the Capitoline in ancient times was the temple of Jupiter, Best and Greatest (the god whom the Latin allies worshipped on the Alban Mount), together with Juno and Minerva. It was to this great temple that all the triumphal processions of Rome made their way. It was approached immediately by the *Cliuus Capitolinus*, 'Capitoline slope,' from the Forum. The temple measured about 204 ft. by 188 ft. At the angle of the hill nearest the Tiber was the Tarpeian Rock, from which criminals were hurled. The sheer cliff may be seen from various points. One of the most prominent ancient features on the Capitoline Hill to-day is the equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius, placed there in 1538, probably under the direction of Michael Angelo, who was commissioned to lay out this site in as worthy a manner as possible. The statue owes its preservation to the belief that it was supposed to represent the earliest Christian Emperor, whereas, as a matter of fact, Marcus was one of the greatest persecutors of the Church. It is the only equestrian statue of an Emperor that has survived. The **Arx** was in ancient times for the most part not built on: it was from the ground there that heralds got the sacred plants which played a part in the conclusion of treaties with foreign powers. The plant (*uerbena sagmina*) symbolized the soil of Rome. The temple of *Iuno Moneta* was on this height; it was the seat of the Mint.

Forum.—Both these hills flank the Forum, to which most of our space must be devoted. Standing near the *Cliuus Capitolinus*, one looks straight down the Forum, and there must have been a lovely view of the Alban mountains in the distance, before the enormous Flavian amphitheatre, commonly called the *Colosseum*, shut it off. We must try to touch briefly on each of the more important buildings of which there are traces in the Forum. Like the Palatine, it is shut off from modern intrusions. The Forum was the centre of the throbbing life of the ancient city—the life social, commercial, legal, and political. Occupying a central position in the hollow surrounded by the various heights, it was the natural meeting-place of the communities on the hills above, and this it continued to be as long as ancient Rome lasted. It was flanked by all sorts of shops, those of the money-changers or bankers included. Military processions passed through it. The people were addressed there. Funeral processions stopped there for the funeral oration to be pronounced. In the adjoining buildings law-cases were tried. An enumeration of the buildings, proceeding from N. to S., will serve to give some notion of the comprehensiveness of the life of the Forum.

The *Tabularium* or Record Office was situated at the foot of the Capitol, and was built in 78 B.C. Its lower courses, on which mediæval work is now superimposed, are the most splendid specimens of Republican masonry surviving.

In front of this was the *Temple of Vespasian and Titus*, erected in A.D. 80. Three columns are still standing. There is also a richly decorated frieze and cornice. An inscription records that the temple was restored by Septimius Severus and Caracalla.

To the left of this was the *Temple of Concord*. This temple with concrete foundations, built by M. Furius Camillus in 366 B.C., was restored by Opimius in 121 B.C., and again rebuilt by Tiberius in A.D. 7–10. Only the threshold is preserved, but some parts of the columns are to be found in museums.

Beyond this are the remains of the *Mamertine Prison*, where the Catilinarian conspirators Lentulus and Cethegus were strangled by order of the consul Cicero. The tradition that St. Paul was confined there is valueless.

To return to the other side, we come to the *Temple of Saturn*. Of this great temple the lofty sub-structures are preserved. The eight columns of red and grey granite belong to a late restoration. This restoration was irregular and carelessly carried out. The temple was originally built about 500 B.C. In its vaults was stored the public treasure of Rome. Julius Cæsar, after crossing the Rubicon and thus declaring civil war, forced his way in and seized £300,000 of coined money, as well as 15,000 gold and 30,000 silver ingots.

Right over on the other side is the *Arch of Severus*. This was built in A.D. 203 as a memorial of the victorious campaigns of the Emperor Septimius Severus in the East. In ancient times it was reached by steps, being above the level of the Forum, and now that the ground has been cleared away, that is again true. The middle archway is 40 ft. 4 ins. in height and 22 ft. 11 ins. wide; the side archways are exactly as high as the large one is wide, but they are only 9 ft. 10 ins. wide. There are four columns on each façade standing on high bases. The bas-reliefs are the most interesting part. Some represent legionary soldiers leading prisoners from the East in chains. Another figures Rome receiving the homage of conquered Oriental peoples. The great majority depict detailed scenes of the various stages of war.

In front of this arch lie some of the most antique remains yet discovered in Rome—the *Lapis Niger*, etc. At this place there was probably a grave or an ill-omened place of some sort. The most interesting part is a rectangular column covered with inscriptions on all four faces. The writing goes from the top down and from the bottom up. The letters show a great resemblance to those of the Greek alphabet, from which the Latin alphabet is admittedly derived. The date is not later than the 5th cent. B.C. The sense cannot be made out. All we can say is that there is mention of a *rex*, of *iouxmenta*, 'beasts of burden,' and of a *kalator*, 'public servant'; the words *sakros esed* (= *sacer sit*, 'let so-and-so be sacred') occur also. It is probably a portion of a religious law that we have here.

Beyond the Black Stone lies all that remains of the *Comitium*, the voting-place of the Republic.

Beyond this again lies the Church of S. Adriano, which corresponds to the main room of the *Senate House* of the Empire. It was constructed by Julius Cæsar. The situation of the smaller committee room is also known. The level of the ground round about has been gradually raised in the period intervening between the original date of the building and the present day.

If we turn back again to get to the other side we come to the remains of three large oblong erections parallel with one another, all much larger than any with which we have yet had to do. The first is the *Basilica Æmilia*. It is only recently that this has been thoroughly excavated. The original building on this site goes back to the year 179 B.C., when its construction was completed by two censors. Lucius Æmilius Paullus, the conqueror of Perseus of Macedon, seems to have decorated it, as an inscription in his honour has lately been found among the ruins. The building was restored by another Æmilius, consul in 78 B.C. A coin of 61 B.C. shows the building as a two-storied portico. In 54 B.C. it was again restored by yet another Æmilius—it was a sort of monument of this family—with Julius Cæsar's approval and at his expense. The building was restored again after a fire in 14 B.C. at the expense of the Emperor Augustus. The next restoration took place in A.D. 22 in the reign of Tiberius. Of the Republican building only foundations remain. The entrance opens into six rooms which served for banking business, etc. A staircase led to the upper story, which was similarly arranged. The main room was 95 ft. wide and about 228 ft. long. The galleries above the side aisles were supported by columns. A considerable number of these have been found lying among the other ruins, in all cases broken, but in some cases more so than in others. These are like Peterhead granite, and form part of the 5th cent. reconstruction, which was very thorough.

Next comes the *Forum Romanum* proper—an open space. At the end nearest to the site of the later Arch of Severus stood the *Rostra* of the Republic. This was a raised platform decorated with the prows of ships captured in the First Carthaginian War in 260 B.C., under Duillius: hence the name. From this platform many a historic speech, many a funeral oration, including that of Mark Antony on Julius Cæsar, was delivered. Another interesting feature of the Forum, of which only the basis now survives, was a bronze equestrian statue of the Emperor Domitian, raised towards the end of the 1st cent. A.D. and described in detail by Statius in the first of his miscellaneous poems called *Siluæ*.

Leaving the Forum proper, we cross the *Sacra Via* (the poet Horace [*Sat.* I. ix. 1] by the requirements of his metre said *uia sacra*, but to the ordinary Roman it would have been as absurd to say *Via Sacra* as to say 'Street Oxford' or 'Street Princes' to-day). This Sacred Way was one of the oldest streets in Rome. Its exact course through the Forum is uncertain, but it would appear that it passed between the Forum proper and the Basilica Iulia, that it then went N.E. and ran along the east side of the Forum, turning southwards eventually and passing under what is now the Arch of Titus. It was *the* thoroughfare through the Forum, and was connected with almost every movement of importance, sacred and secular, throughout the whole of Roman history.

Crossing it, we come to what was by far the largest edifice in the Forum, the *Basilica Iulia*.

Nothing but the pavement and the basis of some of the columns now remains. It was begun in the year 54 B.C. and was dedicated, though not yet finished, by the dictator Julius Cæsar on the day of the celebration of the victory over his Pompeian enemies at Thapsus in 46 B.C. Augustus completed it. On its destruction by fire, he built a much larger building, which retained the original name. It consisted of three parts—a vestibule on the Sacra Via side, the main hall with the galleries surrounding it, and the separated rooms situated behind it. The main hall, used as a law-court, etc., was 328 ft. long and 118 ft. wide (central nave 271 ft. by 59 ft.). Thirty-six pillars of brick covered with marble surrounded the central nave, and into this nave the galleries in the upper story opened. The roof above the central nave was constructed with a clerestory. Much timber was used in making the roof. Four tribunals could try cases at once in this large hall, so that there must have been partitions between them. It is on record that an orator with a specially powerful voice who was pleading before one tribunal received applause from the crowds attending in all four courts. Such buildings have a special interest for us, as it was on them that one at least of the earliest types of Christian church was modelled, and from them that it received the name *Basilica*, which is still current.

Crossing the *Vicus Tuscus* or Etrurian Street, which went at right angles to the Sacra Via, we come to the great *Temple of Castor* or *the Castors.* The three columns which still stand are at once one of the most conspicuous and one of the most beautiful monuments remaining in the Forum. The temple itself was one of the most ancient of Roman foundations, going back to about 500 B.C. The legend of the help given by the twin-brother gods to the Romans when in straits at the battle of Regillus is familiar to all. The temple was the repayment of a vow. Frequently reconstructed as it was, the remains we now know date from the beginning of the 2nd cent. A.D. under Trajan and Hadrian. It is quite a steep climb to get to the floor of the temple. This is of black and white mosaic laid in Tiberius' time, and covered a century later with slabs of variegated marble. The testing of weights and measures was carried on in this temple.

We come next to the *Lacus Iuturnæ.* At the foot of the Palatine the goddess who presided over the springs which bubble forth there was worshipped as Juturna, she who appears in Virgil's *Æneid* as the sister of Turnus, the king of the Rutulians. The pool is about 6½ ft. deep and about 16 ft. 9 ins. square. It is fed by two springs. Various ornaments and other interesting objects have been dug out there.

In this neighbourhood are three (or rather two) connected buildings, all belonging to the same cult, that of Vesta. They are respectively the circular *Ædes Vestæ* and the *Atrium Vestæ*, with the *Domus Virginum Vestalium.* The worship of Vesta was the worship of fire and the hearth. Fire is to the house a continual necessity, whether for the cooking of food or for the external warmth of the body, and it has for the city's house the same importance as for the private house. Just as there were a fire and a hearth in every private house, so there were a fire and a hearth in the central part of every Latin town, belonging to the people itself. In the primitive community it was important that there should be a central fire belonging equally to all the citizens, where fire could be obtained for their houses, if their own fire had gone out. It must never be allowed to go out. Six noble ladies in Rome, vowed to single life, were appointed to guard this fire. Their connexion with the town religion, as well as their high birth, made them a power in Rome, and they were universally respected. The importance of this cult is reflected in the ruins surviving in the Forum. The Temple of Vesta was round, a less common shape than the square or rectangular, and the foundations alone survive. It stood upon a circular substructure 46 ft. in diameter and was ornamented by pilasters. The entrance faced exactly east. The altar was not quite in the middle. The other two buildings ought strictly to be regarded as one, the central *Atrium Vestæ*, which was very large, being flanked on both sides by the living-rooms of the Vestals' house. This house was roomy and splendid, but shut in like a cloister. The central part of the Atrium seems to have been laid out as a garden. There is much of interest about this place that must be passed over.

Right at the other side is the *Temple of the god Antoninus and the goddess Faustina.* On the death of the Empress Faustina in A.D. 141, the Senate, at the instance of her husband, who had been passionately devoted to her, elevated her among the gods, and vowed her a temple, the construction of which was begun almost at once. The name of Antoninus himself was added to that of his wife at his own death. The vestibule of the temple has six unfluted columns of Eubœan marble, 55 ft. 9 ins. high and 4 ft. 9 ins. in diameter. The shafts of the columns have numerous inscriptions on them. A church was built into this temple before the 12th century.

At the southern end of the Forum, on higher ground at the top of the Sacra Via, stands the *Arch of Titus.* This noble structure was decreed by the Senate and people to the Emperor Titus after the triumphant end of the war with Judæa and the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, but was not completed till after the end of his reign (A.D. 81). Piers at the sides, having been seriously injured in the course of repeated misuse of the building in the Middle Ages, were skilfully renewed in 1821. The chief features of the arch are the numerous reliefs with which it is adorned. One shows the Emperor in a chariot crowned by the goddess of Victory. Here also are the lictors carrying the bundles of rods. The most notable relief represents a section of the triumphal procession, where the treasures of the Temple at Jerusalem are being carried on litters; on the first the table of the shewbread and the trumpets of the year of Jubilee, on the second the seven-branched candlestick.

Such is a cursory review of the most notable surviving ruins in the Forum, belonging to the period of the Republic and the early Empire. The area is about 430 by 110 yards. If the grandeur of the ruins impresses one, the impression of decay, perhaps even shabbiness, is also vivid. But the setting in which the remains appear adds glory to them. Vegetation is not seriously interfered with, and in early April one may see growing wild there clover, vetch, cranesbill, geranium, violet, pink, cyclamen, periwinkle, borage, blue anemone, wallflower, birdsfoot trefoil, etc. On some of the ruined walls you will find, five weeks before English time, the wistaria, surely the most exquisitely delicate of all creepers. In the warm period of the day the lizards scurry hither and thither. Above, on the Palatine, wild mignonette abounds.

Beyond the Forum to the south is the Flavian Amphitheatre (commonly called the **Colosseum**). It is one of the most wonderful ruined structures in the world. In this vast edifice, where many a victim bestial and human was 'butchered to make a Roman holiday,' there was room for very many thousands of spectators. The building is a beautiful oval in shape. It is upwards of 180 ft. in height and one-third of a mile in circumference. The exterior is ornamented by three styles of columns—the Doric on the lowest range, the Ionic in the middle, and the Corinthian above. The inside sloping part, where stone seats rose in tiers, was built by the most skilful use of the arch. Beneath the arena there is a vast number of rooms, and certain of these may have been used to house the victims till they were required for exhibition. The nearest modern analogy to the Roman amphitheatre is the Spanish bull-ring (*plaza de toros*) built on the same model. In both, the system of entrances and exits to the various parts of the house is admirably efficient. In both the sunlight has to be reckoned with, and on occasion in Rome a silk awning was drawn over the top. Towards the end of the 1st cent. of the Empire, tickets (*nomismata*) were often showered upon the populace from above (Stat. *Siluæ*, i. 6; Martial, *passim*). Each ticket bore on it the indication of a prize which the lucky catcher obtained on presenting it at an office in the city.

Law-courts.—Leaving this quarter of the city, we can now return to the northern end of the Forum. As the volume of legal business increased with the settled state of the Empire, now free from the curse of civil war, additional law-courts became necessary, and Emperors vied with one another in building them. North of the northern end of the Forum proper was built the Julian Forum, north of that the Augustan, and west of that the huge square forum of Trajan with double apses, bounded on its west side by the Basilica Ulpia. Yet this does not exhaust the number of these buildings. Behind the place where the temple of Antoninus and Faustina afterwards stood, was Vespasian's Forum with the Temple of Peace. To connect this with the Augustan Forum just mentioned, Nerva built one which was called after him, but also called 'Transitorium' (the *connecting Forum*). Of all this wonderful group of glorious buildings very little remains.

On the north side of the Augustan Forum was the **Temple of Mars Ultor.** The three columns and architrave of this building, vowed by Augustus on the battle-field of Philippi and dedicated in 2 B.C., are all that remain to show how splendid a structure it was. The only portion of the *Forum Transitorium* that remains visible is a fragment of the eastern enclosing wall of the forum with two columns belonging to the colonnade half buried in the ground. The cornice and attic of the wall project above and behind these columns. On the attic is a figure of Minerva in relief. Trajan, in order to build his forum, had to cut away the S.W. spur which connects the Quirinal Hill with the Capitoline Mount. The earth was carted away and used to cover up an old cemetery.

Of all Trajan's magnificent buildings nothing remains uncovered but the central portion—about half the area—of the **Basilica Ulpia,** with the **Column of Trajan** in a rectangular court at the further side of the Basilica. The column, which had a statue of Trajan on the top, is over 100 ft. high, and is said to be exactly the height of the spur of the hill which was cut away. It is notable as having a series of reliefs arranged spirally from the basis to the capital—namely, twenty-three blocks of Parian marble. The Senate and people of Rome erected the column in the year 113. The reliefs are of immense interest as depicting many scenes in the wars carried on by Trajan against the Dacians. This people lived in modern Transylvania and also south of the Carpathians in Wallachia and part of Roumania. In the time of the Flavian Emperors they became a serious menace to the Empire. By Trajan's time their king had established a great military power. The second of Trajan's wars with them resulted in the conquest of Dacia (105–106) and the reduction of it to the status of a Roman province. The reliefs are a contemporary historical document of value unsurpassed in the whole of Roman history. Apart from its historical value, the monument has been described as 'the most important example of an attempt to create a purely Roman art filled with the Roman spirit.'

Of further ancient monuments one must simply select one or two for mention. Near the Tiber the vaulted channel of the **Cloaca Maxima** (Great Drain) can be observed. This construction first made habitable the marshy ground of the Forum and the land between the Capitoline and the Palatine. Near this is a circular building, once perhaps the **Temple of Mater Matuta,** now the Church of S. Maria del Sole. The superstructure is solid marble, and had a peristyle of twenty Corinthian columns, of which one is now lost. Some considerable distance N. of this, in what was once the Campus Martius, is the **Pantheon,** the most complete and the most impressive surviving monument of the earliest Imperial period. The original building, erected in 27 B.C., was burned in A.D. 80, restored by Domitian, struck by lightning and again burned in 110, and finally restored by Hadrian (120–124). It is his building we now see. It is a huge rotunda of the simplest proportions. The height of the cupola is the same as that of the drum upon which it rests, and the total height of the building is therefore the same as the diameter of the pavement. The dome is not solid concrete throughout. There are the beginnings of an articulated system of supports between which the weight is distributed. On either side of the vestibule are niches in which colossal statues of Agrippa (the builder) and Augustus once stood. The one opening in the roof admits sufficient light. The building, originally erected to all the divine protectors of the Julian house, has since A.D. 609 been used mostly as a church. What the Church, the great destroyer of Roman pagan buildings, did not ruin, it modified and used for its own purposes.

LITERATURE.—The most minute works on the topography of ancient Rome are H. Jordan and C. Huelsen, *Topographie der Stadt Rom*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1871–1907; O. Richter, *Topographie der Stadt Rom*^{2} (in Iwan von Müller's *Handbuch*), Munich, 1901. The best work on the *Forum* is C. Huelsen, *The Roman Forum*, Eng. tr., Rome, 1906, ^{2}1909 (cf. his *I più recenti scavi nel Foro Romano*, Rome, 1910). Other works of value and interest are T. Ashby, in *A Companion to Latin Studies*, ed. Sandys, Cambridge, 1910, pp. 35–47, and W. Ramsay and R. A. Lanciani, *A Manual of Roman Antiquities*^{15}, London, 1894 (especially as introductions); H. S. Jones, *Classical Rome*, do., 1910, and the fascinating works by R. A. Lanciani, *Ancient Rome in the Light of Recent Discoveries*, do., 1889, *Pagan and Christian Rome*, do., 1892, and *Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome*, do., 1897. The most convenient and up-to-date maps are in H. Kiepert and C. Huelsen, *Formæ Urbis Romæ Antiquæ: accedit Nomenclator Topographicus*, Berlin, 1896, ^{2}1912.

A. SOUTER.

RUDDER.—See SHIP.

RUDIMENTS.—See ELEMENTS.

RUFUS (Ῥοῦφος, a common Latin name).—**1.** In Mk 15^{21} Rufus is named as the son of Simon the Cyrenian, who was compelled to carry the Cross of Jesus to the place of crucifixion (cf. Mt 27^{32}, Lk 23^{26}). Another son, Alexander, is mentioned, and, as the name of Rufus comes second, he was probably the younger of the two. St. Mark gives no further information with regard to them, and it would seem that they must have been known to the readers for whom he intended his Gospel. If, as is generally held, he wrote in Rome for Roman Christians, Alexander and Rufus may have been at the time resident in the city and prominent members of the Church. Simon was evidently a

Hellenistic Jew (cf. Ac 2^{10} 6^{9} 13^{1}), who gave his sons Gentile names.

2. In Ro 16^{13} a certain Rufus is saluted by St. Paul. If we admit the Roman destination of these salutations it is natural to wish to identify **1** and **2**, but the name is so common that there are no real grounds for doing so. Rufus is described as 'the chosen in the Lord' (*τὸν ἐκλεκτὸν ἐν κυρίῳ*), a phrase applicable to every Christian (Col 3^{12}, etc.), but perhaps peculiarly appropriate in his case on account of 'special circumstances, in which a striking intervention of the Divine grace had been recognised, by which his conversion was effected' (C. von Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age*, Eng. tr.^{2}, i. [1897] 395). Possibly, however, the meaning is rather 'eminent as a Christian' (Sanday-Headlam, *ICC*, 'Romans'^{5}, 1900, p. 427), *i.e.* distinguished among his fellow-Christians in character and usefulness. The only other Christians so described in the NT are 'the elect lady' and her sister in 2 Jn 1^{13}. Coupled with Rufus in the salutation is 'his mother and mine' (*τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐμοῦ*). The allusion has generally been supposed to mean that 'this nameless woman had done a mother's part, somehow and somewhere, to the motherless Missionary' (H. C. G. Moule, *Expositor's Bible*, 'Romans,' 1894, p. 429) and that he felt towards her ever afterwards as a son. The Apostle had not visited Rome before writing his Epistle to the Roman Christians. If, therefore, we regard Ro 16 as an integral part of 'Romans,' we shall place this mother and her son elsewhere at the time when she showed kindness to St. Paul, and imagine that later they became residents in Rome. It is perhaps easier to believe that Ephesus was the scene of the woman's hospitality and care, and that the greeting is directed to Rufus and his mother in that city.

T. B. ALLWORTHY.

RULER.—'The ruler of the temple' occurs in Ac 4^{1} AVm, but is more correctly represented by 'the captain of the temple' (AV and RV). He was a priest, second in command to the high priest himself, and had under him the officers who commanded the Temple police. His duty was to superintend the priests and Levites who guarded the Temple and its precincts. The word 'ruler,' however, generally represents *ἄρχων* or some derived word, and the general idea behind *ἄρχων* is that of a magistrate of a city, whereas *ἡγεμών* suggests rather a governor of a country (see GOVERNMENT). In 3^{17} $4^{5.8}$ 13^{27} *ἄρχοντες* is used of the Jews in authority who had Jesus put to death, and therefore includes the high priests (cf. R. J. Knowling in *EGT*, 'Acts,' 1900, on 4^{5}). In 4^{26} $7^{27.35}$ (referred to Moses in Egypt) 23^{5} the word occurs in quotations from the LXX. In Ro 13^{3} magistrates (and possibly also governors and the Emperor) are referred to. In Ac 13^{15} rulers of the synagogue are mentioned at Pisidian Antioch. In Asia Minor there is evidence that the title was one of honour, and therefore could be held by more than one person simultaneously; there is a case known of even a woman bearing this title at Smyrna. In Corinth, however (18^{17}), the normal practice of having one ruler of the synagogue with real power appears to have been maintained. In 14^{5} the leading men among the Jews at Iconium are intended, probably including the honorary rulers of the synagogue. In 16^{19} Luke first uses the general term *ἄρχοντες*, and then the specific *στρατηγοί* for the two leading Roman magistrates of the *colonia* Philippi (see under PRÆTOR). In 17^{8}, again, it is the leading magistrates of Thessalonica, the *πολιτάρχαι*, to whom reference is made (see under MAGISTRATE). In Eph 6^{12} 'the rulers of the darkness of this world' (AV) might be more exactly rendered 'the world-rulers of this darkness' (RV). The reference here is to spiritual powers of evil to which this world is really in bondage, while all the time it falsely asserts its independence of the only true God. This world is the realm of darkness of these powers. References to such powers under various names are frequent in the NT where they are part of the heritage from later Judaism.

A. SOUTER.

S

SABAOTH.—'Lord of Sabaoth' (*i.e.* 'Lord of Hosts,' יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת) is a common title for Jahweh in the prophets, with the exception of Hosea and Ezekiel. The appellation may not have originated with them, but they invested it with a deeper significance. What was the original meaning of the title is still a subject of dispute. Some take the 'Hosts' in question as the armies of Israel which Jahweh leads on to victory (Jg 4^{14}), while others find an allusion to the stars, the host of heaven, or to the armies of angels (but it is contended that in the plural צְבָאוֹת is used only of earthly warriors). Whatever the original meaning of the phrase, it came afterwards to denote the all-controlling power of God, as represented by the rendering of the LXX *κύριος παντοκράτωρ*; cf. 2 Co 6^{18} (also *κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων*). Sometimes, however, the LXX renders *κύριος Σαβαώθ* as in Is 1^{9}, which is reproduced *verbatim* from the LXX in Ro 9^{29}. The only other instance of the use of the phrase in the NT is Ja 5^{4}, where God is so named to suggest the awful majesty of the great Judge who will avenge the oppression of the poor. There are several instances in Rev. of the title made familiar by the LXX, *κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ*, 'Lord God Almighty.'

G. WAUCHOPE STEWART.

SABBATH.—1. The Jewish Sabbath in apostolic days.—For the whole subject in its most general aspect readers are referred to the various Encyclopædias and Dictionaries wherein the Sabbath is discussed. It is enough if here we briefly set forth what were its chief features as a Jewish festival in the days of the early Church.

In common with other ancient institutions of a similar kind, the Sabbath had undergone great modifications with the passing centuries, although preserving the essential character of one day in seven, observed mainly by a cessation of daily business and work. *Shabbāth* (whatever may be said of an Assyrian *šabbatum* in support of a theory which gives a Babylonian origin to the institution) is undoubtedly connected with the verb *shabhath*, 'to cease,' 'to desist from'; and cessation from labour was its most conspicuous and primitive characteristic (Ex $20^{9f.}$=Dt $5^{12ff.}$, Ex 23^{12} 34^{21}).

The Sabbath with which the NT makes us familiar is specially the product of post-Exilic times. There is a paucity of reference to the Sabbath in pre-Exilic days which is most striking. Yet the two or three references that occur (2 K 4^{23}, Am 8^{5}) mention it as a well-established and familiar institution, and Amos in particular makes it clear that cessation from business was a special feature of the day. But after the Exile greater prominence is given to it (Is $56^{2.4.6}$ $58^{13f.}$). Neh 13^{15-22} gives us a picture of vigorous Sabbath-reform. Its observance is not by any means introduced as a new thing. Rather it is the re-establishment, with new rigour, of an institution which had been allowed to lapse into a variety of abuses or even actual neglect (see La 2^{6}). We must also include in these post-Exilic references such passages as Jer 17^{19-27} and Ezk 20, with their glowing promises attached to Sabbath observance and solemn warnings against its profanation. These utterances indicate that rehabilitation of the Sabbath which increasingly characterized Judaism as it emerged purified and refined from the fires of the Exile.

It is clear that in the time of our Lord the observance of the Sabbath was one direct occasion of an open breach between Him and the religious authorities of His day. The well-known and remarkable *logion* found in cod. D (Lk 6^{10}), if it is to be relied upon, particularly illustrates the difference in standpoint so far as work was concerned. As for special religious services associated with the Sabbath, the synagogue was the particular scene of these devotions. The importance of the synagogue as a centre of Jewish life became greater and greater as the central sanctuary of the Temple declined and ultimately perished. In the Diaspora it was inevitable that this should be the course of development. So in the Acts of the Apostles the synagogue is the main scene of the first appeal of Christian preachers to the Jews, and the Sabbath was the special day on which they carried on their propaganda. How rich the day was, *e.g.*, in opportunity for St. Paul from the first we see from Ac $13^{14.44}$ 14^{1} 16^{13} 17^{2} 18^{4}, etc.

Moreover, the observance of the Sabbath by cessation from labour was one outstanding peculiarity of the Jews which most forcibly struck the heathen observer. It is one special mark of the Jew as we meet him in the generally unfriendly pages of Roman authors. Seneca, *e.g.*, is represented by St. Augustine as ignorantly condemning the Sabbath-keeping of the Jews: 'quod per illos singulos septem interpositos dies septimam fere partem ætatis suæ perdant vacando et multa in tempore urgentia non agendo lædantur' (*de Civ. Dei*, vi. 11). For other references see Tac. *Hist.* v. 4; Hor. *Sat.* I. ix. 69; Juv. *Sat.* xiv. 96–106.

This shows indubitably how well Sabbath was kept by the Jews. Not only so; they suffered considerable hardship in adhering to a custom that was wholly disregarded by the world in general. At an earlier period, indeed, we read of certain Jews who perished rather than violate the Sabbath by fighting on that day (1 Mac 2^{34-38}). This led in those troublous times to a relaxation of the law, so that fighting on the defensive was permissible. Ultimately the Romans were obliged to release the Jews from military service, and that, among other things, on account of the great inconveniences attendant on Sabbath observance (Jos. *Ant.* xiv. 10).

Beside this we have the enormous importance attached to the Sabbath by tradition and instruction amongst the Jews themselves. The reference to the 'Sabbath day's journey' (*ὁδὸς σαββάτου*, Ac 1^{12}) reminds us of the glosses and refinements (and, we may also say, absurdities) to which, as time went on, the Sabbatic law was subjected at the hands of the Rabbis. Even this limit of lawful travel was open to various interpretations according as the 2000 ells (the distance allowed) were to be reckoned in a straight line in one direction or as the radius of a circle. In at least one tractate of the Talmud (*Shabbath*) minute directions were treasured up as to what might and what might not be done on the Sabbath day. It may seem as if the day were thus made burdensome to the community, but, if we are to believe the testimony of Jewish writers who are worthy of all esteem, it was not so in reality. The Sabbath was a joyous day of rest from toil and business, of happy social intercourse, of assembly in the synagogue for worship. Josephus clearly though indirectly makes reference to this in *c. Apion.* i. 22 (cf. also *Ant.* XVI. ii. 3). But we need not go beyond the very definite allusion to the synagogue observance as an established practice in Ac 15^{21}. Abstention from the thirty-nine kinds of work specified by the Talmudists as forbidden (the number is evidently artificial, and probably not unconnected with 'forty stripes save one,' 2 Co 11^{24}) was by no means the whole of Sabbath observance.

A passing notice may be taken of the emphasis which Philo, in his characteristic way, puts upon the Sabbath as a positive season to be devoted to 'philosophizing,' to contemplation of the works of God, to moral and spiritual examination and renewal (*de Decalogo*, 20). It is also a day specially appropriate for instruction. Again, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in a vein not unlike Philo's, handles the Sabbath with an extension of the idea to the hereafter. How popular and deep-rooted this use has become the whole devotional language of the Church bears witness. 'There remaineth therefore a Sabbath rest (a Sabbath-keeping, *σαββατισμός*) to the people of God' (He 4^{9}). But in the Talmud, too, Sabbath is a foretaste of the world to come. See also *Ep. Barn.* 15 for further mystical treatment.

2. The observance of Sabbath in the early Church.—As far as we can see, there was no thought on the part of the first 'disciples' of ever discontinuing an observance to which as Jews they had been accustomed all their lives. Whilst Jesus was in direct conflict with the religious authorities as regards their interpretation of the Sabbath and its laws, we hear no word of any complaint of His primitive followers on that score. What mainly marked them off from their fellow-Jews was their testimony and declaration that 'Jesus was the Christ' (Ac 5^{42} 17^{3} 18^{5}). This was divisive and revolutionary enough, it is true; but they seem to have thought that the old faith could live with the new, or at least that old habits and customs which did not appear to clash with their loyalty to Jesus could still be maintained.

The inclusion of the Gentiles within the scope of the gospel brought with it inevitable complications—this among the rest: How far were the religious customs of the Jews to be considered as binding upon them? St. Paul, who was certainly revolutionary and advanced in his teaching in comparison with the Church at Jerusalem, was even openly taxed with advising Jews who lived amongst Gentiles to abandon Moses and 'the customs' (see Ac $21^{17ff.}$). Was that of Sabbath observance one of them? Probably such teaching as we find in Ro 14 might give rise to this charge, though there he does not prohibit or even dissuade, but simply pleads for liberty of judgment. At the same time he certainly disapproved of all attempts to make the observance of the Sabbath and other peculiarly Jewish customs binding on Gentile converts to the faith (Col 2^{16}).

Where Jews continued to form the main *personnel* of Christian communities, Sabbath observance still lived on. Yet, just as surely the setting apart of 'the first day of the week' as the Lord's Day grew up alongside as something distinctively Christian. Traces of this are clear even in apostolic times (see art. LORD'S DAY). The two existed side by side, alike yet different. In the *Apostolic Constitutions*, which reflect in this as in some other respects the usages of earlier times, we find more than one reference to the Sabbath and the Lord's Day together as days equally to be observed (ii. 59, vii. 23, viii. 33). A stray papyrus-leaf discovered in middle Egypt in 1911, which appears to be a portion of a prayer-book that must have been familiar in Eastern Christian circles, probably in the 2nd cent., bears unexpected witness to this early custom. It contains what is called a σαββατικὴ εὐχή, whose liturgical phraseology is easily and closely paralleled in NT and early Christian literature, and follows immediately upon what appear to be the closing words of a prayer for Friday (see *Neutestamentliche Studien für G. Heinrici*, Leipzig, 1914, no. 6: 'Zwei altchristliche Gebete').

As time went on, however, a considerable difference showed itself between the Eastern and Western Churches in their attitude towards the Sabbath. Both continued to keep it; but among the former it was accounted a *festival*, with the sole exception of the 'great Sabbath,' *i.e.* that which immediately preceded Easter Day (see *Apost. Const.* vii. 23), whilst among the latter it was very generally observed as a *fast*. This is unimportant; the main point is that the ancient Jewish institution was carried over into the Christian Church, and lived on in some form or other. Even to this day in the liturgical names for the days of the week, in both the Roman and the Greek Church, Saturday is known by its Jewish name, *sabbatum*, σάββατον. But it is now at most merely a prelude and preparation for the *dies dominica*; and a faint hint at such relation is found in the fact that, where liturgical uses are followed, the collect for the following day is said on Saturday evening.

How at length the Sabbath as an institution ceased to be maintained and gave place to the Lord's Day as its Christian substitute may be briefly conjectured. As Christian became more and more distinct from Jew, this and other things would naturally follow. The early propagation of the faith among Gentiles, as Christianity realized its world-wide mission, would necessarily tend in the same direction. In *Ep. ad Magn.*, attributed to Ignatius, we meet with an early admonition, emphasizing the distinction: 'Let us, therefore, no longer keep Sabbath after the Jewish manner (Ἰουδαϊκῶς) and rejoice in days of idleness. . . . But let every one of you keep Sabbath after a spiritual manner, rejoicing in meditation on the law' (ch. 9). In the nature of things, the two days could not continue to be equally observed in the Christian Church. The Sabbath must needs give place to the Lord's Day: the seventh day of the week to the first. The legislation of Constantine (A.D. 321), which recognized Sunday as a feast day, must have been no small factor in the case; though, again, that would not have been enacted if the custom of keeping the Lord's Day had not already been predominant among Christians. As a concession to paganism, it may be noticed that the studied name given to the day (*dies solis*) 'afforded the possibility of its universal encouragement, without thus appearing to enforce directly an ecclesiastical celebration' (W. Moeller, *History of the Christian Church*, Eng. tr., i., London, 1892, p. 298).

Nevertheless, great confusion has continued to exist in the Christian Church as to the keeping of the weekly festival. This inevitably resulted from transferring the sanctions and some of the features of the Jewish Sabbath to the Lord's Day, and from the incorporation of the unaltered Decalogue as a norm in Christian ethics. The Fourth Commandment was still held to be binding; only Sunday was tacitly substituted for 'the seventh day.' The confusion probably still exists, very much helped by the long-established custom of speaking of the Lord's Day as 'the Christian Sabbath' or even simply 'the Sabbath' or 'the Sabbath Day.' But there is a clear distinction between the two; and for Christians the Lord's Day is paramount. Great as the authority of the Sabbath is, the authority of the Lord's Day for all who accept the resurrection of our Lord is equally great or even greater.

As a matter of fact, the practice of Sabbath-keeping among Christians has been made to rest on different grounds and has been differently interpreted, though the views may ultimately be classified as two, the Sabbatical and the Dominical. Some supporters of the former have argued even that the seventh day is the true Sabbath and ought still to be observed by Christians (see a curious work by Francis Bampfield written to show that the seventh-day Sabbath is the desirable day and according to 'an unchangeable Law of well-establisht Order both in the Revealed Word and in Created Nature' [*Judgment for the Observation of the Jewish or Seventh-Day Sabbath*, London, 1672]). And representatives of this view still exist: *e.g.* the Seventh Day Adventists, an American sect—not, be it noticed, with a desire to return to primitive practice and observe both Sabbath and Lord's Day, but to observe the seventh day alone.

The Jews have long suffered special disabilities in Christian countries in this respect, but this has not availed to cause them to abandon Sabbath-keeping. And we have Sunday. We must discriminate between the day as a day of rest from labour (one day in seven) and as a day of joyful worship and of religious activities. The sanctions for the former are deep-seated in human nature itself. It is simple wisdom to guard such a space of liberty from the encroachments of labour, and to make it, in George Herbert's words, 'The couch of time, care's balm and bay' (*Sunday*, line 5). And all enlightened Christians will continue to make the worthiest use of the day so set apart.

LITERATURE.—J. A. Hessey, *Sunday: its Origin, History, and Present Obligation*^{5}, London, 1889; W. Lotz, *Historia Sabbati: Quæstionum de historia sabbati libri duo*, Leipzig, 1883; J. Meinhold, *Sabbat und Woche im Alten Testament* (=*Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, v.), Göttingen, 1905; J. Bingham, *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, bk. xx. (=*Works*, Oxford, 1855, vol. vii.); R. Baxter, *A Christian Directory*, pt. ii. ch. xviii. (=*Works*, ed. W. Orme, 23 vols., London, 1830, vol. iv. p. 240), *The Divine Appointment of the Lord's Day* (*ib.* vol. xiii.); E. Schürer, *HJP* II. ii. [Edinburgh, 1885]; L. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien*, Paris, 1889; C. H. Toy, *JBL*, 'The Earliest Form of the Sabbath,' xviii. [1899] 190 ff.; *Eight Studies on the Lord's Day* (anon.), Cambridge, 1884; also artt. 'Sabbath,' in *HDB* (S. R. Driver), *EBi* (Robertson Smith, K. Marti, T. K. Cheyne), *JE* (J. H. Greenstone); artt. 'Festivals and Fasts (Hebrew)' (F. H. Woods), and 'Festivals and Fasts (Christian)' (J. G. Carleton), in *ERE*.

J. S. CLEMENS.

SACKCLOTH (σάκκος; from שַׂק, which was introduced, probably through the Phœnicians, into all the languages of Europe; the root is perhaps Egyptian—Coptic *sok*).—Sackcloth meant properly a coarse black fabric woven from goats' or camels' hair, and then an article of clothing made of that material and worn (1) by prophets; (2) by mourners, penitents, and suppliants; and (3) by slaves and captives. This garment, which was originally, and remained pre-eminently, a sacred covering, was a mere loin-cloth, probably resembling the *ihram* of the Muslim pilgrims to Mecca, of whom C. M. Doughty says: 'they enter the town like bathing men—none is excused' (*Wanderings in Arabia*, 1908, ii. 263). The prophet Elijah is described as 'a man with a garment of hair' (2 K 1^8 RVm). Isaiah too wore, at least for a time, sackcloth upon his loins (Is 20^2); and 'a hairy garment' became the characteristic dress of the prophets (Zec 13^{14}). The raiment (ἔνδυμα) of the Baptist was made of camel's hair (Mt 3^{4}), *i.e.* of sackcloth. The dark colour and tragic associations of sackcloth suggested to the prophet of the Revelation, as it had already done to Deutero-Isaiah, a figure for a solar eclipse which seemed to portend a Divine judgment—'the sun became black as sackcloth of hair' (Rev 6^{12}; cf. Is 50^{3}). Before the Final Judgment two witnesses—apparently Enoch and Elijah are meant—are to come and prophesy, περιβεβλημένοι σάκκους, 'clothed in sackcloth' (Rev 11^{3}), a symbol of the need of humiliation and repentance. See also art. MOURNING.

LITERATURE.—See artt. 'Sackcloth' in *HDB* (A. R. S. Kennedy) and *EBi* (S. A. Cook). JAMES STRAHAN.

SACRAMENTS.—Neither in the NT nor in the other Christian writings of the 1st cent. is there any trace of the use of a common name to designate those observances which were afterwards classified more or less comprehensively as sacraments. The word *sacramentum* (see W. Warde Fowler, *The Religious Experience of the Roman People*, London, 1911, p. 464 f., and notes 28–33), as applied to denominate such rites, occurs first in the famous letter (x. 97) of the Younger Pliny to the Emperor Trajan (*c.* A.D. 112); but its employment in that letter may be merely accidental. In Christian usage the term makes its earliest appearance in the Old Latin version and in Tertullian, and there stands as a rendering of μυστήριον, and as synonymous with *mysterium*. The word μυστήριον did not acquire its special reference to the Christian sacraments until later than this period. In the NT it is never applied to institutions or observances, the nearest approach to such a significance being in Eph 5^{32}, where St. Paul asserts regarding marriage, τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν. An approximation to subsequent usage may perhaps be detected in Ignatius; but even of the phrase 'deacons of the mysteries of Jesus Christ' (*Trall.* ii. 3) Lightfoot says that a restriction of its reference to the Eucharist 'would be an anachronism.'

The absence of any common name for the sacraments indicates the absence in this period of any defined sacramental concept. It is true that ideas as well as things must be already in existence before they receive a name; but it is also true that prior to their designation ideas remain uncrystallized. The kindred nature of the ecclesiastical rites known as mysteries and sacraments—their kindred nature as belonging to the externals of Christian practice—must obviously have been perceived from the first. Harnack, indeed, places the grouping together of Baptism and the Eucharist as among 'a series of the most important Christian customs and ideas' whose origin is involved in obscurity and 'in all probability will never be cleared up' (*History of Dogma*, Eng. tr., 7 vols., London, 1894–99, i. 132 f.). Nevertheless, the affinity of these two principal sacraments appears to have been recognized from the earliest times. They are mentioned in conjunction as of the same order by the *Didache* (vii. 1, ix. 1, 5), and by Ignatius (*Smyrn.* viii. 1, 2, 'where the ἀγάπη must include the eucharist' [Lightfoot]). Both are referred to by implication in a manner exactly analogous in the parallel discourses of the Fourth Gospel on the New Birth and the Bread of Life (Jn 3 and 6). An allusion to both may possibly underlie Jn 19^{34}, 1 Co 12^{13}, He 10^{22}, 1 Jn 5$^{6-8}$. Their connexion in the mind of St. Paul, when he conjoins the type of Baptism 'in the cloud and in the sea' with the type of the Eucharist in the 'spiritual meat' and 'spiritual drink' of the wilderness (1 Co 10$^{1-4}$), scarcely admits of question. And the primal picture of the life of the Christian community given in the Acts of the Apostles (2$^{41.42.46}$) exhibits these sacraments as united together in primitive observance. In one of the passages cited above (1 Co 10$^{1-4}$) there is evidence, moreover, not only of the association of Baptism and the Eucharist in the mind of the Apostle himself, but also of the existence of a general sacramental idea in the minds of those to whom he writes; for the argument developed in the succeeding verses (vv.$^{5-12}$) seems to lose point unless it be directed against an improper and unethical application of certain views then prevailing as to the character and virtue possessed by these two sacraments in common.

The absence of any defined sacramental concept is naturally accompanied by the absence of any formulated doctrine of the sacraments in general. This does not mean, of course, that instruction as to the institution, purpose, and significance of individual sacraments was at any time neglected in the Apostolic Church. It is inconceivable that such instruction did not invariably find a place in the elementary teaching (Ac 2^{42} 18^{25} 19^{4}) imparted to every believer concerning the first principles of the doctrine of Christ (He 6$^{1.2}$). The sacramental references in the *Didache*, Hermas, Barnabas, Ignatius, Clement of Rome, all assume that their readers are familiar with the doctrine of Baptism and the Eucharist. The allusive nature of the references to Baptism in St. Paul's Epistles plainly infers that those addressed had been carefully grounded in the relative doctrine. The same may be said regarding the reference to the Eucharist in 1 Co 10$^{16.17}$; while the one example afforded of direct instruction upon the subject of the Lord's Supper (1 Co 11$^{17-34}$) expressly adverts to instruction previously given (v.^{23}) as well as to supplementary instruction to be administered on a future occasion (v.^{34}). But, in accordance with the educative order which rules in the history of the Church—truth and life first, explanations afterwards—the elaboration of sacramental doctrine belongs to a later period than that of the 1st century. 'Cyril [*Catechetical Lectures*] is the first church-teacher who treats of baptism, the oil, and the Eucharist, in their logical sequence, and in accordance with general principles' (Harnack, iv. 293).

In these circumstances any discussion of the abstract subject of sacraments in connexion with the Apostolic Church has little primary material to deal with. It must presuppose the whole special study of particular sacramental observances; and it must confine itself almost exclusively to the general inferences to be drawn from that study. At the outset some definition of the more exact significance in which the term 'sacrament' is used requires to be taken for granted; and for this purpose the definition provided by the *Shorter Catechism* (Q. 92) of the Westminster Assembly will be found to offer certain advantages. It is distinguished by extreme precision of statement. It postulates, as essential to the nature of a Christian sacrament, not only (1) the outward and sensible sign, and (2) the inward and spiritual grace thereby 'represented, sealed, and applied to believers,' but also another constituent, one of great importance in differentiating the sacramental from the magical, namely, (3) the institution and command of Christ, which conjoins the inward and spiritual grace with the outward and sensible sign, and imposes upon participators the attitude of religious obedience. And it concentrates attention upon the two particular observances, which, in virtue of their special history, sanction, and rank, have always occupied a position apart from all others. If not the only Christian sacraments, Baptism and the Eucharist are at any rate by universal consent the Christian sacraments *par excellence*; and with the witness which may be adduced regarding them the apostolic authority of the whole system of sacramental practice and doctrine stands or falls. At the same time it must be borne in mind that there are other and cognate rites rooted in the soil of this period—chrism, laying on of hands, benediction, offices of common worship—which partake of a sacramental character, and cannot be left altogether out of account. (See separate articles, BAPTISM, EUCHARIST, ANOINTING, ORDINATION, etc.)

Whatever inferences may be drawn from a study of the sacraments in this period will be found to have an important bearing upon other and larger fields. One lesson taught by the science of comparative theology is that the ceremonial associated with any form of religion furnishes an illuminating index to the origins and contents of that religion. Our whole view of the nature of Christianity and of the history of the Church must be affected by the conclusions to which we come regarding sacramental practice and theory in the Apostolic Age; and these conclusions, in consequence, are themselves peculiarly liable to be biased by theological and ecclesiastical prepossessions. The subject, therefore, is one which requires the exercise of candid and dispassionate judgment. It may be dealt with under two heads: (1) inferences as to sacramental observance, and (2) inferences as to sacramental doctrine.

1. Inferences as to sacramental observance.—(*a*) *The observance of sacramental rites was primitive and universal in the Apostolic Church.* All the evidence available goes to establish this conclusion. There is no trace of a period anterior to the practice of sacramental rites; no record of the subsequent introduction of such a practice; no vestige of any controversy, like that concerning circumcision, upon the question of obligation or propriety. Direct references to sacramental rites may not be very numerous in the NT; in the case of the Eucharist they are admittedly scanty. But the references which do occur are of a sort which may be said to offer their actual infrequency as additional constructive proof, and to leave no manner of doubt that sacramental rites were from the first an integral part of the Christian 'way,' that baptism was invariably enjoined upon converts to the faith, and that the 'breaking of bread,' which at least comprised the Eucharist in its germinal form, was *one* (Ac $20^{6.7}$, 1 Co 11^{20}) if not absolutely *the* chief purpose of Christian gatherings for worship. The only questions concerning the origin of Christian baptism, as an observance, relate to its connexion with and differentiation from antecedent kindred Jewish rites. Certainty as to the original form of the Eucharist is to some extent obscured by speculations with regard to the supposed primitive custom of the Christian Agape. But the prevalence of that custom in the Apostolic Church, a circumstance too generally taken for granted, is itself both hypothetical and supported only by somewhat meagre and equivocal evidence (P. Batiffol, *Études d'histoire et de théologie positive*^{3}, Paris, 1904, pp. 283–325). The term 'breaking of bread' in Ac $2^{42.46}$ 20^{7} may refer to the Agape as well as to the Lord's Supper; its reference to the latter, however, is not less obvious, but, on the contrary, more obvious, than its reference to the former. The attempt to maintain that St. Paul or any other teacher engrafted a commemorative or sacramental significance upon a custom which before was predominantly social and but vaguely religious credits innovation with a facility, speed, and completeness of accomplishment which are to the highest degree improbable.

Recent research has thrown interesting light upon the environment of pagan ideas and practice amid which the Gentile Churches were planted; but its results do not substantiate the hypothesis that Christian sacraments owe either inception or character to this source. The lineage of these sacraments is manifestly Jewish. Apostolic history exhibits no trace of any real nexus between them and the Hellenic mysteries; and their subsequent conflict with the mysteries of Isis and Mithra belongs to a phase of development posterior to the age of origins. Such general resemblances as their comparison with the mystery rites has discovered may be sufficient to furnish what Farnell has called 'adjacent anthropology' with illustrations of certain laws in the evolution of religion from the human side. But these parallels, while remote and indecisive in themselves, are also accompanied by contrasts much too pronounced and significant to afford solid ground for any theories of definite borrowing or suggestion. It is true, indeed, that, at a later date, recognized analogies led to a deliberate adaptation of the mystery terminology; and the very name *sacramentum*, which seems to have been used of initiation into the third grade—the grade of *miles*—in the Mithraic cult, may itself have found entrance into the Church by this avenue (F. Cumont, *Textes et monuments figurés relatifs aux mystères de Mithra*, 2 vols., Brussels, 1895–99, ii. 318, n. 11). It is true also that, still later, there set in a marked tendency to imitate or compete with the accessories of mystery ceremonial. But the utmost influence upon the sacraments with which these pagan rites can be credited in the Apostolic Age is that of having provided the sacramental vocabulary with perhaps one or two convenient words then in current use and of having prepared the way, through familiarity with symbolic worship and its circle of ideas, for the reception of sacramental observances and teaching among Gentile Christians. To attribute to the mysteries any influence more germinal than this is to mistake the soil for the seed. Although the conclusion that the observance of sacramental rites was primitive and universal may appear to be elementary, important consequences follow from it. If such rites obtained from the first, the conception of primitive Christianity as a formless spiritual impulse, a mere community of religious experience which afterwards developed its own constitutional order and embodied its worship in appropriate ceremonies, is not tenable. Primitive Christianity was undoubtedly charismatic. It bore witness to the presence and power of the Holy Spirit dividing to every man severally as He willed. But the sacraments attest that primitive Christianity was ceremonial as well as charismatic. And such ceremonies carry with them the implication of some measure of corporate form, of common regulations, and of recognized administrative rule. The co-existence, moreover, of ceremonial side by side with charismatic life, especially with a charismatic life so universal and powerful as was manifested at the first, affords a proof of the vigour and stability of the ceremonies themselves. Such a combination could not have been maintained unless these ceremonies had been regarded either as of indispensable value, or as ordained by incontestable authority, or, which was in fact the case, as possessing both of these sanctions in the fullest measure.

(*b*) *The observance of sacramental rites was regarded as of indispensable value in the Apostolic Church.* For the earlier half of the 2nd cent. and for the closing years of the 1st this assertion will hardly be challenged. Evidence as to the high place assigned to Baptism and the Eucharist in the *Didache*, to Baptism in Hermas and Barnabas, to the Eucharist in Ignatius, and to the eucharistic service in Clement of Rome, is decisive and leaves no room for doubt. For NT times the conclusiveness of the evidence has been disputed. The mere prevalence, however, of these sacramental observances from the first itself affords strong presumption as to the exceptional reverence in which they were held. In the case of a religion old enough to possess traditional customs one can imagine rites of universal currency which, having become thus consuetudinary, are regarded as of but ceremonial significance. It is impossible to imagine such formalism in the case of a religion still in its infancy, of a religion so spiritual, moreover, and so intolerant of unreality as that of Christ. These rites must have been esteemed as primary, or they would not have been universally observed. That Baptism, for instance, was treated as indispensable is plain. Even one converted by a heavenly vision (Ac 9^{18} 22^{16}), even those upon whom the Holy Ghost had already fallen (10^{48}), were required to receive it, while of those whose understanding and experience of the faith were discovered to be essentially defective (19^{1-7}) the crucial question at once asked by the Apostle was—'Into what then were ye baptized?' To Baptism St. Paul habitually appeals as to a fact of cardinal religious importance (Ro 6^{1-14}, 1 Co 6^{11} 12^{13}, Gal $3^{26.\,27}$, Col $2^{11.\,12}$, Tit 3^{5}); and he includes it among a series of solemn witnesses to the unity which the Christian calling demands in a concatenation of ideas the most exalted conceivable (Eph $4^{4.\,5.\,6}$). Regarding the Eucharist, again, it may be affirmed with confidence that St. Paul could never have expressed himself as he did in 1 Co 11^{17-34} had he reckoned its value to be secondary, or its sacredness to be negligible, or its obligation to be anything less than imperative upon all members of the Church. Support has been claimed upon various grounds for the contention that sacramental observance is 'not central' in the NT. It has been pointed out that in the Acts and writings of the apostles the space devoted to sacramental subjects is extremely exiguous, that in many whole books neither one sacrament nor the other is mentioned, that such references as do occur are for the most part incidental. But it may be replied that the books of the NT do not purport to be comprehensive; that they are occasional or specific in their character; that not one of them is, or professes to contain, a systematic manual of first principles; that all of them assume the concurrent operation of evangelistic preaching and oral instruction; that, when read as addressed to churches in which sacramental observance was invariable and presupposed, they are at once perceived to be really interwoven with manifold allusions to the sacramental life unobserved before. The argument *ex silentio* is proverbially a perilous argument. It becomes convincing only when accompanied, as in this case it is not, by independent proof that silence must infer either ignorance or disregard. It may often with equal, if not greater, propriety be used to establish the very contrary of that which it has been cited to make good. Lake's remark applies most pertinently in this connexion: 'It is impossible to over-estimate the importance of realizing that, if we want to discover the central points of Christian doctrine, we must look not at those to which St. Paul devotes pages of argument, but at those which he treats as the premises accepted equally by all Christians' (*The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, London, 1911, p. 233 n.). It is not really paradoxical to maintain that the NT writers say little about sacramental observance just because sacramental observance was in their eyes a first principle. The emphasis laid in the NT upon the saving grace of faith is another reason adduced to depreciate the primitive importance of the sacraments. But saving graces and the means of grace are never placed in contrast in apostolic doctrine. The antithesis is gratuitous and imaginary. The relation between faith and sacrament remains exactly analogous to that which the Gospels represent as existing between faith and the instrumentality used by our Lord in the performance of His miracles. The faith involved in sacramental obedience is faith, not in outward rites, but in Him by whom these rites were appointed, whose instruments they also are. One particular passage (1 Co 1^{12-17}) is frequently quoted as an indication that St. Paul disparaged Baptism as compared with preaching. Careful examination of the purpose of that passage leads to a conclusion entirely different. Had St. Paul not recognized the primary importance of Baptism as the sacrament of initiation into the Church, had he not supposed that his administration of it was more liable than his preaching to encourage the party watchword—'I am of Paul,' he would not have adverted to his apostolic practice in this connexion. He thanks God that he baptized few of the Corinthians himself, just because he knows the supreme incorporating significance of that ordinance, and perceives the misinterpretation which party-spirit might have put upon any special diligence shown by him as a minister of the actual rite of Baptism—'lest any man should say that ye were baptized into my name' (1 Co 1^{15}).

(*c*) *The observance of sacramental rites based itself in the Apostolic Church upon the authority of Christ's institution.* The question which concerns us here is not that as to the origin of these rites. The sacraments meet us upon the very threshold of the Apostolic Church; and the discussion of their institution and of their relation to contemporary Jewish customs belongs to the province of Gospel study. What we are here concerned with is the authority which secured or sanctioned their observance in the Church. Only one such authority—that of the apostles—can in the first instance be imagined. Whether that authority was official or not, it must still have been effective. The apostles were believed to know the mind of Christ. They were the companions of His ministry. They were the witnesses of His resurrection. Without their injunction or approval sacramental observance could not have been introduced. But their authority was not original. It was derivative. They were ἀπόστολοι of Christ (Clem. Rom. *Ep. ad Cor.* i. 42). The things which they taught the Church to observe were *the things which Christ commanded* (Mt 28^{20}). Hence the sacraments must have been supposed to possess the authority of our Lord Himself; and this is the belief upon which sacramental observance was established. Apart altogether from historical criticism of their contents, the Gospels bear testimony to the convictions which held sway in the Apostolic Church. St. Matthew's record (28^{16-20}), whatever view be taken as to the textually unassailable Trinitarian formula, proves that the Christian observance of Baptism was referred directly to the appointment of our Lord; and this conclusion is confirmed both by the description of baptism as 'in (ἐπί, εἰς, ἐν) the name of Jesus Christ' (Ac 2^{38} 8^{16} 10^{48}, etc.), and by the distinction insisted upon between Christian baptism and the baptism of John (Ac 18^{25} 19^{3-5}, He 6^{2}). The combined witness of the Synoptists leaves no doubt that our Lord's own institution was believed to be the origin of the Eucharist. Lk $22^{19b.\,20}$ may be indebted in some way to 1 Co $11^{24.\,25}$; but there is no ground for the conjecture that St. Paul's account diverges at this point from the tradition of the Church at Jerusalem; while his own emphatic declaration—'I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you' (v.^{23})—whether referring to a special revelation or not, indicates clearly the supreme authority consistently presupposed as the foundation of sacramental observance. More than the bare command of Christ was contemplated as investing the sacraments with their authority. It was His command, surrounded in either case with circumstances of incomparable solemnity. If St. Matthew represents the belief of the primitive Church, Baptism was conceived of as an ordinance of the Risen Lord, delivered by Him on an occasion of transcending importance, decreed in the same breath with a claim to universal authority in heaven and on earth, associated with an imperial charge to make disciples of all the nations, and accompanied by a promise of His unfailing presence all the numbered days until the completion of the age. If the Synoptists and 1 Co 11^{23-26} $10^{16.17}$ represent the belief of the primitive Church, the Eucharist was conceived of as an ordinance appointed by the Lord upon the eve of His sacrifice and in anticipation of it, upon an occasion of unique and consummating intimacy of self-revelation to His disciples, an occasion overshadowed, indeed, by the approaching betrayal and crucifixion, and therefore filled to overflowing with recollections inexpressibly moving and poignant, but consecrated also as the inauguration of the present communion of His body and blood, and radiant with the assurance which it contained of the impending triumph of His Kingdom. The sacraments, thus regarded as 'holy ordinances instituted by Christ,' afford an indication that the idea of positive ordinance, side by side with and counterbalancing the idea of individual charismatic freedom, was part of the essence of Christianity from the first. For the new 'way,' Christ had appointed beforehand certain definite rites which all life quickened by the Holy Spirit should observe. And the extraordinary solemnity of circumstance with which their appointment had been emphasized secured for these observances, even apart from discernment of their meaning or experience of their virtue, and without the original aid of any formulated sacramental theory, the homage of unquestioning practice. The sacraments of Christ may be said to resemble the words of Christ in this, that, while filled by Him with manifold grace and truth, the wealth of their contents would not be appropriated otherwise than gradually, and at the first, in consequence, their reception rested for its assurance chiefly upon the strength of that sovereign authority to which they owed their promulgation. In the apostolic belief that they were holy ordinances instituted by the Founder and King and Head of the Church we find the one sufficient explanation of their earliest prevalence. The faith of apostolic times saw the authority of our Lord's Person standing as fountain-head at the beginnings of sacramental observance; and, were it not for the demand made upon faith by the miracles of Pentecost and the Resurrection, the credibility of this historic witness to the actual institution of the sacraments by Christ would never in all probability have been seriously challenged.

2. Inferences as to sacramental doctrine.—(*a*) *As ritual acts of faith and obedience towards God, the sacraments possessed the character of worship from the first.* True sacraments are always capable of consideration under two aspects: a Godward aspect and a manward aspect. In the former they appear as acts of worship; in the latter they appear as means of grace. There is, indeed, a third aspect in which they are sometimes considered—that in which they become cognizable as forms of public or mutual self-expression. The last, however, is really an incidental accompaniment of the first, and quite subordinate to it. Only when the devotional life of the Church grows cold are the sacraments much thought of in this light. In the Apostolic Church they were not contemplated as formal means by which either the corporate religious consciousness or the decisions and experiences of personal religion received expression. That they did express such consciousness—the consciousness of blessings enjoyed, of the reality of 'the re-birth which is typified by the Church's sacrament of initiation' and of 'the participation in the Divine Life which is dramatised in its sacrament of communion' (E. Underhill, *The Mystic Way*, London, 1913, p. 33 f.)—may be in a sense true; but this was not regarded as their purpose. The decisions and experiences of personal religion, indeed, could not fail to be shown forth or implied in the sacraments. Inasmuch as these observances were distinctive and elementary acts of Christian faith and love they became at once prominent tokens of the Christian profession; and to this circumstance, no doubt, they owe in some measure their investment with the designation *sacramenta*. In the case of the initiatory rite, the rupture with the past (Ro 6^{3}, Eph 4^{20-23}, Col 3^{9}, etc.) and 'the good confession in the sight of many witnesses' (1 Ti 6^{12}) and the new habit of life (Ro 6^{4-6}, Eph $4^{23.24}$, Col 3^{10}, etc.) were circumstances so arresting that Baptism must always in those days have worn the complexion of an open avowal. In the case of the Eucharist, that rite which postulated devotion to Him whose memorial it was, in which also declared fellowship with the one Body was time after time renewed, participation became not only a badge of continued fidelity and an example in perseverance calculated to encourage others (He $10^{24.25}$, where it is surely natural to understand as included a reference to the eucharistic service), but, at a later date, a criterion as well by which adherence to sound doctrine (Ignatius, *Smyrn.* vi.) might be tested. Nevertheless, as an observance of personal faith, neither Baptism nor the Eucharist was an act of self-expression otherwise than incidentally. Both, primarily, were solemn acts of worship performed towards God. But both did not fulfil this character in the same way. The germ of a future classification of rites into sacraments singular and sacraments capable of repetition is already latent in their divergent types. Baptism is worship in the form of definitive self-surrender to God in Christ, accompanied with repentance and acknowledgment of faith. It is the dedication of a living sacrifice, the acceptance of office in a holy priesthood, the response to a calling of God to become the 'lively stones' of 'a spiritual house,' and, indeed, to be a temple bodily through the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit. The Eucharist, on the other hand, as the distinctive Christian form of stated common worship, was to be taken part in continually. By it the worship of the Church was differentiated from the worship of the synagogue; and it became at an early date the central act of the whole Christian cultus. This aspect of the observance connected itself from the first with the offering of the thanksgiving in accordance with our Lord's example; and the rapid specialization of the name εὐχαριστία, applied therefore to the sacrament regarded as worship, may be traced from St. Paul (1 Co 14^{16}) through St. Clement of Rome (*Ep. ad Cor.* i. 41 [see Lightfoot]) to its precise and settled use in Ignatius (*Eph.* xiii. 1, *Philad.* iv. 1, *Smyrn.* vi., viii. 1) and in the *Didache* (ix. 1, 5). The Eucharist was the culminating point of Christian worship. Elements of service—'lections, chants, homilies, and prayers'—might be and were borrowed from the Jewish liturgy (L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, Eng. tr.^{4}, London, 1912, p. 47 f.). But 'the eucharistic celebration . . . was the new and vivifying principle, the centre round which these adopted elements ranged themselves' (J. B. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, pt. i., 'St. Clement of Rome,' London, 1890, i. 393).

(*b*) *In their aspect as means of grace the sacra-*

ments were regarded as symbolical but not merely symbolical, as effectual but not magical, as both sealing and applying the spiritual benefits which they outwardly represented but in a way not yet strictly defined nor yet explained in terms of relative doctrine. The sacraments were looked upon not only as human acts but also as Divine instruments. The grace of God wrought through them, and wrought by means of symbols. The method of instruction by parable habitually employed by our Lord on earth had already taught His disciples to view external nature as a shadow of the Kingdom of Heaven, and had encouraged the conviction that 'everything, in being what it is, is symbolic of something more' (R. L. Nettleship, quoted by W. R. Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, London, 1899, p. 250). 'God omnipresent was so much in all their [the early Fathers'] thoughts, that what to others would have been mere symbols, were to them designed expressions of His truth, providential intimations of His will. In this sense, the whole world, to them, was full of sacraments' (R. Hooker, *Works*^{2}, ed. J. Keble, Oxford, 1841, vol. i. p. xcii). In harmony with our Lord's didactic method, and as a continuation of it, the sacraments instituted by Him took their place in the Church as permanent and embodied parables of the Kingdom. Symbolism was inherent in the use made by them of 'sensible signs.' Their elements and their actions were filled with ideas both obvious and more recondite. The water, the bread, and the wine, and the whole ritual associated with them spoke eloquently of invisible things and spiritual processes. Illustrations of a tendency to pass even beyond the similitudes primarily suggested, and to elaborate particular details of the imagery for purposes of doctrine, may be found not only in the age succeeding the apostles (the *Didache*, Hermas, Barnabas, Ignatius), but already in the apostles' writings themselves (1 P $3^{20.\,21}$, Ro 6^{4}, Col 2^{12}, 1 Co 10^{17}, etc.). Care, however, must be taken not to read the modern acceptance of the term 'symbolical' into the primitive view of the sacraments. According to modern habits of thought, symbols which speak outwardly to the senses operate upon the soul exclusively through the association of ideas. They make their address to the intellect, and only through the intellect influence the affections and the will. They are nothing more, in fact, than a language of signs. That this was not how the Apostolic Age regarded them, that they were always looked upon as having more than mere intellectual potency, research into the contemporary forms of popular religion claims to have established. Harnack, who both in *History of Dogma* and in *Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries* (Eng. tr., 2 vols., London, 1904) repeatedly emphasizes the assertion that the symbol was uniformly contemplated as possessing a vital and not only a figurative significance, thus represents the primitive view, at least in the field of Gentile Christianity: 'Although Christian worship is to be a worship in spirit and in truth, these sacraments [Baptism and the Lord's Supper] are sacred transactions *which operate on life*. . . . No doubt, the elements of water, bread, and wine, are symbols, and the scene of operations is not laid in externals; still, the symbols do actually convey to the soul all that they signify. Each symbol has a mysterious but real connection with the fact which it signifies' *Expansion of Christianity*, i. 286). Lake goes so far as to express the opinion that 'this position [the purely symbolical view of the sacraments] has received its death-blow from the modern study of the history of religions' (*The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, p. 389). Gentile Christians in contact with the pagan mysteries, and habituated to the conception that symbols carry with them vital effects, would not, unless expressly taught to do so, divest the sacraments of that deeper than emblematic significance which they naturally assumed them to contain; while for Jewish Christians a merely emblematic interpretation of the sacramental symbols would have appeared to attribute to these symbols the very character which stamped the legal worship, now abrogated because fulfilled in Christ, with imperfection—the character, namely, of 'a shadow of the good things to come, not the very image of the things' (He 10^{1} 8^{5}, Col 2^{17}). When we find the *Didache* prescribing careful ceremonial in relation to Baptism (vii.) and applying to the Eucharist the Dominical word 'Give not that which is holy to the dogs' (ix. 5), and Ignatius speaking of our Lord purifying the water by His suffering (*Eph.* xviii. 2) and exhorting 'Let your baptism remain as your arms,' *i.e.* as your shield (*Polyc.* vi. 2), and describing the Eucharist as 'the medicine of immortality, the antidote that we should not die' (*Eph.* xx. 2), we feel that we are in a region of sacramental ideas lying quite beyond the superficial theory of symbols. But we are really in the same region before we leave the canonical books. Those who contend that the purely symbolical is the only view of the sacraments entertained by NT writers cannot make good their contention except by denying a plain sacramental reference to Jn 3 and 6, and by employing ingenious exposition to empty one after another the entire series of express NT references to Baptism and the Lord's Supper of any other than a figurative implication. But there can be little doubt that the first readers of the Fourth Gospel would perceive in Jn 3 a direct allusion to Christian Baptism and in Jn 6 a direct allusion to the Eucharist; and, while all the express NT references to Baptism and the Lord's Supper are quite compatible with higher than figurative conceptions of the sacraments, in the case of a number of them (*e.g.* Ro 6^{1-14}, 1 Co $10^{1-13.\,16.\,17}$ 11^{17-34} 12^{13}, Gal $3^{26.\,27}$, Eph 4^{5} 5^{26}, Col $2^{11.\,12}$, Tit 3^{5}, 1 P $3^{20.\,21}$, He $6^{1.\,2}$) the straightforward interpretation is one clearly involving that higher sacramental conception, to which also the consensus of the whole series points and testifies.

The sacraments, while regarded as more than empty symbols, while looked upon as really effectual, and tending to combine with the nature of dramatic παραβολαί the nature also of σημεῖα (in the sense of the Fourth Gospel) permanent in the Church, were not, however, thought of as having any kind of magical affinity. The precise meaning of the word 'magic' is difficult to define; and in this connexion its elasticity has led to a controversial use much to be deprecated. The characterization of sacramental theory as magical too often takes the place of serious argument. But the spiritually effectual and the magical are not synonymous terms. The really salient feature of magic, which 'has been ingeniously defined as *the strategy of animism*' (F. Cumont, *Les Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, Paris, 1906, p. 224), may be recognized in its claim to possess the secret of *commanding* unseen powers. From the sacraments this feature is excluded by the institutional authority which they assert. The sacraments obey; they do not command. They operate not of necessity, but through the unconstrained agency of the Holy Spirit, who chooses them as His instruments. Their virtue resides not in material elements or ritual actions, but in the covenant of promise attached to their faithful observance. To magic, unless the name be stretched beyond its legitimate connotation, the sacraments of the Apostolic Church have no more substantial resemblance than prayer has to incantation. It is beyond doubt that in the world which Christianity entered the practice of magic and the circle of ideas associated with it were familiar. But the stories of Simon Magus (Ac 8^{5-24}), of Elymas the sorcerer (13^{6-12}), of the damsel possessed of a spirit of divination (16^{16-18}), of the magicians of Ephesus (19^{13-19}), as well as the condemnations of idolatry and sorcery contained in the Epistles (Gal 5^{20}, 1 P 4^{3}, 1 Co 10^{14}, Col 3^{5}; cf. Rev $9^{20.21}$ 18^{23}), illustrate the attitude of antagonism which the Church assumed towards magic from the first. Nor was this antagonism that of rivalry. Christianity was in no true sense a mystery-religion. Its sacramental system differed fundamentally from that of the mystery rites (but see J. E. Harrison's derivation of *μύστης*, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, Cambridge, 1903, p. 153 f.). Except when forced into seclusion as a *religio illicita*, it worked openly. It knew of no magical secrets to be kept from all but the initiated. It knew only of life-giving secrets to be declared. In the Apostolic Church no trace exists of the *disciplina arcani*; and even when, at a later date, that *disciplina* was introduced, it was introduced in connexion with the institution of the catechumenate, and was employed as a method of education, as a device of rhetoric, as an expedient for the promotion of reverence, and not as implying any esoteric cult (see Batiffol, *Études d'histoire et de théologie positive*, pp. 1–41). It is perhaps only fair to add that, in the opinion of some competent scholars, the mysteries themselves, in their ultimate forms, and as understood by cultivated votaries, seem to have outgrown their original magic, and to have approximated, at least, to a sacramental character. The Christian polemic directed against them in the early centuries implies alleged resemblances. 'In the sacraments of Mithra, Tertullian and other Apologists perceived a diabolic parody of the usages of the Church' (S. Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, London, 1904, p. 613). Modern apology will incline rather to interpret such resemblances as disclosing in the sacramental system of the faith a Divine adaptation to the experienced requirements of human nature, a Divine response to the longing of the human heart for assured cleansing, for help in the pursuit of holiness, and for the promise of eternal life. That which the more refined mystery conceptions sought after, the sacraments actually supplied. It may well be that, not only in the syncretistic philosophies of the Roman Empire, but also in its 'conflict of religions,' the Spirit of Truth was secretly at work, opening many doors of prepared receptiveness for the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven. From any alliance with magic the Christian sacraments, at any rate, were safeguarded from the first by the personal relation which they involved as between members of the Church and the Person of her living and exalted Head, by the predominant emphasis laid upon the grace of Christian faith as an indispensable condition of every spiritual blessing, and by the intensely ethical requirements which were invariably associated with their observance.

The effect ascribed to the sacraments was partly of the nature of Divine assurance and promise. They operated so as to establish or confirm a new relationship of privilege which contained *in posse* a dower of future blessings—grace to be realized in this age and the hope of the world to come. The specific use of the word *σφραγίς* to designate the initiatory rites—a use common in post-apostolic times—does not yet appear as conventional. But the idea—more probably connected with Jewish revelation than with mystery conceptions — is already found in St. Paul's Epistles (2 Co $1^{21.22}$, Eph 1^{13} 4^{30}). Baptism is the outward sign of the Divine calling and election. By it those sealed are marked by God as His. They are enrolled in 'a nation from the midst of nations.' They are made members of the Body of Christ. And the gift of the Holy Spirit accompanying their initiation is a gift of 'the Holy Spirit of promise,' the 'earnest' (ἀρραβών) of an 'inheritance.' The Lord's Supper, again, is a seal of the New Covenant in Christ's blood, an assurance of eternal life now, an anticipation of the Parousia, a promise of resurrection, a pledge of the Messianic triumph, a foretaste of the great Supper of the Kingdom of Heaven (Mt $26^{28.29}$, Mk $14^{24.25}$, Lk $22^{20.16-18}$, Jn 6^{54}, 1 Co 11^{26}; also Mt 22^{1-13}, Lk 14^{15-24}). But the actual bestowal of the blessings represented by the sacraments was also regarded as an effect of their observance. They operated respectively as veritable means of their own distinctive grace. And they accomplished this not through any natural psychological process—an explanation which really reverts to the theory of empty symbols—but by the power of the Holy Ghost. They acted not upon intellect only, but upon the person, upon life. Baptism was the actual occasion of those effects which it represented—of the forgiveness of sin (Ac 2^{38} 22^{16}, Eph 5^{26}, Tit 3^{5}), of the gift of the Holy Spirit (Ac 2^{38}, 1 Co 12^{13}), of the dying and burial with Christ (Ro $6^{3.4}$, Col 2^{12}), and of regeneration (Jn 3^{5}, Tit 3^{5}). The Eucharist was the actual occasion of the communication and communion of the body of Christ and of the blood of Christ (1 Co 10^{16}) and of all that was represented by the ministration and reception of the bread and wine in the sacrament (see also Jn 6^{53-58}, and Ignatius, *Rom.* vii. 3, *Philad.* iv. 1, *Smyrn.* vi.). How the sacraments become thus effectual; what relation exists between the elements and that which is bestowed through them; in particular, what the body and blood of Christ precisely signify, and how such sacred realities ought to be conceived of as related to the consecrated bread and wine—these are questions which do not expressly emerge in this period. But, although no theory of sacramental grace is formulated as yet, the materials for its future construction are already provided. Among the prolegomena of sacramental theory, the doctrine of the Incarnation must always hold the place of supreme importance. That doctrine, not so much in its bearing upon the earthly life of our Lord as in its bearing upon His heavenly state and ministry, and in the conclusions to be drawn from it as to the perpetuity of the human nature assumed, as to the permanent relation of that human nature to His Divinity, as to its glorification, as to its endowment with the power of the Holy Spirit in full measure, and as to its potential omnipresence, constitutes the very basis of the whole sacramental fabric. And not only was that doctrine, uncodified as yet in creeds, and waiting still to be followed into its consequences, fundamental in the faith and teaching of the Apostolic Church, but certain aspects of it, which, as challenged by Docetic tendencies, receive marked prominence in the Johannine writings (Jn 1^{14}, 1 Jn 4^{2}, 2 Jn ^{7}) and prominence at least not less marked in the Epistles of Ignatius, are the very aspects which look in the direction of sacramental theology, and in the light of which sacramental theology was afterwards developed (*e.g.* see Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 66, and J. H. Srawley's comment, *The Early History of the Liturgy*, Cambridge, 1913, p. 35). In one place, indeed, in which Ignatius refers to Docetic separatists in such terms as to suggest that the Eucharist implies the reality of Christ's flesh (*Smyrn.* vi.), the doctrine of the Incarnation and the doctrine of the Eucharist are brought into a closeness of contact which illustrates the derivation of the sacramental principle from the contents of the truth that 'the Word became Flesh and dwelt among us.' In the two natures united in our Lord's Person, the two parts of the sacrament, its outward sign and its invisible grace, found their analogy. Our Lord's bodily presence was in fact the compendium of all sacraments; and all sacraments were the virtual extension of our Lord's bodily presence and activity. Of doctrine such as this the foundation had been laid already in the Apostolic Age, and the material provided. But it was left to subsequent centuries of constructive faith and devout reflexion to rear upon that foundation and with that material the doctrinal edifice of the sacramental system.

(*c*) *Although either sacrament was regarded as the specific means of its own appropriate grace, both had a common reference to the whole way of salvation in Christ; and, while the complexity of this reference permitted certain aspects of it to receive peculiar prominence from time to time, there is no sufficient ground for the assumption that all were not equally implied in the nature of the institutions from the first.* Baptism and the Lord's Supper had each its own distinctive purpose in the economy of grace. But they possessed in common similar general relations to the entire scheme of redemption. Both were means towards the fulfilment of the mystical union with Christ. Both had respect to the sacrifice offered by Him on the Cross. Both were inseparably connected with the cardinal fact of the Resurrection. Both looked up to a Prince and a Saviour by the right hand of God exalted. Both were dependent for their vitality upon the operation of the Holy Ghost sent forth from Him. Both had in view the constitution and service of the body corporate and the communion of saints. Both belonged to a new and spiritual order which bore witness to the one hope of the coming and kingdom of the Christ of God. Their common outlook was thus not in one direction only but in many—an outlook so comprehensive that it is strictly accurate to describe the blessings represented, sealed, and applied by them as being nothing less than 'Christ and the benefits of the New Covenant' (*Shorter Catechism*, Q. 92). This manifoldness of the sacramental outlook is, indeed, made evident in the facility with which each succeeding modern hypothesis as to what was 'central' in primitive Christianity can claim the witness of the sacraments for its support. If, *e.g.*, the gospel of the Kingdom was mainly eschatological in its contents, there is no difficulty in showing that the sacraments looked forward to a Kingdom yet to come, of which they were the seals. If, on the other hand, the gospel of the Kingdom was mainly spiritual in its contents, it is equally easy to demonstrate that the sacraments as means of grace find their purpose in a Kingdom of God realizing itself gradually here and now. It may quite well be that at different periods, in different Churches, and by different teachers, particular aspects of the sacraments — whether the personal aspect or the corporate, the commemorative, the mystical, the ethical, or the prophetic—may have been given superior prominence. The Pauline theology may have laid more stress upon their relation to Christ's death, and the Johannine upon their relation to Christ's life; but it is not necessary to assume that only one aspect can be primitive, that all others were superinduced and represent deflexions from the original ordinance. It seems to be more reasonable to attribute the real variety of meaning and purpose which may be assigned to the sacraments to the intrinsic wealth of the sacraments themselves. If they were, as the Apostolic Church believed, the very institution of Christ Himself, it is not surprising to find that they exhibit the same many-sidedness of significance which characterized all the words which Christ spoke and the same many-sidedness of effect which characterized all the works which He performed. As 'holy ordinances instituted by Christ' they combine simplicity with mysterious depth; and from many sparkling facets, with iridescent doctrine, they reflect the light.

LITERATURE.—In addition to books cited above see Literature appended to artt. BAPTISM, EUCHARIST, ESCHATOLOGY; artt. SACRAMENTS, BAPTISM, EUCHARIST, SYMBOL, MAGIC, MYSTERY in other Dictionaries and Encyclopædias; A. V. G. Allen, *Christian Institutions*, Edinburgh, 1898; P. Batiffol, *Primitive Catholicism*, Eng. tr., London, 1914; W. Beyschlag, *NT Theology*, Eng. tr., Edinburgh, 1895; C. Clemen, *Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources* (the introduction to which contains an extensive bibliography), do., 1912; L. R. Farnell, *The Evolution of Religion*, London, 1905, 'Sacrificial Communion in Greek Religion,' *HJ* ii. [1903–04] 306 ff.; Percy Gardner, *Origin of the Lord's Supper*, London, 1893, *Exploratio Evangelica*, do., 1899, *The Growth of Christianity*, do., 1907; T. R. Glover, *The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire*, do., 1909; E. Hatch, *Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church*, do., 1890; J. R. Illingworth, *Divine Immanence*, do., 1898; F. B. Jevons, *An Introduction to the Study of Comparative Religion*, New York, 1908; H. A. A. Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions*, do., 1913; A. Loisy, 'The Christian Mystery,' *HJ* x. [1911–12] 45 ff.; *Lux Mundi*^{10}, ed. C. Gore, London, 1890, pp. 401–433; A. C. McGiffert, *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, Edinburgh, 1897; W. M. Ramsay, *The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the NT*, London, 1915; W. Sanday, *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*, Oxford, 1907.

ROGER S. KIRKPATRICK.

SACRIFICE.—1. Sources.—The sacrificial ideas found in the teaching of the Apostolic Church cast their roots so deeply in the soil of OT ideas and practice that careful reference to the sacrificial system inherited by apostolic writers from Jewish sources is essential. Even more closely than in other subjects, the apostolic literature assumes the genetic connexion of Christianity with Judaism in its doctrine of sacrifice. The OT thought-world is everywhere regarded as the basis for expounding the ultimate and more spiritual exhibitions of the sacrificial principle characteristic of apostolic interpretation. To make accurately and sympathetically the fine adjustments necessary between these transformed and spiritualized sacrificial values and their pre-Christian forms is of first importance. This task is the more difficult because the Jewish sources are themselves in turn inherited from primitive Semitic usages of which the meaning and origin are at present under investigation and the subject of keen discussion. Possibly reminiscences of each of the main theories advocated respecting the origin of sacrifice may be traced in the terms that illustrate apostolic teaching—*e.g.* the Gift theory (Ph 4^{18}), the Homage theory (Ro 12^{1}), the Common Meal theory (1 Co 10^{14-22}); the Expiatory theory is too obvious to need references. The one constant element in primitive sacrifice persisting to apostolic times that modern research, both anthropological and psychological, seems to warrant is that sacrifice appears to have pleased the object of worship and secured the favour of the deity—*i.e.*, it was 'propitiatory' in the broadest sense. The most reliable expert opinion of different schools of anthropologists regards sacrifice as devised by man as an institution by which he might indicate and satisfy the instincts of his religious nature, and therefore only indirectly Divine in its origin. Sacrifice thus originated in primitive childlike ideas of God, and developed, through the primary religious instinct of pleasing Him by giving or sharing a meal with Him, into later rites regarded as of expiatory value as the moral consciousness of the race deepened. Some such long course of development lies behind the appearance of sacrifice in the OT.

(*a*) *Early Israel.*—Here sacrifice is regarded as a familiar custom at the beginning of human history; it originated in the first family; it was patriarchal. It meets us early in the OT as the comparatively complete and elaborated cultus mirrored in the J document, but no light is thrown upon its origin. Its chief occasions were times of meeting with God; it marked the intimate relationship between the god and his worshippers; the prevailing conception of its significance was that it was a present to God in sign of homage, thanksgiving, desire for communion or Divine gifts. The indications here of the stricter motive of expiation are very slight, although awe of the Divine Presence finds early and constant expression; and there is little doubt that Israel in all ages believed in the effectiveness of sacrifice to preserve or restore the favour of Jahweh. In view of apostolic teaching the early significance of the Covenant Sacrifice should be noted. Its specific object was to make a covenant sure and binding by the interchange of blood between the parties to it; half the animal victim's blood was poured upon the altar for God and half sprinkled upon the people (cf. Ex 24^{6-8}, He $8^{6ff.}$ 9^{15-22}). The religious efficacy of sacrifice was interpreted according to the degree of ethical and spiritual enlightenment of the offerers. The popular idea of a union cemented by blood in its physical and literal character was beginning to be challenged in the early monarchy; the higher theology of the age was already excluding the idea of God as a fellow-guest, and offerings were regarded as worthless without obedience (cf. 1 S 15^{22}). God was disposed favourably by sacrifices, but we are not able to say in what manner they were supposed to influence Him. Neither these nor the older Semitic sacrifices were strictly expiatory, as has often been assumed; even where the animal may have been regarded as the offerer's substitute, it may not necessarily have been as expiation for sin. Human sacrifices were unquestionably offered in the earlier stages of the Hebrew transition from the prehistoric to the historic development of the doctrine. They were common in Palestinian religion.

(*b*) *Prophetic teaching.*—Before touching upon the priestly or Levitical sacrificial system, from which it is evident apostolic teaching chiefly drew its thought-forms and its sacrificial terminology, reference must be made to the attitude taken towards sacrifice by the OT prophets, especially by those of the 8th century. From these the primitive Christian Church drew much of the substance of its teaching on sacrifice as it came to be interpreted in ethical and spiritual values. These two types—prophetic and priestly—dominate the structure of our OT sources; they existed side by side and acted and reacted upon each other. If not distinctly rival systems in the religious thought and practice of Israel, they represent different ideals concerning that which is an acceptable offering to the Lord. To recognize that both of them deeply influenced apostolic views of sacrifice is important. It is not probable that the prophets actually proposed the abolition of sacrifice, as some scholars have maintained. They assumed its legitimacy; they denied its necessity. Their protest was against the exaggerated importance of sacrifice (cf. Am 5^{25}, Jer $7^{21f.}$); it was not essential to forgiveness. The Levitical cultus provided sacrifice as the chief vehicle of God's grace; forgiveness is mediated through it. The insistent iterance of the prophetic word is that sacrifice is not essential; God requires obedience, not sacrifice. Because He is a righteous God, He can accept nothing in place of righteousness. Righteousness is fundamental religion (Mic 6^{6-8}); without it sacrifice was an insult to God; He was weary of it; it provoked Him. Whilst they did not demand a religion without a cultus, *i.e.* a purely spiritual worship, the prophets denied that sacrifice in itself has efficacy with God, and that He has appointed it as essential to the ministry of His grace. In thus setting character before cultus the Psalmists join the prophets, emphasizing at the same time the abiding value in the sight of God of penitential feeling (cf. Ps 40^{6-9} $51^{16f.}$). With the great prophet of the Exile there rises also the commanding figure of the Suffering Servant of the Lord. Out of His personal afflictions for His people grows the vision of a voluntary and personal sacrificial offering of Himself. This transcends in its perfect ethical and spiritual value all lower ideas associated with the offering of animal victims (Is 53). The extent to which this presentation of the Suffering Servant and the prophetic attitude of bare tolerance towards the sacrificial system influenced the apostolic teaching on sacrifice has not been fully appreciated.

(*c*) *Levitical.* — Historically this followed the prophetic period referred to. It did not precede it, as was formerly thought. The elaboration of the Levitical Code and the bewildering details of the priestly legislation respecting sacrifice led to the depreciation of the prophetic criticism of it. Levitical conceptions became characteristic of the Judaism with which early Christianity had such intimate and vital connexion. The transition from the ethical ideals of the prophets to the ceremonial ritual of the Levitical system carries us into a different world of sacrificial ideas; in many respects the change marks reaction; ethically it is on a lower plane, though it may possibly as a hard shell have preserved for future generations the kernel of the prophetic teaching regarding sacrifice. Its marvellous completeness provided a basis for typological analogy. It was almost inevitable, in the circumstances in which Christianity arose, that the primitive Church should extensively use this as a vehicle for teaching its doctrine of redemption. We need not refuse to see in the rich detail of Jewish sacrifices an unconscious illustrative preparation for apostolic forms of teaching. Yet it is difficult to hold that this whole ceremonial system was instituted with a conscious reference to, or binding authority for, the spiritual teaching of the sacrificial principle in Christianity, in which the Jewish sacrificial system was at once fulfilled and abrogated. The chief feature of the Levitical system, as distinguished from the sacrifices of the earlier cultus in Israel, was the greater importance attached to piacular or expiatory sacrifices—the guilt-, sin-, and trespass-offerings. This resulted from the deepened sense of sin which had developed during the Exile. Originally not more important than other offerings, the sin-offering now becomes the sacrifice *par excellence.* Eventually this type of sacrifice appears to have overshadowed the other great type represented by the peace-offerings, which assumed that the covenant relations with Jahweh were undisturbed. It was the expiatory type that constituted the daily sacrifice—the continual burnt-offering—up to apostolic times; it was regarded as most perfectly embodying, through its vicarious character, the sacrificial idea; it was not connected with any particular transgression, but was maintained as the appropriate means of a sinful people's approach to a Holy God. Essential features in it were the shedding and sprinkling of blood and the conveyance of the sacrifice entire to God and His ministers; it was also accompanied by the imposition of hands. The utmost importance was attached in this type of sacrifice to the disposition of the victim's blood: the blood was God's; it belonged to Him of right; a mysterious potency inhered in it; the life was in it (cf. Lv 17^{11}); safety for the individual and the nation lay in such sacrifices of blood. It is of great importance, however, in view of apostolic conceptions to note that such sacrifices—the highest in value the Levitical system provided—availed only for sins of ignorance, for unwitting transgression of holy things and for the removal of physical uncleanness, which was regarded as implying moral as well as ceremonial disability in drawing near to God (Nu 15^{30}). For wilful sins—'sins with a high hand'—no reconciling sacrifice was provided in Israel; the penalty of such sins was death—'that soul was cut off from Israel.' But even such sins were not beyond the reach of forgiveness. That such sinners might through confession and true penitence approach God, and through His grace, apart from sacrifice, meet with His mercy was the evangelical proclamation of the prophets. It was held, however, by later Jewish interpreters that the 'scapegoat' on the great Day of Atonement expiated the sins of all Israelites who had not deliberately put themselves outside its effects by forsaking the religion of their people; and this expiation was applied so as to include sins the penalty of which was 'to be cut off from his people,' or death (cf. *EBi* iv. 4219, 4224).

(*d*) *Later Jewish.*—The whole question of the expiatory value of Jewish sacrifices generally is keenly debated amongst modern scholars. The theory of the penal substitution of the life of the animal victim in place of the life of the offerer, which was formerly regarded as almost an axiomatic principle of interpretation, now meets with cogent criticism. Whilst this theory is still held on the ground of evidence direct and indirect in biblical and post-biblical ideas or usage, it must be said that probably the majority of modern scholars regard it as no longer tenable. Much in the discussion of these opposing positions turns upon the confidence which should be placed upon the theories of sacrifice prevalent in later Judaism. If the date and adequacy of the valuable materials collected from later Jewish sources, belonging to the time when the institution of the Synagogue was growing up side by side with the sacrificial worship of the Temple, could be depended upon, they would afford data of the highest importance in seeking to interpret the ideas of the apostolic literature, whose writers had been taught in the synagogue or in the Rabbinical schools. The present difficulty, however, of gathering the old Jewish theory of sacrifice from these sources may be illustrated by the contrary judgments of two scholars who have had access to them. Holtzmann sums up the result thus: 'Everything pressed towards the assumption that the offering of a life, substituted for sinners according to God's appointment, cancelled the death penalty which they had incurred, and that consequently the offered blood of the sacrificial victims expiated sin as a surrogate for the life of the guilty' (*Neutest. Theol.* i. 68, quoted by W. P. Paterson, art. 'Sacrifice' in *HDB* iv. 342^{b}; cf. Stevens, *Theol. of the NT*, p. 409). G. F. Moore holds an opposite opinion: 'The theory that the victim's life is put in place of the owner's is nowhere hinted at, perhaps because the Jewish doctors understood better than our theologians what sin offerings and trespass offerings were, and what they were for' (*EBi* iv. 4226). Such a measure of disagreement need not, however, lead to the position assumed by other scholars that no theory underlay the practice of sacrifice in Israel: 'A precise answer to the question how the sacrificial worship influenced God men were unable to give. When in the blood of the Sin-offering the tie between God and His people was renewed, what was felt was the weird influence of the incomprehensible' (Smend, *Alttest. Religionsgesch.*, p. 324). Apostolic writers held that there is a simple answer given in Lv 17^{11} to the question how sacrifice expiates—'it is the blood that maketh atonement.' 'According to the law, I may almost say, all things are cleansed with blood, and apart from shedding of blood there is no remission' (He 9^{22}). Two other important tendencies of the later Jewish period also passed as influential principles for sacrificial interpretation into the apostolic teaching: (a) the strong tendency to recognize the sufferings, and especially the death, of righteous men as atoning for the sins of other men. For instance, the merits of Abraham served to cover the sins of his posterity; such expiatory value of suffering is also applied to the sufferings of Moses, Ezekiel, and Jeremiah, and to the passion of the martyrs; it was also pre-eminently illustrated in the career of the Suffering Servant of Is 53. These sufferings constituted a ground of forgiveness of sin in Israel; they are expressly compared, in point of efficacy, to the Day of Atonement (*Pesiqta*, 174*b*). These tendencies probably influenced profoundly the sacrificial theory of the age; for it was a transition easily made from the vicarious death of the righteous to the belief in substitution of animal victims, or possibly by *a fortiori* reasoning from the value of the substitutionary death of the animal victim to that of the righteous saint (cf. 2 Mac 7^{37}, 4 Mac 6^{29}). (b) Whilst the sacrificial ceremonies were most scrupulously observed and with great pomp and solemnity, a process was going on which was loosening the hold of sacrifice upon the Jewish religion. A reluctant admission was beginning to be made—which ultimately found its logical and historical completion in apostolic Christianity—that it was not a full expression of the relation of His people to God, and was not wholly essential for their communion with Him. Sacrificial worship was being gradually co-ordinated with that of the synagogue. Owing to the renewed authority of the teaching of the prophets, and the widening distance from the Temple services of the multiplied congregations of the Dispersion, knowledge of the Law and the ethical value of good deeds became recognized forms of religious activity which were regarded as directly well-pleasing to God; the Rabbi and the scribe became at least complementary authorities, often indeed competitors with the priest and the Levite. The destruction of the Second Temple within the Apostolic Age so quickened the rapidity with which traditional authority became superior to sacrificial that it was officially taught that the study of the Law was more valuable in the sight of God than the continual burnt-offering (*Megilla*, 3*b*, 16*b*, *Pesiqta*, 60*b*). The fact that within the Apostolic Age the abolition of sacrifice as a national mode of worship in Jewish religion had become, through the destruction of Jerusalem, a necessity may well be helpful in defining the attitude of apostolic writers towards sacrifice.

For careful information on the origin and theory of sacrifice the reader should consult the very full article 'Sacrifice' by W. P. Paterson in *HDB*, which favours the substitutionary theory, and that in *EBi* by G. F. Moore, which opposes it; also Smend's discussion of the development of the sacrificial system in Israel in his *Alttest. Religionsgeschichte*; G. B. Stevens outlines the sacrificial system in *Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, pt. i. ch. i.

2. Modifications of the inherited sacrificial system presented in apostolic teaching and in the practice of the Apostolic Church.—The best method of expounding the apostolic views of sacrifice is to notice in what directions and to what extent the writers in the primitive Church modified the sacrificial ideas they carried with them in their passage from Judaism to Christianity. These were the ideas from which controversies and party divisions in the Apostolic Church largely sprang. Jewish and Gentile Christians possessed a different heritage of sacrificial practices; the apostolic literature has reference to both, but the references to the Jewish immeasurably preponderate. The starting-point for the apostolic modifications is found in the Synoptic account of the attitude of Jesus towards the current sacrificial system. (*a*) He recognized the authority of the sacrificial law as practised in His time by observing it, keeping the Passover and other feasts, worshipping in the Temple, where sacrifice was the central act; by commending its observance to others, *e.g.* the law of the leper in the day of his cleansing (Mt 8^{4}; cf. Mk 1^{44}). (*b*) He constantly favoured the prophetic rather than the priestly view of sacrifice. He quoted Hos 6^{6} 'I desire mercy and not sacrifice' (Mt 9^{13} 12^{7}), and commended the judgment that love is more than all burnt-offering (Mk 12^{33}); He declared that sacrifice is worthless with unrepented sin (Mt 5^{23}). (*c*) He referred to His own death as sacrificial, comparing it especially with the Covenant sacrifice with which the Mosaic system was instituted, 'My blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many unto remission of sins' (Mt 26^{28}, Lk 22^{20}; cf. 1 Co 11^{25}). If we may take the 'new' of the Lucan and Pauline versions as our Lord's, we may draw the inference that in the establishing of the 'new' the 'old' Covenant was abrogated, and with it the sacrifices that had initiated it and given it historical continuity in Israel. How long it was after the institution of the New Covenant before the Apostolic Church appreciated all its implications it is not easy to determine. The Petrine attitude, which favoured a policy of continuity or at least compromise towards important parts of the Jewish sacrificial cultus, is exhibited in early, strenuous conflicts of judgment recorded in the Apostolic Church. St. Paul quickly seized the central principle in the changed situation which was to mark the development of Christian thought and usage in reference to the Jewish sacrificial system, but he succeeded only gradually in applying it. The full inferences of the abrogation of the ancient sacrifices are first drawn by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The use made by the apostolic witnesses of the elaborate and technical terminology of the Jewish sacrificial system must be briefly reviewed. The 'proof-text' method of working over this material in fragmentary textual correspondences and coincidences between the old and new is not satisfactory, and has yielded place to the co-ordinated testimonies of typical apostolic teachers. The differences and signs of developing doctrine in this group of writers must be separately considered as constituting together—

3. The apostolic teaching.—The records of the apostolic preaching in the Acts reveal the primary fact that 'Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures' (1 Co 15^{3}) was an article of common tradition in the Apostolic Church. The death of Christ appears to have been regarded at a very early period as expiatory; the idea of expiation was closely associated with that of sacrifice; it was natural, therefore, that the death of Christ should be looked upon as a sacrifice and spoken of under sacrificial figures. This sacrificial interpretation of His death is embedded in subsequent types of apostolic teaching (A. Ritschl, *Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*, Bonn, 1870–74, ii. 161; A. Cave, *Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice*, p. 280 ff.). No direct mention of the sacrifice of Christ is made by James or Jude; but their silence may be accounted for by the fact that the subject was foreign to the purpose for which they wrote.

(*a*) *Petrine.*—In the Epistles of Peter the sacrificial references are clear and interesting; 'sprinkling of the blood of Jesus' (1 P 1^{2}; cf. Ex 24^{8}); 'ye were redeemed . . . with precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, even the blood of Christ' (1^{18}); cf. also Is $53^{7\mathrm{ff.}}$ with its clear echo in 1 P $2^{21\text{-}25}$, where the sacrificial idea of vicarious suffering is too obvious to need comment. The characteristic feature of the Petrine references is their close sympathy with OT ideas and usage.

(*b*) *Pauline.*—In the Pauline references the contrast between the Jewish and Christian aspects of sacrifice is more pronounced. St. Paul's direct references to Levitical sacrifice are not numerous. Their scarcity, however, does not warrant Bruce's suggestion that his ideas were coloured more by the analogy of human sacrifice, with which Greek and Roman story makes us familiar, than by that of the Levitical system (cf. *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, Edinburgh, 1894, p. 169). Whilst St. Paul does allude to pagan ideas of communion through sacrifice (1 Co $10^{18.\ 28}$), he was intimately acquainted with the minutiæ of the Levitical system and even definitely associated himself with its observance (Ac 21^{26} $24^{11.\ 17\mathrm{f.}}$), though some find it difficult to believe that his action in the Temple could have been so contrary to his clearly expressed precept (cf. Gal 4^{9}). It should also be noted that St. Paul, unlike the writer to the Hebrews, does not explicitly declare that the sacrifices of the Law came to an end with the death of Christ. Whilst it cannot be denied that St. Paul clearly regards the death of Christ as substitutionary, he expounds this conception so much less in terms of the sacrificial system than might have been expected from him that it has been possible for some expositors to maintain with some plausibility that he did not regard Christ's death as a sacrifice (cf. Pfleiderer, *Der Paulinismus*^{2}, Leipzig, 1890, p. 144). This is an exaggerated position; for in addition to many traces of sacrificial ideas which he used as suggestive illustrations of the meaning of Christ's death, he speaks definitely of the Death as a sacrifice, 'He gave himself up for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for an odour of a sweet smell' (Eph 5^{2}); 'Our passover also hath been sacrificed, even Christ' (1 Co 5^{7}). References to the blood of Christ as the ground of the benefits conferred by His death (Ro 3^{25} 5^{9}, 1 Co 10^{16}, Eph 2^{13}) are not satisfied by regarding the 'blood' as merely an allusion to His violent death; it seems clear from the tenor of St. Paul's teaching that he means 'sacrificial blood' (cf. Ro 8^{32}, Gal 2^{20}, Col 1^{20}, Eph 1^{7}). It may be maintained, however, that if he 'has not especially brought out this idea [the interpretation of Christ's death] in connection with his allusions to sacrifice, he has done so in other ways, and the inference that this was his conception of Christ's death, viewed as a sacrifice, is quite inevitable' (Stevens, *Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, p. 63).

(*c*) *Epistle to the Hebrews.*—Unlike St. Paul the writer to the Hebrews presents his doctrine of salvation wholly in terms of sacrifice, and thus provides the classical treatment of the significance of sacrifice for apostolic thought. His argument is developed in a running comparison between the sacrifices of the Levitical ritual and the perfect offering presented by Christ in the sacrifice of Himself. The sacrificial institutions associated with the Old Covenant are set forth as types and shadows of the heavenly and eternal reality in which the New Covenant is established in the blood of Christ. The key-word of the Epistle and of the comparison it elaborates is 'better.' The Son whose humanity is perfect, the Mediator of the new and better covenant, is the true High Priest (see art. PRIEST) (cf. $8^{6\text{-}13}$ $9^{15\mathrm{ff.}}$). His constitutive function is to offer sacrifice (8^{3}). Christ offers Himself; the nature and effect of this perfect sacrifice are contrasted with the sacrifices of the Law (8–10^{18}); the contrast culminates in the parallel between the action of the high priest in the Holy of Holies on the Day of Atonement (Ex 24$^{4-8}$) and Christ entering the heavenly places 'through his own blood' (9$^{11ff.}$). The superiority of Christ's sacrifice is everywhere impressively developed. It was also an offering in close dependence upon the love of God: by the grace of God Christ tasted death for every man (2^{9}); it was never spoken of as 'reconciling God.'

Three main truths emerge from the comparison. (i.) *The Levitical sacrifices cannot take away sin*; they serve rather to bring to mind the sin they cannot expiate (10^{3}). At its best the Levitical system contemplated the removal of ceremonial faults only, sins of ignorance and infirmity (10$^{4.11}$); it effected a purification of the body only. The pathetic failure of the whole sacrificial system touches all the writer's thought; it was morally ineffective because it belonged to the lower, sensible world (9^{11} 11^{3}), 'the visible order' of Philo and the Alexandrian thinkers. The absoluteness and finality of Christ's sacrifice is demonstrated by relating it to the heavenly and eternal realm of reality (8$^{1f.}$ 9$^{1.24}$ 10^{1})—the realm which Philo, in the spirit of Plato's doctrine of archetypal ideas, calls 'the intelligible world.' Christ has entered with His sacrifice into heaven itself (9^{24}) and obtained eternal salvation for us (7^{27} 9$^{12.15}$ 10^{10}), having 'through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish unto God' (9^{14}). It was an offering, on our behalf and as our representative, of a pure and spotless life. The solidarity of Christ with mankind is confidently stated: 'Both he that sanctifieth and they that are sanctified are all of one; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren' (2^{11}). The Levitical sacrifices were perpetually repeated, just because they had no real efficacy either objective or subjective (9^{6} 10$^{3f.}$); Christ's sacrifice is made once for all, 'perfecting for ever them that are sanctified' (7^{27} 9$^{12.25f.28}$ 10$^{12.14}$). Christ's sacrifice purged the conscience to serve the living God (9^{14} 10^{22}), thus dealing with sin ethically and in its deepest seat instead of with its accidental expressions which marked the limits of efficacy in ceremonial sacrifices (9^{9} 10^{3}). The sacrifices of the Law opened no way of spiritual access to the holy presence of God (9^{8}); by the blood of Jesus a new and living way was dedicated by which men could draw near to Him with spiritual confidence (10$^{19f.}$). Everywhere the writer insists upon the truth that only by better sacrifices than those of the Levitical system could the heavenly places and the spiritual realities be cleansed and consecrated (7^{25} 9$^{19.21-24}$); insufficiency marks all material elements and outward aspects of sacrifice; indeed, the whole point of the exposition turns upon contrast, not upon congruity. The interpretation of the Epistle which is frequently met with, that because its author expounds the Christian salvation in the terminology of sacrifice its meaning is therefore to be determined throughout by reading it in the light of the Levitical system, misses entirely the main motive of the writer, which is to mark the radical difference between the Christian and the Levitical conception of sacrifice. The most important fact to be observed is that the author, constrained by the estimate of the Christian values of sacrifice, ethicizes the whole meaning of sacrifice, and ascribes to Christ's offering of Himself a wholly different nature from that which belongs to the Levitical oblations.

This is specially seen in the way in which the writer deals with (ii.) *the value of the material of Christ's sacrifice—His blood.* In the Levitical system the manipulation of the blood was of supreme importance. Nothing was cleansed without its use (9$^{21f.}$). The vital moment in the culmination of the sacrifices of the Day of Atonement was the entering of the Holy of Holies by the high priest, bearing with him sacrificial blood (9^{7}). Christ's sacrificial act was accomplished also when He entered into the heavenly place 'through his own blood' (9$^{11ff.}$) 'to make propitiation for the sins of the people' (2^{17}); 'he offered a sacrifice for sins once for all, when he offered up himself' (7^{27}; cf. 9$^{26.28}$). It is clear that the writer makes distinct use of the conception of substitution. But it is important to notice the evidence that something deeper than the literal substitution and the idea of legal transfer of sin which had gained currency in the later Jewish period was in the writer's mind. The value of Christ's offering is ethical; it resides in His will; His blood is presented not simply as the evidence of His death, but as the offering of His life. It is life, not death, which is the essence of all true sacrifice. Even in the Levitical system the blood constitutes the sacrifice, because 'the blood is the life' (Lv 17^{11}). Christ's offering of Himself includes more than His dying; it is the willing offering of His life in the perfection of ceaseless filial obedience to the will of God. The writer of this Epistle emphasizes this: 'Sacrifices and offerings and whole burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein (the which are offered according to the law), then hath he said, Lo, I am come to do thy will. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By which will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all' (10$^{8ff.}$). This offering with which God was well pleased brought humanity into a new relation to God. It was a positive ethical and religious valuation of Christ's sacrifice that went beyond its value as merely legal substitution.

(iii.) *The doctrine of the New Covenant.* The first Covenant was not dedicated without blood (9^{18}; cf. Ex 24$^{6.8}$); sacrificial blood was for Israel essentially 'the blood of the covenant' (9^{20}; cf. Mt 26^{28}). The sacrifices of the Mosaic Covenant were the sign of the establishment of the Law; the New Covenant in Christ's blood was the sign of its fulfilment, and therefore 'unto remission of sins' (Mt 26^{28}; cf. Jn 6^{53}–7^{1}, 1 Jn 1^{7}). The blood divided by sprinkling between the parties to the covenant was the seal of the friendship it established or restored. It was under the shelter of this covenant relation that the whole system of Levitical sacrifices was instituted; they availed only for those within its bonds. This conditioned its permanence; it could not abide. It was the prophetic attitude towards sacrifice that initiated the conception of the necessity of a New Covenant which should be ethical and spiritual and therefore permanent and universal. Jeremiah's prophecy of the New Covenant (Jer 31^{31}) is the principal link between the sacrifices of the Law and Christ's fulfilment and consequent abolition of them. This is a covenant under which God lays His laws upon the hearts of men and inscribes them upon their minds, and undertakes no longer to remember their sins and iniquities (10$^{16ff.}$ 8$^{8ff.}$). 'Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin' (10^{18}). A real remission makes all other sacrifices useless. The sacrifice of Christ, 'the mediator of a new covenant' (9^{15}) by which such a new covenant is established, is the 'one offering by which he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified' (10^{14}). The prophetic idea of the value of the sacrificial sufferings of the Righteous Servant is thus restored in close association with the use of sacrificial ideas which were the current coin of Jewish thought. Henceforth there was no longer room for the sacrifices of the Law (10^{18}). The only sacrifice that retained its permanence for the future was 'a sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of lips which make confession to his name' (13^{15}).

(*d*) *Johannine.*—These writings probably represent apostolic views on sacrifice towards the close of the Apostolic Age and therefore later than the sources hitherto considered. It is a question for discussion, however, whether the ideas they suggest represent a development of the apostolic thought upon this subject or whether they simply reproduce the common positions to which the Church had become accustomed as traditional interpretations. That so little is said of sacrifice itself and so much of the abiding ethical and spiritual results that Christian thought had learned to connect with the sacrificial death of Christ seems to favour the opinion that the apostolic conception had by this time become more completely separated from the Jewish and more perfectly expressed in purely ethical applications; the mystical rather than the legal aspect of sacrifices prevails. But direct sacrificial terms appear at times in the Gospels, Epistles, and Apocalypse, and probably quite as frequently, proportionately, as in the Pauline writings. (i.) The references to 'the Lamb of God' (Jn 1^{29}) predominate. The great saying of John the Baptist, whether critically valid or not, is a good illustration of the Johannine type of reference. This sacrificial symbol is definitely applied to Jesus. Whether the reference is to the Paschal Lamb or to the prophetic sacrificial ideal of the Suffering Servant (Is 53^{11}) is not certain. But there is no doubt of the expiatory value attached to the symbol; for the Lamb 'taketh away the sin of the world' (1^{29}; cf. 1 P 1^{19}). Jesus takes away sin by the sacrificial method. Symbol and expiatory idea occur again several times in the Apocalypse, where 'the Lamb' is combined with references to the sacrificial blood; 'a Lamb standing, as though it had been slain' (Rev $5^{6.\ 12}$); those who have 'washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb' (7^{14}); 'they overcame because of the blood of the Lamb' (12^{11}). Salvation is ascribed unto 'our God which sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb' (7^{10}). These references indicate how easily and naturally sacrificial ideas were associated with the work of Christ and especially with its results. Although textual difficulties attach to 'the Lamb that hath been slain from the foundation of the world' (13^{8}), it may illustrate how influentially the sacrificial idea applied to Christ persisted in apostolic thought. (ii.) The references of Jesus to 'eating my flesh, and drinking my blood,' in Jn 6 are sacrificial; they are interesting as references in apostolic times to sacrifice as the sharing in a common meal with a view to enriching human life by communion. Here such ideas, though presented in sacrificial symbolism, are intensely ethical and spiritual in value. (iii.) Illustrations of the elevation of the sacrificial idea to the sublime acts of ethical self-sacrifice by which Christ accomplished His redemptive mission may be traced in the references to the laying down of His life in vicarious surrender; 'the lifting up' (Jn 3^{14} $12^{32f.}$), 'the good shepherd' (Jn 10^{11}), 'the prophecy of Caiaphas' (11^{50}), 'the corn of wheat' ($12^{23ff.}$). (iv.) And in Jn 17^{19} the work of Christ is paralleled, as in Hebrews, by that of the high priest on the Day of Atonement by the use of a word of sacrificial associations. (v.) In the First Epistle of John words and ideas with direct sacrificial implications are frequently observed; 'the blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us from all sin' (1^{7}); 'he is the propitiation for our sins' (2^{2} 3^{16} 4^{10}); 'he was manifested to take away sins' (3^{5}); with these may be read the distinctive saying of the Apocalypse, 'Unto him that loveth us, and loosed us from our sins by his blood' (Rev 1^{5}). The contribution these sayings make to the interpretation of the apostolic thought respecting sacrifice is that they everywhere appear as familiar Christian phrases, which suggest how surely the transition had been accomplished in the early Church from the legal and preparatory conception of sacrifice to the permanent Christian view which was ethical and spiritual.

(*e*) *Sub-apostolic.*—In this period the sacrificial ideas met with in the Apostolic Age continued with but little change; the tendency, judging from post-apostolic development, was, if anything, towards more ceremonial and material views of sacrifice as applied to illustrate or interpret the death of Christ. The Epistle ascribed to Barnabas deals with the subject in its relation to the sacrifices of the Jewish Temple, which are considered to have been abolished in order that 'the new law of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is without the yoke of necessity, might have a human oblation' (ii.).

4. Conclusions.—Sacrifice was taken over by the Apostolic Church as a living institution in Judaism; the value of it as a fundamental principle of religious worship was recognized; the retrospect of its history given by the apostolic writers is reverent and appreciative; it was educative. For a time there appears to have been hesitation as to how far its practice should continue in the Christian environment; the primitive Jewish Christians made use of it by worshipping in the Temple at Jerusalem, and in the observance of ritual associated with the sacrificial system elsewhere within the Christian communities. Others with a quicker spiritual instinct reached the conviction that as Christ was the only perfect sacrifice, the material and historical sacrifices were of relative value only, and transient. Vehement controversy arose when the Judaizing party in the Church sought to lay upon Gentile believers the burden of the ceremonial law of Israel. The sharp contentions of the Petrine and Pauline schools (Ac 15^{39}), the Council at Jerusalem (Ac 15), the teaching of the Pauline Epistles, particularly Galatians, and ultimately the masterly argument of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews are witnesses to hesitations and tendencies of thought in apostolic times. Sympathy with the ancient ritual of sacrifice and sanction for its practice appear to have accompanied the emergence of Christianity as a separate institution from the Judaism in which it had its rise. Whilst the great principle that in Christ all preparatory sacrificial institutions were fulfilled found early acceptance, it was only slowly that its many-sided implications were fully acknowledged.

(*a*) *Retention of the Jewish sacrificial system as symbolic.*—Even when the sacrificial system as a living institution had passed into a condition of obsolescence in the Apostolic Church, it remained permanently influential as an organized system of illustrations for interpreting the spiritual realities of the work of Christ; it became a system of types and symbols which were of service for the teacher and preacher. Whilst the apostles deliberately set aside the belief in the efficacy of Jewish sacrifices, it is evident not only that they could express the work of Christ in no better terms than those associated with sacrificial ritual, but that they found in these terms some real meaning when applied to the shedding of His blood for the remission of sins. Consequently sacrificial terminology came into easy and common usage, and became in fact the most comprehensible and almost necessary medium for the thought-forms which set forth the inward and abiding realities of the Christian redemption. The evidence for this abounds, as we have seen, in the apostolic literature. How close the symbol moved towards the reality in the apostolic teaching respecting the significance of the death of Christ, how far, that is, His death was truly a sacrifice, involves questions that run up into the problems of the grounds on which the efficacy of His death was ultimately based (see ATONEMENT). So far, however, as its efficacy is based on the meaning of sacrifice in the OT, the divergent positions held as satisfying the terms of apostolic teaching may be broadly represented on the one hand by writers who hold that sacrifice in the OT was substitutionary in the sense of providing satisfaction for sin, and, on the other hand, by writers who maintain that such a view 'rests upon profound misunderstandings of the nature of the OT sacrifices, and entirely ignores Jewish conceptions of the effect and operation of sacrifice' (*EBi* iv. 4232). The kindred question arising from the apostolic use of sacrificial symbols, as to how far Christ's death was truly a sacrifice, or merely illustrated by sacrificial language, also leads to opposing replies. On the one hand, it is held that 'Old Testament conceptions will always be suggestive and historically instructive for the study of Christian teaching, but a direct source of such teaching they cannot be. Christianity rises high above that national and ritualistic religion on whose soil it took its rise' (Stevens, *Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, p. 2; cf. W. R. Smith, *Prophets of Israel*, Edinburgh, 1882, p. 6). On the other hand, W. P. Paterson writes: 'Nor for the apostolic age was the description of Christ's death as a sacrifice of the nature of a mere illustration. The apostles held it to be a sacrifice in the most literal sense of the word' (*HDB* iv. 343 f.). One fact stands clearly out. The thought-forms of the Apostolic Church have survived, and are living and apparently necessary thought-forms for modern Christian thinkers. The whole problem of symbolism or typology in Christian teaching will probably receive greater attention in the near future. This will be necessary in order to show how far the detailed correspondences between the precise elements of Jewish ritual and Christian ideas of sacrifice so freely set forth in the apostolic writings afford justification or otherwise for the exegetical methods subsequently adopted by Christian expositors. It is in effect the question whether the minutiæ of sacrificial ritual in the ancient economy should be elaborated by them with increasing ingenuity as providentially supplied for literal application as a means of legitimately interpreting the sacrificial work of Christ, or whether the whole Levitical system should be broadly expounded as preparatory because illustrating the sacrificial principle, itself eternal in all true religion, as generally predictive of its final and highest expression in Christ. The latter alternative would have the advantage of co-ordinating the predictive element in sacrificial typology with the same element in prophecy, and applying to it the methods of interpretation which modern critical scholarship has used with success in exhibiting the *preparatio evangelica* in Messianic prophecies as Christ fulfils them. (These positions are discussed in Cave, *Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice*, pp. 131–173; *HDB* iv. 348; Stevens, *Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, p. 2 ff.; A. S. Peake, *The Bible*, London, 1913, pp. 347–361.) Another feature of the retention by the apostolic writers of the sacrificial symbols is their effective application to the beautiful ethical ritual that was to become characteristic of the worship and service of the Christian life. Everything in Christianity, in both its Godward and its manward activities, is regarded as essentially sacrificial in spirit. Christ's sacrifice of Himself was not only the fulfilment of all preceding types; it was itself a type; it was typical of the presentation to God as an offering well pleasing to Him, 'an odour of a sweet smell,' of the whole body, soul, and spirit of Christian manhood (Ro 15^{16}, Jude ^{24}). The heart of apostolic teaching was that every Christian was crucified with Christ; he died with Him (Ro $6^{4ff.}$). But he had also his own cross upon which, as upon an altar, the oblation of his own life was offered; he also was a 'priest unto God,' and it was essential that he should have somewhat to offer. Hence the offering of his body (Ro 12^{1}), his prayers and his thanksgivings (He 13^{15}), his good deeds (13^{16}), his gifts of charity (Ph 4^{18}), his entire service for others (Ph 2^{17}), were spoken of as sacrifices after the manner of Christ's offering of Himself. Such sacrifices were acceptable to God and were a means of blessing for men. St. Paul is bold enough to say that his sufferings on behalf of others were means whereby he could 'fill up what is lacking of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh on behalf of his body, which is the church' (Col 1^{24}). This saying probably reflects in the Christian atmosphere the later Jewish idea of the value of 'the sufferings of the saints.' Its applications in subsequent Christian thought are too subtle and historically too far-reaching for reference here. These and the association of the Eucharist with sacrificial values lie far beyond the limits of apostolic thought both exegetically and historically (cf. T. M. Lindsay, *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries*, London, 1902, p. 307; J. B. Lightfoot, 'The Christian Ministry,' in *Philippians*^{6}, London, 1881, pp. 261, 264 f.

(*b*) *Fulfilment in the death of Christ.*—The dominant and, with the slight exception of the secondary applications referred to, the sole concern of the apostolic mind was to relate the sacrificial ideas of the past to the supreme fulfilment of their meaning in the death of Christ. There can be no doubt that the death of Christ was very early regarded in this light; it corresponded to these ideas as antitype to type. Not only was the whole sacrificial worship thought of as in a general sense typical of Christ's perfect offering of Himself, but the correspondence between His death and the different elements of the Levitical system is indicated; *e.g.* covenant sacrifice (He 9^{15}); Passover sacrifice (1 Co 5^{7}); peace offering (Eph 5^{2}); sin offering (Ro 8^{3}, He 13^{11}, 1 P 3^{18}); sacrifices of the Day of Atonement (He $9^{12ff.}$). The ritual acts of the Jewish system are also regarded as having been repeated in the history of Christ's dying; *e.g.* the slaying of the spotless lamb (Rev 5^{6} 13^{8}), the sprinkling of blood in the sin offering (He $9^{13ff.}$), and in the covenant sacrifice (1 P 1^{2}); the destruction of the victim without the gate (He 13^{13}). Moreover, spiritual results are attributed so definitely to the fulfilment in Christ's death of all the suggestions conveyed historically and typically by the ineffective offering continually of animal sacrifices that this event must inevitably issue in—

(*c*) *The abrogation of sacrifice.*—In their pre-Christian days the apostolic writers had believed in the efficiency of the Jewish sacrificial system; now they regarded its oblations as of value chiefly because of the witness of these to their own inadequacy. The reality of the inward experience that they had 'redemption in his blood,' access in worship into 'the holiest of all' through the blood of Jesus, reduced their need of the older sacrifices to a vanishing point. Whilst it may be an open question whether the sacrificial systems of either the Jewish or the Græco-Roman religion could have maintained their place as permanent institutions in presence of the growing refinement of taste and the more elevated ideas of God, made familiar in the Platonic or Stoic systems of thought current in the Apostolic Age, yet the sure joys of forgiveness of sin, the newness of life and the privileges of direct communion with God in Christ ultimately made it axiomatic for apostolic teaching that all other sacrifices, Jewish or pagan, were abolished in Christ. His sacrifice was effective because it belonged to a different world—the world of heavenly and eternal realities—from that of the temporary, carnal, and ineffectual offering of material gifts. This transition to ethical and final values in sacrifice was accompanied in apostolic thought by a—

(*d*) *Return to prophetic ideas of sacrifice.*—These made the real value of sacrifice to depend upon personal relations between God and man, and upon its voluntary quality. This return was, as we have seen, mediated chiefly by means of the influence of the great prophetic figure of the Suffering Servant of Is 53 (cf. Ac 8^{32} $3^{13.\ 26}$ $4^{27f.\ 30}$, He 9^{28}, 1 P $2^{21\text{-}25}$). It cannot be without significance for the modern mind that sacrificial categories derived from the Levitical order were unable to express fully for the apostolic mind the significance of the sacrificial death of Christ. These were obsolescent and needed the complement and interpretation of the prophetic ideas whose value was permanent. In the recognition of sacrifice as essentially ethical and spiritual the apostolic writers so far anticipated the findings of modern criticism that prophecy, not ceremonial legalism, represented the high-water mark of the religious ideas of Israel. Without implying its priority in time they assumed its priority in value; it was the decline of prophetism and the ascendancy of ritualism which had brought on that night of legalism in later Jewish religion in which the formalism of priest, Pharisee, and scribe, to which apostolic teaching was antithetical, had developed. The exposition of the apostolic meaning of sacrifice has suffered many things, even at the hands of Christian teachers, because the animal victims and not the human servant, law and not prophecy, have given it significance; the OT system of ritual sacrifice has been so fully discussed that the figures of Jeremiah, the suffering Remnant, and the Servant of the Lord, the human forerunners of Christ in sacrificial obedience, have failed in emphasis (cf. G. A. Smith, *Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the OT*, London, 1901, p. 170 ff.).

LITERATURE.—A. A. Sykes, *Essay on the Nature of Sacrifice*, London, 1748; W. Magee, *Scriptural Doctrines of Atonement and Sacrifice*, do., 1812; J. Davison, *Origin and Intent of Primitive Sacrifice*, do., 1825; P. Fairbairn, *The Typology of Scripture*, Edinburgh, 1845–47; A. Cave, *Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice and Atonement*, new and revised ed., do., 1890; J. F. D. Maurice, *Doctrine of Sacrifice*, new ed., London, 1879; H. C. Trumbull, *The Blood Covenant and its Bearings on Scripture*, New York, 1885; A. Scott, *Sacrifice: its Prophecy and Fulfilment*, London, 1894; W. Sanday, *Different Conceptions of Priesthood and Sacrifice*, do., 1900; G. B. Stevens, *The Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, Edinburgh, 1905, pt. i., chs. i., ii., v., vii., *Theology of the NT*, do., 1899, pts. iii., v.; G. Milligan, *Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, do., 1899; T. V. Tymms, *Christian Idea of Atonement*, London, 1904, lects. v., vii.; C. von Weizsäcker, *The Apostolic Age*^{2}, do., 1897; W. H. Ward, 'The NT Doctrine of the Relation of Christ's Death to the OT Sacrificial System,' in *Bibl. Sac.* lxiv. [1894] 246 ff.; art. 'Sacrifice' in *EBi* by G. F. Moore, and in *HDB* by W. P. Paterson (both valuable); Comm. on *Hebrews* by B. F. Westcott, London, 1889, F. Delitzsch, Eng. tr., Edinburgh, 1878–80, A. B. Davidson, do., 1882, A. B. Bruce, do., 1899; R. W. Dale, *The Jewish Temple and the Christian Church*^{5}, London, 1880; H. J. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der neutest. Theologie*, Freiburg i. B., 1896–97. For more general reference to sacrifice: J. H. Kurtz, *Der alttest. Opfercultus*, Mitau, 1862, Eng. tr., Edinburgh, 1863; J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, Berlin, 1883, Eng. tr. with additions, Edinburgh, 1885; W. R. Smith, *Rel. Sem.*, new ed., London, 1894, pp. 213–440; R. Smend, *Lehrbuch der alttest. Religionsgeschichte*^{2}, Freiburg i. B., 1899; H. Schultz, *Alttest. Theologie*^{4}, Göttingen, 1888, Eng. tr.^{2}, Edinburgh, 1898, 'The Significance of Sacrifice in the Old Testament,' in *AJTh* iv. [1900] 257 ff.; E. B. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*^{3}, London, 1891; F. B Jevons, *An Introduction to the History of Religion*^{3}, do., 1904, chs. xi., xii.; D. G. Brinton, *Religions of Primitive Peoples*, New York, 1897; J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*^{2}, London, 1900; J. Donaldson, *Expiatory and Substitutionary Sacrifices of the Greeks*, Edinburgh, 1875.

FREDERIC PLATT.

SACRILEGE.—See ROBBERS OF CHURCHES.

SADDUCEES.—The Sadducees were a Jewish sect or party best known by their opposition to the Pharisees.

1. Sources.—Our knowledge of the Sadducees, such as it is, is derived from the following sources: (*a*) Gospels and Acts; (*b*) Josephus; (*c*) Rabbinical writings, mainly Mishna, Tosefta, Sifre, Sifra, and Mechilta (these are all of comparatively late date, but their value is unquestionable as embodying earlier traditions. They record various disputes that took place between Pharisees and Sadducees); (*d*) Zadokite fragments (these are two fragments discovered quite recently in the Cairo Genizah. They deal with the beliefs and practices of a sect that lived in Damascus probably two centuries B.C., and was clearly Sadducean). Some references to Sadducees are found in various Church Fathers, but they have no independent value. It has to be remarked of the evidence of Josephus that it almost seems that part of what he had to say regarding Pharisees and Sadducees has been lost. In *Ant.* XIII. v. 9, XVIII. i. 2, he refers to *BJ* ii., but there we find only a scanty reference to Pharisees and Sadducees, while his notice of the Essenes is full. Further, the tendency of Josephus to bring Jewish parties into line with Greek schools of philosophy detracts somewhat from the value of his account.

2. The name.—The explanation of the name 'Sadducee' has long been a puzzle. Only two views need to be mentioned. (*a*) It has long been held that the name is derived from a certain priest Zadok. The difficulty has been to identify the Zadok in question. A linguistic difficulty has also been urged, to account for the form *Zaddûkîm* from *Zadok*. This, however, disappears when we find that in the LXX and in Josephus the name is spelt *Zaddok*. (*b*) The view in *EBi* supported by *EBr*^{11} (see art. 'Sadducees') is that the word represents the Persian *zandik*. In modern Persian *zandik* means a Zoroastrian, hence an infidel. It is argued that, just as the Greek ἐπικοῦρος was used by Jews as='infidel,' the Persian *zandik* was probably applied to this sect, who, from the standpoint of the Pharisees were little better than infidels, and who further supported the introduction of foreign customs. Further, in the Arabic NT 'Sadducee' is translated *zandakiya*. It must be admitted that this view is ingenious. Its difficulties are obvious, a chief one being that we cannot argue safely from modern Persian to an ante-Christian usage. Besides, if we are to admit that the Zadokite fragments are Sadducean in character and origin—and this cannot easily be denied—it is beyond doubt that in this case the old and widely held opinion is correct. (For full discussion see W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Books of the Apocrypha, their Origin, Teaching, and Contents*, London, 1914, p. 132 f.)

3. Opposition to the Pharisees.—That the two parties were hostile is known to all. How precisely and concisely the difference is to be defined is a problem of great difficulty. Our knowledge of the Sadducees in particular is not extensive, and a large portion of it comes from sources that certainly were not sympathetic. Geiger's view that the Sadducees were aristocratic while the Pharisees were democratic is true so far, but does not bring out the fact that their differences were notably theological or give any explanation of those divergences. J. R. Hanne's view that Pharisees and Sadducees carried on the old conflict of prophetism and priestism is attractive, but according to the NT it is the Pharisees who are blinded and enslaved by that ceremonialism and externalism against which prophetism protested. Wellhausen's view that the Pharisees were essentially those devoted to the Law on religious grounds while the Sadducees were essentially a political party has really little evidence in its favour, and all our authorities agree in representing the differences between the two parties as to a great extent doctrinal. (For reference to those views see A. Hilgenfeld, *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums*, Leipzig, 1884, p. 86 f.) Instead of attempting the ambitious task of expressing the differences in any one phrase, we shall do better simply to set down what is known of them as they existed.

(*a*) *Standard of faith and practice.*—The fundamental difference between Pharisees and Sadducees was that relating to the supreme arbiter of all disputes. What is the standard? What the final court of appeal? The Sadducees held that it was contained only in the written Law. The Pharisees held that the oral traditions were as authoritative at least as the written Law.

> 'The Pharisees have delivered to the people from the tradition of the fathers all manner of ordinances not contained in the laws of Moses; for which reason the sect of the Sadducees reject these ordinances; for they affirm that only such laws ought to be observed as are written, while those which are orally delivered from the tradition of the fathers are not binding. And concerning these things great questionings have arisen among them' (Jos. *Ant.* XIII. x. 6).

All other sources fully bear out the accuracy of this statement, which in a sense is the most important that we have. In its light everything else must be read and where necessary corrected. It explains the negations or Agnosticism of the Sadducean creed: no doctrine that was not clearly taught in the written Law possessed for them validity or certainty. It explains why they were more rigid than the Pharisees in enforcing the penal law (*Ant.* XIV. iv. 2 f.). It would be misleading to call the Sadducees the Protestants of Judaism, but there is some similarity between their divergence from the Pharisees and the divergence of Protestants from Roman Catholics on the question of authority. In both cases we have an appeal to the written Word alone, as against an appeal to the Word *plus* traditions, precedents, and ecclesiastical judgments. For the latter the Pharisees claimed the same sort of infallibility as the Roman Church attaches to *ex cathedra* pronouncements by the pope.

How did this conflict eventuate? In reality there was a clear victory for neither. Pharisaism and Sadduceeism in their long discussions affected each other. On the one hand, the complexities of life convinced the Sadducees that cases had to be met for which there was no definite guidance in the written Word, and popular feeling compelled them to fall in with the procedure of the Pharisees (*Ant.* XVIII. i. 4). Still, we may take it, they strove to make all new regulations in harmony with the Word. On the other hand, their insistence on the supreme authority of the Word led to an intensive study of the Word by the Pharisees, who were concerned to show, just as a Roman Catholic is, that the oral tradition was really based upon the Word. Hence the Pharisees won, but only by doing full justice to the Sadducean position.

> 'The Pharisees won the day ultimately, for they were able to show by subtle exegesis that the oral tradition was based upon the written Law. But, and this is the great point, the Sadducæan principle was thus victorious; as a party they went under; but the Pharisees, by adopting the Sadducæan principle that nothing is binding that cannot be shown to be in accordance with the written Law, implicitly acknowledged that the Sadducees had been right all along' (Oesterley, *op. cit.*, p. 143).

(*b*) *Providence.* — According to Josephus, the Sadducees did not believe in Providence.

> While the Pharisees, he tells us, hold that some things in the world happen by the will of Providence, and that other things lie in the power of men, 'the Sadducees take away Providence, and say there is no such thing, and that the events of human affairs are not at its disposal; but they suppose that all our actions are in our own power' (*Ant.* XIII. v. 9). 'The Sadducees take away Providence entirely, and suppose that God is not concerned in our doing or not doing what is evil; and they say that to act what is good, or what is evil, is at men's own choice, and that the one or the other belongs so to every one, that they may act as they please' (*BJ* II. viii. 14).

We cannot admit that this is an accurate account of Sadducean belief. Josephus is here straining the position of the Sadducees into correspondence with the Epicureans and sceptical individualists of Greece. If the Sadducees were the stalwart supporters of the written Word, they could not have held such a view of God and the world. Further, if Josephus is accurate here, passages such as Mt 3^{7} 16^{1}, Ac $5^{39f.}$ become unintelligible. There it is implied that Sadducees believe in wrath to come, in signs from heaven, in the danger of fighting against God. Again, while Rabbinical writings contain no evidence of any dispute with the Pharisees on this topic—a silence which is very significant—the Zadokite fragments show the Sadducean doctrine of God to be in harmony with OT teaching (see Oesterley, *op. cit.*, p. 145 f.). We conclude that on this topic there was no essential difference between Pharisees and Sadducees. It follows that the popular idea of Sadducees as irreligious and rationalist is as baseless as the idea that all Pharisees were whited sepulchres.

(*c*) *The future life.*—It is clear that the Sadducees did not believe in the resurrection of the body (Ac 23^{8}). Did they believe in the immortality of the soul? According to Josephus, they did not.

> 'They take away the belief of the immortal duration of the soul and the punishments and rewards in Hades' (*BJ* II. viii. 14).

Oesterley tries to show that in this point also Josephus is untrustworthy. Josephus, he holds rightly enough, does not separate the questions of resurrection and immortality, and represents for his Greek readers, to whom resurrection was an unfamiliar idea, the denial of the one as a denial of the other. This is not improbable in itself, but it is difficult to explain away the agreement on this point between Josephus and Ac 23^{8}, 'The Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit.' Oesterley very properly connects this usage of 'angel' with Ac 12^{15}, 'It is his angel.' And he argues that what is meant is that Sadducees did not believe that the departed become angels or spirits (*op. cit.*, p. 147 f.). It is not obvious how he can conclude that probably the Sadducees believed in the immortality of the soul, after admitting that they did not believe in resurrection or in the departed becoming spirits. Probably on this point the Sadducees took Agnostic ground. Their supreme standard being the written Law, it is difficult to see what else they could have done.

(*d*) *Attitude to foreign influences.* — In strong contrast to the Pharisees (see art. PHARISEES), the Sadducees were sympathetic to foreign, especially Hellenistic, culture. This contrast between the two parties is surprising. The Sadducees stood for the old truth against the innovations of the Pharisees. The latter were the party of progress. Yet it was the conservative Sadducee who embraced foreign culture with enthusiasm, and the progressive Pharisee who bitterly opposed it. In the history of the conflicts of political and ecclesiastical parties it is no unusual thing to find the opponents apparently exchanging rôles. Often no better explanation can be given than that suggested by Oesterley in this case, 'the innate illogic of human nature' (*op. cit.*, p. 155).

(*e*) *The Messiah.* — The Sadducees held that Aaron and his family were the chosen of God from whom Messiah should proceed.

(*f*) *The calendar.*—Into this complicated subject we have no occasion to enter. It is sufficient to say that endless disputes were carried on between the two parties as to the correct dates of the feasts, arising from the fact that while the Pharisees reckoned by a lunar year, the Sadducees computed a solar year (see Oesterley, *op. cit.*, p. 150 f.).

4. Position and influence. — In our period the

Sadducees were in the position of an aristocracy. 'This doctrine is received but by a few, yet by those still of the greatest dignity' (Jos. *Ant.* XVIII. i. 4). Practically they may be identified with the Temple high-priestly caste, though there were priests who were not Sadducees, and no doubt Sadducees who were not priests. The majority of the Temple officials and their relatives constituted the main portion of the sect of the Sadducees (cf. W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, Berlin, 1903, p. 164 f.). The high priest and the whole Temple cultus still possessed considerable influence. But their power was waning. Various movements tended to diminish it. Essenes rejected the Temple rites almost entirely. Several late Jewish works speak deprecatingly of the present Temple compared with the former. The real religious leader was no longer the priest but the scribe. The facts that the Sadducees were harsh in punishing, and that the upkeep of the Temple was so expensive, tended to make the people favour the party who opposed the Sadducees (cf. Bousset, *op. cit.*, p. 87 f.). With the destruction of the Temple Sadduceeism disappeared.

As to the character of the sect our knowledge is too limited to enable any just estimate to be made. According to Josephus, they did not agree too well among themselves.

> 'The behaviour of the Sadducees one towards another is in some degree wild, and their conversation with those that are of their own party is as barbarous as if they were strangers to them' (*BJ* II. viii. 14).

Their unpatriotic conduct in Maccabæan times cannot be palliated, and there is reason to fear that worldliness and an eye to the main chance dulled the purity of their devotion to the Law. On the other hand, it is important to remember that the common notion that they were mere politicians and irreligious has absolutely no foundation in the authentic evidence we possess.

5. Attitude to Christianity.—Jesus Himself referred very seldom to the Sadducees; His polemic was directed against the Pharisees. In His protest against their making void the Law by their traditions He was at one with the Sadducees. Yet it was from the Sadducees that the most bitter persecution of Judæan Christianity arose. We know the part played by the Sadducean Sanhedrin in the trial of Jesus. They continued to persecute His disciples (Ac 4$^{1ff.}$ 5^{17} 23$^{1ff.}$). Josephus informs us that they were responsible for the death of James, the brother of the Lord (*Ant.* XX. ix. 1). There can be little doubt as to the reason for this persecution. It began when Jesus interfered with the prerogatives of the Sanhedrin by expelling the money-changers from the Temple-court. Significant also is the stress laid upon His alleged threat to destroy the Temple. In the rise of a party adhering to Jesus they feared political consequences (Jn 11$^{47ff.}$). They were in power, and they meant to keep it, and anything that threatened to be a danger to their power or to the Temple cultus with which their power was bound up they strove to destroy. That any Sadducees became Christian we are not told. Many of the priests believed (Ac 6^{7}), but that is indecisive, as many priests were not Sadducees. But one of the disciples was 'known unto the high priest' (Jn 18^{15}); a considerable degree of intimacy is implied in this statement, and it is very improbable that a friend of the high priest would be anything but a Sadducee. There is a possibility, then, that the author of the Fourth Gospel was once a Sadducee. One would like to think that the two greatest of NT writers were of Pharisee and Sadducee origin respectively. Both sects had their good points, and both their grave errors. Christianity conserved what was good in both, and offered a higher unity in which their differences were transcended.

LITERATURE.—See under PHARISEES.

W. D. NIVEN.

SAIL, SAILOR.—See SHIP.

SAINT.—'Saint' in the NT is the English equivalent of ἅγιος, 'holy,' as applied to the individual. It is important to recall the fundamental idea of 'holy,' which is primarily a religious and not an ethical idea (see art. HOLINESS). The man, thing, or place that is holy belongs to God, and is therefore 'separate' from what is profane or common property. What belongs to God partakes of the Divine character; therefore the ethical content of 'saint' is determined by the character attributed to the Divinity to whom the 'saint' belongs, and by the nature of the existing bond. Everywhere in the NT God is One whose heart, purpose, and power towards men are revealed as redeeming love in Jesus Christ. The 'saint' is a 'believer (πιστός) in Christ Jesus' (Eph 1^{1}, Col 1^{2}), *i.e.* one who has accepted the gospel of love which constitutes the essential significance of His life, death, and resurrection, along with its corresponding ethical obligations. In other words, 'saint' is the NT equivalent of 'Christian.'

1. The saint is one on whose whole life God has an irresistible claim, which is humbly acknowledged by the individual concerned. This claim receives its most striking admission in such utterances as 'the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself up for me' (Gal 2^{20}); 'ye are not your own; for ye were bought with a price' (1 Co 6^{20}); 'beloved of God, called to be saints' (Ro 1^{7}). Under various metaphors, this new and compelling relationship of the 'saint' to God is expressed. Regarded as a criminal on trial, he is 'justified' or 'acquitted' (yet as an act of grace, and not with a verdict of 'not guilty,' Ro 5^{8}); as an enemy he is 'reconciled'; as a debtor he is 'forgiven'; as a slave he is either 'redeemed' or admitted to the status of 'son' in the household of God (cf. A. Deissmann, *St. Paul*, Eng. tr., London, 1913, p. 145). In other words, the saint is 'called' by God, in the sense of receiving not an invitation, but rather a royal summons, expressed in the free gift of an overwhelming love. The NT does not look on 'sainthood' as an adventure which may be presumption, a kind of life for which volunteers are asked, a warfare at our own charges, for which some are constitutionally or temperamentally or by virtue of circumstances unfitted. It is not what we are, or feel ourselves to be, or what we have been, that determines our right to call ourselves 'saints.' Our 'calling' rests on the truth of the character and purpose of God revealed in Jesus Christ. The ethical bearings of this claim upon men properly belong to the art. SANCTIFICATION. It is sufficient to say here that the 'saint' is one who is immediately and obediently responsive to the Spirit of God, the spirit of sonship (Ro 8^{15}). He is one who is, from the ideal point of view, no longer subject to any external rule or 'law'; from whom no tracts of the world's life are fenced off by any arbitrary or conventional requirement; whose only 'constraint' is the 'love of Christ,' especially as revealed in His Cross (2 Co 5^{14}); in other words, one who 'possesses the kingdom' (Dn 7^{22}), accepts the rule of God, and suffers it to bring forth its own fruits in character and moral attitude. The Holy Spirit is the immanent principle of the new life (Ro 8$^{14f.}$).

2. It should be noted that in the Bible the term 'saint' is never applied to individuals as such. The word is always 'saints.' Only twice is it used in the singular, as applied to persons (Ph 4^{21}, Rev 22^{11}), where, however, the 'saint' is regarded as a member of a community. Jesus alone in the NT is called ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ (*e.g.* Mk 1^{24}). This is important as establishing a link between the OT and the NT conceptions. In the OT 'saints' are members of the true Israel, at first of the nation, and latterly of the pious remnant. In the NT 'church' and 'saints' are used interchangeably in the greetings of letters: the former in Thessalonians, Corinthians, Galatians, Philemon; the latter in Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians. Just as in the OT the covenant is made with the nation, or with Abraham as representing the nation yet to be, so with the NT the Church or community of believers is the recipient of the 'new covenant in my blood.' This is not equivalent to putting the Church first, and the individual experiences of its members last. It simply means that the present experience and future realization of 'salvation' by the individual was to the first Christians or 'saints' inconceivable, except in so far as it involved a mutual relationship with others in the sight of God. Saintliness is an impossibility unless it contains as its essence an experience of God's love common to all which finds expression in common worship, and certain corresponding mutual obligations of loving thought and ministry towards others. The members of the Church have been individually justified, reconciled, forgiven, and have entered upon a new relationship of trust and freedom with God; but the spirit that has accomplished this can have no free course in the development of individual life and character, except in so far as it expresses itself in a community where Christ is head of every man (1 Co 11^{3}). 'We, who are many, are one body in Christ, and severally members one of another' (Ro 12^{5}). The saints in the NT as in the OT receive a 'kingdom' (Dn 7^{27}), a social gift too great for one pair of hands to hold, or for one single mind to conceive. We must comprehend 'with all saints' (Eph 3^{18}) the dimensions of the love of God. No Christian apart from others can perfectly fulfil the moral and spiritual ideal, or attain to 'eternal life.' A more common description in the NT of the kingdom which is the possession of the saints is 'inheritance' (see art. HEIR). Christians are 'heirs' of eternal life (Tit 3^{7}), and also of the 'kingdom' (1 Co $6^{9.\,10}$ 15^{50}). The mutual relationship that exists as binding the members of the Church together is increasingly based in the NT on the response to certain moral obligations, which are directly involved in the experience of salvation (Eph 5^{5}, Col 1^{12}).

It will thus become readily apparent that with the new conception of God revealed in the Cross of Christ these two aspects of NT sainthood issue in the result that moral obligation in the Christian life is not merely reinforced, but deepened and enriched. The enervating sense of impossibility, and the facile acceptance of a two-fold standard of living, so interwoven with the popular use of the word 'saint,' are really the still persistent product of the monastic ideal, and are seen to be, what they really are, a fundamental denial of the Christian faith, which is essentially the acceptance of a filial relationship to God. The moral activities of the saint are rooted in a 'patience' which obeys the voice of illumined conscience, and humbly believes in Jesus at all costs (Rev 14^{12}; cf. Col 1^{10}).

LITERATURE.—H. J. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der NT Theologie*^{2}, 2 vols., Tübingen, 1911 (*passim*); P. Feine, *Theologie des NT*, Leipzig, 1910 (*passim*); art. 'Saint' in *HDB*; R. Law, *The Tests of Life*, Edinburgh, 1909, p. 90 f.; J. Denney, *The Way Everlasting*, London, 1911, p. 113 ff.; F. Paget, *Studies in the Christian Character*, do., 1895, p. 55 ff.; H. F. Amiel, *Journal Intime*^{5}, Geneva, 1887, tr. Mrs. Humphry Ward, London, 1898, p. 147; J. H. Newman, *Parochial and Plain Sermons* (Selection), do., 1868, pp. 260 ff., 277 ff.

R. H. STRACHAN.

SALAMIS (Σαλαμίς).—Salamis, the most important city of ancient Cyprus, was the first place visited by St. Paul and Barnabas in their first missionary journey (Ac 13^{5}). Situated at the eastern extremity of the island, about equidistant from Cilicia in the north and Syria in the east, it was the emporium of the wide and fertile plain of Salaminia, which stretched inward between two mountain ranges as far as Nicosia, the present capital of Cyprus. Once a centre of Mycenæan civilization, and afterwards colonized by the Greeks, Salamis became the arena of a long conflict between an Eastern and a Western culture, Phœnicia and Hellas here contending with and profoundly influencing one another.

The city possessed a fine harbour, near which the Athenians defeated the Phœnicians, the allies of Persia, in 449 B.C. The same waters witnessed the greatest sea-fight of ancient times, in which Demetrius the son of Antigonus achieved in 306 B.C. a brilliant victory over Ptolemy Soter and thus wrested the island from him. But after a few years Cyprus was again in the possession of the Egyptian king, and it was probably during his reign that Jews began to settle in the island, to which a letter is said to have been sent by the Roman Senate on behalf of this people about 139 B.C. (1 Mac 15^{23}). Their numbers were doubtless greatly increased in the time of Herod the Great, when 'Cæsar made him a present of half the copper mines in Cyprus, and committed the care of the other half to him' (Jos. *Ant.* XVI. iv. 5). Many Jews must have made their home in Salamis, where Barnabas (himself a Cypriote, Ac 4^{36}) and St. Paul found synagogues, in which they 'proclaimed the word of God' (Ac 13^{5}). The historian has recorded no incidents or results of this visit. After the 'sharp contention' of St. Paul and Barnabas at the beginning of the second missionary tour, the latter went back to labour in his native island, taking his cousin Mark with him (15^{39}). During a widespread insurrection in the reign of Hadrian (A.D. 117), the Jews of Salamis, grown numerous and wealthy, rose and massacred their fellow-citizens, and the once populous city became almost a desert. 'Hadrian, afterwards Emperor, landed on the island, and marched to the assistance of the few inhabitants who had been able to act on the defensive. He defeated the Jews, expelled them from the island, to whose beautiful coasts no Jew was ever after permitted to approach. If one were accidentally wrecked on the inhospitable shore, he was instantly put to death' (H. H. Milman, *Hist. of the Jews*^{4}, London, 1866, ii. 421). Devastated by earthquakes in the time of Constantius and Constantine, Salamis was restored by Constantius II. and named Constantia. Epiphanius, the writer on the heretical sects, was its archbishop A.D. 367–402. The story that Barnabas suffered martyrdom there is a late legend. His relics, with a copy of the First Gospel, were 'discovered' in A.D. 477, and the Emperor Zeno consequently made the Cyprian Church independent of the patriarchate of Antioch. The site of the ancient city is now covered by sandhills, its place being taken by Famagusta, 2½ miles S., where there is a good natural harbour.

LITERATURE.—Conybeare-Howson, *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, new ed., 1877, i. 169 ff.; T. Lewin, *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*^{3}, 1875; J. A. R. Munro and H. A. Tubbs, in *JHS* xii. [1891] 59 ff., 298 ff.

JAMES STRAHAN.

SALEM.—See JERUSALEM, MELCHIZEDEK.

SALMONE (Σαλμώνη; Strabo usually writes Σαμώνιον, sometimes Σαλμώνιον; Pliny, *Sammonium*).—Salmone is a promontory in the east of Crete (Ac 27^{7}). It is uncertain whether the modern Cape Sidero, in the extreme N.E., or Cape Plaka, about

7 miles farther S., was so named. The map of Crete in *EBr*^{11} gives the latter. It has been surmised that the ancient usage itself varied. On passing Cnidos, the S.E. corner of Asia Minor, St. Paul's Alexandrian ship was beaten out of her course, which would have taken her straight to Cythera, north of Crete, and obliged to bear S.W. by S. till she came over against (κατά) Salmone, from which point she could work slowly westward under the lee of the island. The season was autumn, during which the Etesian (north-west) winds blow in the Ægean for forty days, beginning at the rise of the dog-star (Herodotus, vi. 140, vii. 168); 'perflant his diebus, quos Etesias vocant' (Pliny, *HN* ii. 47). Aristotle describes them as *μῖξιν ἔχοντες τῶν τε ἀπὸ τῆς ἄρκτου φερομένων καὶ ζεφύρων* (*de Mundo*, iv. 15).

Literature.—J. Smith, *The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*^{4}, 1880, pp. 74–81; W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, 1895, p. 320 f.; Conybeare-Howson, *St. Paul*, new ed., 1877, ii. 392 f. James Strahan.

SALT (*ἅλς*; also *ἅλας*, a form which is rare except in LXX and NT; adj. *ἁλυκός*).—This condiment of food was in general use among the civilized nations of antiquity. From the religious significance which it had for the primitive mind, and especially its association with sacrificial meals, it became—and still is throughout the East—a symbol of guest-friendship and fidelity; from its purifying and antiseptic properties, an image of the power of good men to preserve the moral soundness of society (Mt 5^{13}); and from its piquancy, a suggestion of the relish which wit and wisdom give to talk which would otherwise be insipid. St. Paul exhorts the Colossians to let their speech be 'seasoned with salt' (*ἅλατι ἠρτυμένος*, Col 4^6), and the salt which he had in mind possessed finer properties than the *ἅλες* and *sal* of Greek and Latin writers.

Attic 'salt' was Attic wit. Pliny (*HN* xxxi. 7) says: 'The higher enjoyments of life could not exist without the use of salt: indeed, so highly necessary is this condiment to mankind, that the pleasures of the mind can be expressed by no better term than the word salt (*sales*), such being the name given to all effusions of wit.' The meaning of the word is usually indicated by the context in which it occurs: 'Sale vero et facetiis Cæsar . . . vicit omnes' (Cic. *de Offic.* I. xxxvii. 133); 'facetiarum quidam lepos quo, tanquam sale, perspergatur omnis oratio' (Cic. *de Orat.* i. 34); 'sal niger,' *i.e.* biting wit, sarcasm (Hor. *Ep.* II. ii. 60).

St. Paul was of course familiar with this classical 'salt,' which at its best was intellectual acuteness and sparkling wit, but which easily degenerated into *εὐτραπελία* (Eph 5^4). There was no lack of it in his university town of Tarsus. But as a Christian he takes the word—like *χάρις*, *ἀγάπη* and many another term—and gives it a new and better connotation. He eliminates from it the bitterness of sarcasm and adds to it the essential grace of Christianity. Without making it less intellectual, he makes it more spiritual. As a lover of good talk, he is far from deprecating what is stimulating and pungent. He desiderates all the old readiness 'to answer each one' (Col 4^{6b}), but the answer will no longer be the repartee which seeks a brilliant personal victory; it will be the response of the heart that loves still more than of the mind that glitters. If the new meaning of the metaphor is to be determined by the context in which it is employed—'walk in wisdom,' 'let your speech be always with grace'—salt becomes the symbol of a rare combination of virtues. A spiritual wisdom and Christian grace, at once quickening the gifts of Nature and hallowing the charms of culture, are to replace pagan wit as the savour of that human intercourse which is the feast of reason and the flow of souls.

Literature.—Grimm-Thayer, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*^{2}, 1890, *s.v.* ἅλας; artt. 'Salt' in *HDB* and *EBi*; J. B. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*^{3}, 1879. James Strahan.

SALUTATIONS.—Salutations are friendly greetings, literary and otherwise, which Christianity took over from the social life of antiquity, but filled with a new content of Divine love and made a symbol of a common brotherhood in Christ. Of literary greetings those in Ro 16$^{3-15}$ are the most striking and the most puzzling. Here are twenty-five persons and four house-societies, each apparently well known to St. Paul, and characterized by him with a particularity as brief as it is discriminating. This by one who had never been in Rome is quite impossible, it is said. Jülicher says: 'One must presuppose a kind of popular emigration from the Pauline congregations in the East to Rome, in order to find so many friends of the apostle in Rome.'* But there was a constant movement to Rome from all over the Empire, as well as a returning tide, and the Apostle with his rare knowledge of societies in Asia and Europe could easily have a score of personal friends in the capital, as well as an intimate knowledge of the Church there. David Schulz sought the solution in Ephesus, to which Church these words were directed.† Spitta claims that the Epistle to Rome is really two Epistles, the second being written from Spain later, after St. Paul knew the Romans from residence.‡ But this presupposes a second imprisonment—a point in dispute—and it is not wise to assume it unless necessary. The *Acta Pauli* (ed. C. Schmidt, Heidelberg, 1905) connects the death of St. Paul with the imprisonment of which we know. But in every city in which St. Paul worked there were Jews and Christians personally known to him who were now in Rome; cf. Juv. *Sat.* iii. 62 ff., and Strabo, xiv. p. 675 (ed. Amsterdam, 1707, p. 993), where he speaks of the city 'full of Tarseans and Alexandrians.'

K. Erbes, in a suggestive article, thinks that, as St. Paul's journey to Rome was well known in the city, many disciples met him at Forum Appii or Tres Tabernæ, and gave him full particulars concerning the Roman congregation. Even before, brethren in Rome in deep sympathy had written to him, so that he was familiar with disciples there. In the Peter-Paul *Acts* (ed. R. A. Lipsius, Leipzig, 1891, p. 180 f.), it is said that St. Paul received in Malta a friendly letter from Rome by two messengers, and this occurs in the oldest part of these Acts. The greetings in Ro 16 may be a historical reminder of this letter. Christians also may have gone ahead to Rome from St. Paul's various Churches to help and plead for him. How much Christians did in this way for lesser men we know from Lucian, *de Morte Peregrini*, 13, and Ignatius, *ad Smyrn.* 10, and Erbes gives interesting parallels between the Epistles of Ignatius and St. Paul. The Greek names in these greetings—there are also Latin—confirm what we know from other sources, that most of the members in Rome were Greek. In the *Bulletino dell' Instituto di Corrispondenza archeologica*, Rome, 1881, p. 131 ff., H. Dessau gives eighty-one names in families in Ostia in which NT ones often recur. It can easily be proved by inscriptions in the time of Claudius and Nero that all the names in Ro 16 were Roman names. Erbes thinks that these were actual salutations sent to Rome by the Apostle, occasioned perhaps by these embassies and letters; and that this beautiful message covering with renown these humble and faithful workers might not be lost, they inserted it in the most appropriate place in the Epistle to the Romans.§

The religious interest, however, so predominates in the NT that salutations like those in Ro 16 are rare. They are swallowed up in the ever-recurring prayer (in which, perhaps, greeting also is not wanting) that the grace of God or of Christ may be with the Christians. And the community or brotherhood seems to supersede the personal element. 'The churches of Asia salute you'

---

* *Einleitung in das NT*^{7}, Tübingen, 1906, p. 95, Eng. tr., *An Introduction to the NT*, London, 1904, p. 109 f.

† *SK*, 1829, p. 609 f.

‡ *Untersuchungen über den Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (=*Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristentums*, vol. iii. pt. i.), Göttingen, 1901, esp. pp. 76, 82–91.

§ 'Zeit und Ziele der Grüsse Rom. 16$^{3-15}$,' in *ZNTW* x. [1909] 128–147.

(1 Co 16^{19}); 'All the brethren salute you' (v.^{20}). If Aquila and Prisca salute, 'the church that is in their house,' the society usually meeting in their triclinium or dining-room is immediately brought in (v.^{19}). Again, 'All the saints salute you' (2 Co 13^{13}), where the word 'saints' is to be interpreted as equivalent—without losing its religious significance—to our word 'members.' This universality of Christian interest, or inclusiveness of brotherhood, appears often: 'Salute every saint in Christ Jesus' (Ph 4^{21}); 'The brethren which are with me salute you' (v.^{21}), where all the Christians who were wont to assemble in prison or in his hired rooms (Ac 28^{30}) to console St. Paul, or were actually present when he dictated this letter, join in his salutation; 'All the saints salute you, especially they that are of Cæsar's household' (Ph 4^{22}), where we are reminded of what recent research in inscriptions has shown, not to speak of the literary evidence—that converts, and some of them of high rank, were in the Imperial Court, besides many in the city of the highest circles.* Sometimes St. Paul is so anxious to bring home to the societies his loving greetings that he takes the pen from the amanuensis and adds these in his own hand (1 Co 16^{21}, Col 4^{18}). In the form 'All that are with me salute thee' (Tit 3^{15}) there is nothing unusual, as the same appears in the papyri.† The Christian note, of course, is peculiar: 'Salute them that love us in faith' (*ib.*). In the midst of other associations, in and for Christian society alone St. Paul lived and worked. On account of a danger of a false Judaizing, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews brings in the Christian leaders in a unique way. The democracy of Christianity is seen both in the inscriptions or opening words of the Epistles and in the greetings at the close, where mention of ministers or officers is generally absent, in a way impossible after A.D. 80 or later. But in Hebrews we have: 'Salute all them that have the rule over you [better, 'all your leaders,' ἡγουμένους], and all the saints' (13^{24}). The author is determined, as in desperation over theological and other (v.^{4}) dangers (cf. the Epistles of Ignatius), to refer the believers again (see v.^{7}) to their guides and other helpers, of whose correctness he is convinced. Even their salutations must first be given to them. The personal touch is in 2 Jn^{12} and more remotely in 3 Jn^{14}. James, 2 Peter, 1 John, and Jude omit greetings at the end.

Of greetings in practice, the kiss, well known in Oriental lands, is urged five times, besides being mentioned in Ac 20^{37}—'Salute one another with a holy kiss' (1 Co 16^{20}, 2 Co 13^{12}, Ro 16^{16}, 1 Th 5^{26} ['all the brethren'], and 1 P 5^{14} ['Salute one another with a kiss of love']). The thought at the back of it in ancient folklore was the communion of soul with soul, or the forming of a covenant, for the soul flows out of the nose or mouth. This significance held long in magic. When the sorcerer attempts to awaken the dead by a kiss, he will pour his own soul into him (cf. 2 K 4^{34}), as Jahweh makes man a living soul by breathing (Gn 2^{7}).‡ In ancient Rome the kiss was a sign of family relationship, so that there developed a formal law of the kiss (*ius osculi*) between relatives, going as far as those between whom marriage was forbidden. It was also a sign of peace or agreement. The salutation by the kiss was taken over under Christianity as a matter of course, but, like everything else, purified and sanctified. References in the NT presuppose an assembly for worship, where the Epistles are read, the kiss being not yet perhaps a formal part of the service, but a general practice on the ground of brotherly love in religious communion. Whether in NT times the kiss was promiscuous between the sexes cannot be answered certainly, though it is risky to argue from later custom that it was.* The separation of the sexes in the assemblies, the strict subordination of women amounting to a depreciation on the part of St. Paul (1 Ti 2^{9-15}), and general customs among both Jews and Greeks, make it exceedingly unlikely that the kiss was given promiscuously. If so, it was, as Cabrol says, a sign of the purity of morals among Christians. But later, in the 2nd and 3rd centuries, with the growth of larger freedom and self-confidence, the kiss became more general. It has been argued, though on slight grounds, that it was a custom in the Jewish synagogues.†

R. Seeberg thinks, from the ancient custom of the kiss in the Lord's Supper service, and from the passages on the kiss in the Epistles, that the Epistles especially (not so much the Gospels) were read in the evening service, to which in the early Church the Supper was limited, and that the kiss as a part of the worship took place after that reading. 'So the writer of the Epistles reckons that his Epistle will be read in that evening service, in which worship and sociability flow together, so that he tries to prepare hearts for the reception of the Lord, whom they await in the Supper.' Besides, in 1 Co 16^{22}, after the kiss of v.^{20} comes the *Marana tha* ('The Lord is coming' [not, *Maran atha*, 'The Lord has come']) and the benediction, and we know from the *Didache* that the *Marana tha* was an element of the oldest liturgy of the Supper; consequently St. Paul in this passage connects an exhortation to the kiss with the Supper liturgy. He therefore expects that his Epistle will be read immediately before the Supper. The Lord's Supper kiss at the end of different NT Epistles proves that these Epistles are intended to be read in the evening public worship.‡ This is an ingenious and suggestive interpretation. Unfortunately, we have not sufficient light to estimate it.

As we go into the post-Apostolic Age, we find the kiss a secure part of public worship. 'When we have ceased from prayer, we salute one another with a kiss. There is then brought to the presiding brother bread and a cup of wine' (Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 65). Athenagoras quotes an extra-canonical Scripture warning against an abuse of the kiss, saying that 'the kiss, or rather the salutation, should be given with the greatest care; since, if there be mixed with it the least defilement of thought, it excludes us from eternal life' (*Legat.* 32). Clement of Alexandria also recognizes abuses which crept in, and refers to the resounding kisses in church which made suspicions and evil reports among the heathen, and claims that the kiss must be 'mystic' (*Pæd.* iii. 11). Tertullian presupposes omission of the kiss when fasting, but declaims against the omission (except on Good Friday), believing that the kiss of brotherhood is a part of every true prayer (*de Orat.* 18). On the other hand, he refers to the embarrassment the custom causes in the case of an unbelieving husband who is unwilling for his wife 'to meet any one of the brethren to exchange a kiss' (*ad Uxor.* ii. 4). Origen refers the custom of the kiss after prayer to Ro 16^{16} and other Scripture, and says that the kiss must be holy, chaste, and sincere, an expression of peace and simplicity (*ad Rom.* x. 33 [Migne, *PG* xiv. 1283]). The *Apostolic Constitutions* (viii. 11) insisted on order in this part of the service; the clergy to kiss the bishop, the laity the men, the women the women, going back in this last particular to the probable use of the Apostolic Church.

Literature.—Besides the books mentioned in the footnotes see J. E. Frame, *ICC*, 'Thessalonians,' Edinburgh, 1912, p. 216; A. Robertson and A. Plummer, *ib.* '1 Corinthians,' do., 1911, p. 399; G. Wohlenberg, *Der erste und zweite Thessalonicher-*

---

* See A. Harnack, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*, Eng. tr.^{2}, 2 vols., London, 1908, Index, *s.v.* 'Rome.'

† J. A. Robinson, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, London, 1903, p. 280.

‡ H. Gressmann, in *RGG* iii. [Tübingen, 1911] 1908.

* As do E. Venables in *DCA* ii. 902 f., F. Cabrol in *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne*, Paris, 1903 ff., ii. 117 f., and A. E. Crawley in *ERE* vii. 740 f.

† F. C. Conybeare, in *Exp*, 4th ser., ix. [1894] 460–462.

‡ 'Kuss und Kanon' in *Aus Religion und Geschichte*, i. [Leipzig, 1906] 118–122.

brief, Leipzig, 1903, p. 122; K. Leimbach, in *Zeitschrift für die hist. Theol.* xli. [Gotha, 1871] 430–435; V. Schultze, art. 'Friedenskuss' in *PRE*^{3} vi. 274 f.; C. Krieg, in F. X. Kraus, *Realencyklopädie der christlichen Altertümer*, 2 vols., Freiburg i. B., 1881–85, i. 542–544, where older literature is given, and where reference to *ZWT* should be vol. xx. (not vol. xl.) p. 108; T. K. Cheyne, in *EBi*, *s.v.* 'Salutations.'

J. ALFRED FAULKNER.

SALVATION, SAVE, SAVIOUR.—1. Words referring to salvation in the NT outside the Gospels (for Gospels see *DCG* ii. 552–557, 571–573).—*σώζειν* ('to save') is generally used for spiritual deliverance. The exceptions in the Acts are 4^{9} 14^{9}, where it is used for healing from bodily infirmity, and $27^{20.\,31}$, where it is used for deliverance from shipwreck. In the other passages in the Acts ($2^{40.\,47}$ 4^{12} 11^{14} $15^{1.\,11}$ $16^{30.\,31}$) it is used to denote spiritual deliverance. The link between the two meanings may be seen in the quotation from Jl 3^{5} (Heb.; 2^{32} Eng.) cited in Ac 2^{21}; cf. Ro 10^{13}. *σώζειν* refers to the deliverance from Egypt in Jude^{5}; to deliverance from death in He 5^{7}; to spiritual deliverance in Ro $5^{9.\,10}$ 8^{24} 9^{27} $10^{9.\,13}$ $11^{14.\,26}$, 1 Co $1^{18.\,21}$ 3^{15} 5^{5} 7^{16} 9^{22} 10^{33} 15^{2}, 2 Co 2^{15}, Eph $2^{5.\,8}$, 1 Th 2^{16}, 2 Th 2^{10}, 1 Ti 1^{15} $2^{4.\,15}$ 4^{16}, 2 Ti 1^{9} 4^{18}, Tit 3^{5}, He 7^{25}, Ja 1^{21} 2^{14} 4^{12} 5^{20}, 1 P 3^{21} 4^{18}, Jude^{23}. In Ja 5^{15} ('the prayer of faith shall save him that is sick') *σώζειν* is interpreted of bodily healing by many commentators; but the general context of a chapter which as a whole relates to what is spiritual, the immediate context associating forgiveness of sins with the particular command ('and, if he have committed sins, it shall be forgiven him'), and the use of the word 'healed' in the next verse to denote healing from sin, concur to indicate that here also the word, as usually in the Epistles, means spiritual deliverance. Any difficulty in understanding *ἐγείρω* in 'the Lord shall raise him up' of spiritual succour is less than that of explaining 'the prayer of faith shall save' of bodily healing in this context.

σωτήρ ('saviour'), used in the Gospels for God (Lk 1^{47}) and Christ (Lk 2^{11}, Jn 4^{42}), similarly in the Acts and the Epistles refers to God in 1 Ti 1^{1} 2^{3} 4^{10}, Tit 1^{3} 2^{10} 3^{4}, Jude^{25}; and to Christ in Ac 5^{31} 13^{23}, Eph 5^{23} ('the saviour of the body'), Ph 3^{20}, 2 Ti 1^{10}, Tit 1^{4} 2^{13} 3^{6}, 2 P $1^{1.\,11}$ 2^{20} $3^{2.\,18}$, 1 Jn 4^{14}.

σωτηρία ('salvation'), used in the Gospels for spiritual deliverance in general, but connected with the idea of salvation through the Messiah (Lk $1^{69.\,71.\,77}$ 19^{9}, Jn 4^{22}), occurs for the deliverance from Egypt in Ac 7^{25}, for deliverance from death in shipwreck in Ac 27^{34}, for the deliverance of Noah in He 11^{7}. It is used for spiritual deliverance in Ac 4^{12} $13^{26.\,47}$ 16^{17}, Ro 1^{16} $10^{1.\,10}$ 11^{11} 13^{11}, 2 Co 1^{6} 6^{2} 7^{10}, Eph 1^{13}, Ph $1^{19.\,28}$ 2^{12}, 1 Th $5^{8.\,9}$, 2 Th 2^{13}, 2 Ti 2^{10} 3^{15}, He 1^{14} $2^{3.\,10}$ 5^{9} 6^{9} 9^{28}, 1 P $1^{5.\,9.\,10}$ 2^{2}, 2 P 3^{15}, Jude^{3}. Eleven (Ro 10^{1} 13^{11}, Ph 1^{19} 2^{12}, 1 Th $5^{8.\,9}$, 2 Ti 2^{10}, He 1^{14} 5^{9} 9^{28}, 1 P 1^{5} 2^{2}) of these instances refer to the future and ultimate salvation; the other instances refer, at any rate partly, to the salvation in this life. In Rev 7^{10} ('Salvation unto our God which sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb') 12^{10} ('Now is come the salvation, and the power, and the kingdom of our God, and the authority of his Christ') 19^{1} ('Salvation, and glory, and power, belong to our God'), there is a special way of using the word.

σωτήριον ('salvation'), used in the Gospels for spiritual deliverance through the Incarnation (Lk 2^{30} 3^{6}), occurs in St. Paul's speech in Ac 28^{28} for spiritual deliverance through the Incarnation, and in Eph 6^{17} for spiritual deliverance, the future being largely in view. In Lk 2^{30} 3^{6}, Ac 28^{28} it is from Is 40^{5} 52^{10} (LXX); in Eph 6^{17} it is from Is 59^{17} (LXX).

σωτήριος ('bringing salvation') occurs in Tit 2^{11} for spiritual deliverance through the Incarnation.

2. Connexion of NT words with OT words.—The analogous words in the OT are used for external deliverance, for a combination of external and spiritual deliverance, and very rarely for spiritual deliverance simply. The new feature in the NT is the frequent application to spiritual deliverance simply and to the supreme spiritual deliverance through the Incarnation. In the OT the verb יָשַׁע (*yāshaʿ*), meaning etymologically 'width,' 'spaciousness,' 'freedom from constraint,' usually denotes external deliverance; see, *e.g.*, Dt 20^{4}, Jg 3^{31}, 1 S 10^{27}, Ps 28^{9}, Hos 1^{7}; it denotes spiritual deliverance in Ezk 36^{29} 37^{23}. The noun יְשׁוּעָה (*yᵉshûʿāh*) is used for external deliverance in, *e.g.*, Ex 14^{13}, 1 S 14^{45}, Ps 3^{8}, Jon 2^{9}, for the cognate sense of welfare or prosperity in Job 30^{15}, and for a combination of external and spiritual deliverance in, *e.g.*, Is $12^{2.\,3}$ 45^{17} 49^{6} $51^{6.\,8}$ $52^{7.\,10}$ 56^{1}, Ps 67^{2} 98^{2}, though possibly some of these are instances of spiritual deliverance simply. The noun תְּשׁוּעָה (*tᵉshûʿāh*) is used for external deliverance in, *e.g.*, Jg 15^{18}, 1 S $11^{9.\,13}$, Ps 37^{39}, and for a combination of external and spiritual deliverance in Is 45^{17} 46^{13}, Ps $40^{10.\,16}$ 51^{14}, though possibly in some of these instances for spiritual deliverance simply. The noun יֵשַׁע (*yēshaʿ*) is used for external deliverance in, *e.g.*, Hab 3^{13}, Ps 12^{5} $18^{2.\,35.\,46}$, for the cognate sense of preserved security in Job $5^{4.\,11}$, and for a combination of external and spiritual deliverance in, *e.g.*, Mic 7^{7}, Hab 3^{18}, Ps 24^{5} 25^{5} 51^{12}, though possibly Ps 51^{12} may refer to spiritual deliverance simply. The noun מוֹשָׁעָה (*môshāʿāh*) occurs in Ps 68^{20} only; it there denotes, at any rate chiefly, external deliverance. (For the use of the Hebrew words see S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, 1890, pp. 90, 91 [^{2}1913, pp. 118, 119]; *The Parallel Psalter*^{2}, 1904, pp. 455, 456.)

3. Idea of salvation.—A characteristic thought of the NT is that salvation is past, present, and future. This may be seen with regard both to the actual words relating to salvation and to different expressions of the idea. Christians are spoken of as those who have been saved, and who are in possession of a salvation which they can use or neglect: 'By grace have ye been saved,' 'By grace have ye been saved through faith' (Eph $2^{5.\,8}$); 'According to his mercy he saved us' (Tit 3^{5}); 'How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation?' (He 2^{3}). Yet salvation is also future. As a helmet 'the hope of salvation' is to be 'put on' (1 Th 5^{8}). 'Now is salvation nearer to us than when we first believed' (Ro 13^{11}). Those who now have been justified by Christ's blood have yet to be saved through Him from the wrath (5^{9}); and those who have been reconciled to God through Christ's death have yet to be saved by His life (5^{10}). Christians are bidden to work out their salvation with fear and trembling (Ph 2^{12}); salvation is said to be ready to be revealed in the last time (1 P 1^{5}), although it is now received by a foretaste (1^{9}). Christians are at some future time to inherit salvation (He 1^{14}). While Christ has been once for all offered to bear the sins of many, He has yet to appear for salvation to those who wait for Him (9^{28}). The same three aspects—a past gift, a present possession, a future inheritance—are to be traced also in regard to eternal life, redemption, the gift of the Holy Ghost, and the Kingdom of Heaven, phrases which afford different expressions of the idea of salvation. In the Fourth Gospel eternal life is the present possession of the believer (3^{36} 5^{24} 6^{47} 6^{54} 12^{50} 17^{2}). This is indicated not only by the use of the present tense, but also by that which is asserted about eternal life. To believe, to hear the word, to eat the flesh of the Son of Man, to drink His blood, to be growing in the knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ, are all acts and conditions possible and realized in the present life. But the present possession is also a step towards future attainment. This is hinted at in 6$^{40.54}$, and more distinctly shown in 4$^{14.36}$ 6^{27} 12^{25}. Similarly in 1 Jn. the present character of eternal life is indicated in 3^{15} 5$^{11.12.13.20}$; the futurity of it is suggested in 2^{25}, and a link between the two is hinted at in 1^{2}. In the rest of the NT the idea of what is future preponderates. Ac 13$^{46.48}$, Ro 6$^{22.23}$, 1 Ti 1^{16} 6^{12} are ambiguous; in Mt 19^{16} (Mk 10^{17}, Lk 18^{18}), Mt 19^{29} 25^{46}, Mk 10^{30}, Lk 10^{25} 18^{30}, Ro 2^{7}, Tit 1^{2} 3^{7}, Jude^{21} the phrase refers to the future. 'Redemption' is used in Lk 1^{68} 2^{38} and 'redeem' in Lk 24^{21} for the redemption to be accomplished by the Messiah, and 'redemption' is used in Lk 21^{28} for that which is to accompany the coming of the Son of Man after our Lord's earthly ministry 'with power and great glory.' In the Epistles redemption denotes a past work in Ro 3^{24}, He 9$^{12.15}$, 1 P 1^{18}; a present possession in 1 Co 1^{30}, Eph 1^{7}, Col 1^{14}; a future gift in Ro 8^{23}, Eph 1^{14} 4^{30}. In Tit 2^{14} the word is ambiguous. He 11^{35} is irrelevant. The gift of the Holy Ghost is spoken of as past, present, and to come. It has already been received in 1 Co 12^{13}, Gal 4^{6}, Ja 4^{5}, 1 Jn 3^{24}. It is a present possession in 1 Co 3^{16} 6^{19}, Eph 2^{18}. It is a future inheritance in Ro 8^{23}, 2 Co 1^{22} 5^{5}, Eph 1^{14}. Similarly, the Kingdom of Heaven or of God, which is the sphere in which salvation and redemption and the gift of the Holy Ghost are received, is spoken of sometimes as now existing, sometimes as to be established in the future. In Ro 14$^{16.17}$, 1 Co 4$^{19.20}$, Col 1^{13} 4^{11} it is viewed as present; in 1 Co 6$^{9.10}$ 15^{50}, Gal 5^{21}, Eph 5^{5}, 2 Th 1^{5}, 2 P 1^{11}, Rev 11^{15} 12^{10} it is regarded as future. In the Gospels the present character is indicated in Mt 3^{2} 4^{17} 10^{7} 11$^{11.12}$ 12^{28} 13, Mk 1^{15}, Lk 9$^{2.27.60.62}$ 10^{11}; signs of its future character are in Mt 7^{21} 13$^{41\text{-}43}$ 18$^{8.9}$ 19^{28} 25^{34} 26^{29}, Mk 9$^{43\text{-}47}$ 14^{25}, Lk 13$^{28.29}$ 19^{11} 21^{31} 22$^{18.29.30}$. There is thus a consistent view throughout the NT in accordance with which salvation is regarded sometimes as already accomplished, sometimes as a present state, sometimes as an inheritance to be received in the future. In regard to the salvation thus represented in the NT as an abiding and growing possession the following points may be noticed.

(*a*) *The deliverance which gives admission to the state of salvation is everywhere regarded as accomplished by Christ.* In Ac 2$^{21\text{-}36}$ 'the Lord' of whom Joel (3^{5} Heb.; 2^{32} Eng.) declared that through calling on His name there should be salvation is identified with Christ. In St. Peter's speech in Ac 4^{12} it is said that 'in none other' than 'Jesus Christ of Nazareth' 'is there salvation; for neither is there any other name under heaven that is given among men whereby we must be saved.' In the speech of St. Peter and the apostles in 5^{31} it is said that Jesus 'did God exalt with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and remission of sins.' In St. Peter's speech at the Council of Jerusalem in 15^{11} belief is expressed 'that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we [Jews] shall be saved, even as they [Gentiles].' 'Our Lord Jesus Christ gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us out of this present evil world' (Gal 1^{4}). 'In Christ Jesus' the Gentiles 'that once were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ'; and His work of peace was such as to 'reconcile them both [Jews and Gentiles] in one body unto God through the cross' (Eph 2$^{13\text{-}18}$). 'The Lord Jesus Christ, who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of his glory' is 'a saviour' (Ph 3^{21}). 'Our Saviour Christ Jesus . . . abolished death, and brought life and incorruption to light through the gospel' (2 Ti 1^{10}). He is described as 'our Saviour' (Tit 1^{4} 2^{13} 3^{6}), as 'the author of' 'salvation' (He 2^{10}), and 'Saviour' (2 P 1$^{1.11}$ 2^{20} 3$^{2.18}$), and as 'the Saviour of the world' (1 Jn 4^{14}).

(*b*) *The means of the deliverance was notably Christ's passion and death.*—According to St. Peter's speech in Ac 2^{23} it was 'by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God' that Christ was 'delivered up,' a fact implying the purpose accomplished by His death. According to St. Paul's speech at Ephesus (Ac 20^{28}) Christ 'purchased with his own blood' 'the church of God.' 'The word of the cross is' 'the power of God' 'unto us which are being saved' (1 Co 1^{18}). 'Christ crucified' is 'unto them that are called, both Jews and Greeks,' 'the power of God, and the wisdom of God' (1$^{23.24}$). It was part of His work that 'by the grace of God he should taste death for every man' (He 2^{9}). That 'he became unto all them that obey him the author of eternal salvation' is mentioned in close connexion with His sufferings (5$^{8.9}$). 'With precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, even the blood of Christ,' were men 'redeemed' (1 P 1$^{18.19}$). He 'loosed us from our sins by his blood' (Rev 1^{5}). To Him described as the Lamb it is said, 'Thou wast slain, and didst purchase unto God with thy blood men of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation' (5^{9}). 'They which come out of the great tribulation . . . washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb' (7^{14}).

(*c*) *The deliverance thus accomplished was from sin.* In the speeches of St. Peter and St. Paul in the Acts, and in the words addressed to St. Paul at his conversion by Christ, the work of Christ is constantly associated with remission of sins (Ac 2^{38} 3^{19} 5^{31} 10^{43} 13^{38} 26^{18}; cf. Rev 1^{5}).

(*d*) *The deliverance was also from the penalties of sin.* 'Being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from the wrath of God through him' (Ro 5^{9}). He 'abolished death' (2 Ti 1^{10}). It was a purpose of His incarnation that 'through death he might bring to nought him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and might deliver all them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage' (He 2$^{14.15}$).

(*e*) *The reception of the deliverance is made possible by faith.* 'A man is justified by faith apart from the works of the law' (Ro 3^{28}; cf. 5^{1}). 'A man is not justified by the works of the law save through faith in Jesus Christ' (Gal 2^{16}). 'By grace have ye been saved through faith' (Eph 2^{8}).

(*f*) *The faith which enables the Christian to lay hold on the deliverance includes life and action.* In the teaching of St. Paul that which 'availeth' is 'faith working through love' (Gal 5^{6}), and 'faith' in St. Paul's writings habitually means more than mere intellectual belief and includes the moral attitude of surrender to God. St. James differentiates the faith which has not works, and doth not profit, and is dead, and is like the belief of the demons, and is barren (2$^{14\text{-}20}$), from the faith which is needed in prayer that is to be effectual and which makes those who have it rich (1^{6} 2^{5} 5^{15}).

(*g*) *The salvation is far more than deliverance.* It affords not only escape from the penalties of sin and from sin itself, but also admission to union with Christ, so that the saved are enabled to participate in His risen and ascended life. 'All we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death. We were buried therefore with him through baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life'; 'If we died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him'; 'Reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God in Christ Jesus' (Ro 6$^{3\text{f}.8.11}$). 'The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ?' (1 Co 10^{16}); 'In one Spirit were we all baptized into one body'; 'Ye are the body of Christ, and severally members thereof' (12$^{13. 27}$). 'Ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ. . . . Ye all are one man in Christ Jesus' (Gal 3$^{27. 28}$). 'That Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith' (Eph 3^{17}). 'Having been buried with him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with him through faith in the working of God' (Col 2^{12}). 'If then ye were raised together with Christ'; 'ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God' (3$^{1. 3}$). Thus the life of salvation which the Christian lives is a life in which he has been brought into Christ, is alive in Christ, partakes of Christ's body and blood, is united in Christ to other Christians, and has Christ dwelling in his heart.

(*h*) *So far as the possibility of receiving is concerned the life of salvation is open to all men,* since 'the living God . . . is the Saviour of all men, specially of them that believe' (1 Ti 4^{10}), though this must not be pushed to a denial of the correlative NT truth that there are possibilities of rejection and that there is eternal punishment as well as eternal life.

(*i*) *The power of the salvation in some sense extends beyond man so as to affect the universe.* 'All things' are eventually to be 'subjected unto' 'the Son' (1 Co 15^{28}); it is the purpose of the Father 'to sum up all things in Christ, the things in the heavens, and the things upon the earth' (Eph 1^{10}), and that 'in him should all the fulness dwell; and through him to reconcile all things unto himself, having made peace through the blood of his cross; through him . . . whether things upon the earth, or things in the heavens' (Col 1$^{19. 20}$).

4. First-century writers outside the NT.—The documents to be considered are the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, the *Epistle of Barnabas*, and the *Epistle to the Corinthians* of St. Clement of Rome. The general features of teaching about salvation expressed in these books are the same as those found in the NT.

(*a*) *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* contains remarkably little on the subject. The NT doctrine that good works are a necessary part of the life of salvation receives the particular expression, reminiscent of the deutero-canonical books of the OT (Sir 17$^{22. 23}$ 29$^{12. 13}$ 40^{24}, To 4$^{7-11}$ 12$^{8. 9}$ 14$^{10. 11}$), that almsgiving affords a ransom for sin: 'Be not thou found holding out thy hands to receive, but drawing them in as to giving [cf. Sir 4^{31}]. If thou hast ought passing through thy hands, thou shalt give a ransom for thy sins. Thou shalt not hesitate to give, neither shalt thou murmur when giving; for thou shalt know who is the good paymaster of thy reward' (iv. 5–7). The description of the Eucharist as a 'sacrifice' (xiv. 1, 3) may imply that it was regarded by the writer of the *Teaching* as a means of appropriating the redemption accomplished by Christ.

(*b*) *The Epistle of Barnabas* supplies more. Salvation is possessed by Christians in the present time as being a mark of that life which has been bestowed and can be lost (ii. 10). It is also future, since it is hoped for (i. 3) and desired (xvi. 10) and the complete hallowing has yet to come (xv. 7). It is the work of God as being 'He who redeemed' (xix. 2). It includes deliverance 'from death' (*ib.* 2). It could not have been if the Son of God 'had not come in the flesh' (v. 10). The remission of sins and sanctification needed for it are through the blood of Christ (v. 1); His sufferings were 'for our sake,' and 'He suffered in order that His wound might give us life' (vii. 2); 'He offered the vessel of his spirit as a sacrifice on behalf of our sins' (vii. 3), 'His flesh on behalf of the sins of' His 'new people' (vii. 5); 'the cross' has 'grace' (ix. 8). Remission is applied by means of baptism (xi. 1, 8, 11). Salvation is gained through hope on Christ (xii. 3, 7). Souls may be saved by words spoken by Christians (xix. 10). For the possession of salvation there is need of righteousness and endurance (iv. 9–14, vii. 11, viii. 6, xix. 10); and in a phrase resembling that in the *Teaching* quoted above it is said, 'thou shalt work with thy hands for a ransom for thy sins' (xix. 10). Through the remission of sins are gained renewal and regeneration, re-creation and Divine indwelling: 'Since then He renewed us in the remission of sins, He made us another type so as to have the soul of children, as if He were re-creating us' (vi. 11); 'Receiving the remission of sins and hoping on the Name we became new, being created afresh from the beginning. Wherefore God really dwells in our habitation within us. How? The word of His faith, the calling of His promise, the wisdom of the ordinances, the commandments of the teaching, He Himself prophesying in us, He Himself dwelling in us, opening to those who had been in bondage to death the door of the shrine, which is the mouth, giving us repentance leads to the incorruptible shrine. For he who desires to be saved looks not to the man but to Him who dwells and speaks in him' (xvi. 8–10).

(*c*) *The Epistle of St. Clement of Rome* emphasizes strongly the work of our Lord as the Saviour. Christians are described as having been 'called and sanctified by the will of God through our Lord Jesus Christ' (*præf.*); and blessedness is said to be 'upon those who have been chosen by God through Jesus Christ our Lord' (l. 7). Christians have 'taken refuge in' God's 'mercies through our Lord Jesus Christ' (xx. 11). Those who are saved are 'saved through Jesus Christ' (lviii. 2). Jesus Christ is 'the High-priest of our offerings, the Guardian and Helper of our weakness,' 'the Way in which we found our salvation' (xxxvi. 1, 2), the 'Gate of the Lord,' through which 'the righteous shall enter' (xlviii. 3; cf. Ps 118$^{19. 20}$). 'The blood of Christ' 'is precious to his Father because it was poured out for the sake of our salvation and won for the whole world the grace of repentance' (vii. 4). 'Through the blood of the Lord' is 'redemption for all those who believe and hope in God' (xii. 7). His 'blood was given on our behalf' (xxi. 6). 'Jesus Christ our Lord gave His blood on our behalf by the will of God, and His flesh on behalf of our flesh, and His soul on behalf of our souls' (xlix. 6). Christians are said to be 'justified by works and not by words' (xxx. 3). Preserving the other side of the NT antithesis, the writer says also: 'We, having been called in Christ Jesus through His will, are justified not through ourselves nor through our wisdom or understanding or piety or works which we wrought in holiness of heart, but through faith, through which the Almighty God justified all men who have been from the beginning' (xxxii. 4). The work of salvation includes the body (xxxvii. 5, xxxviii. 1). God is the Saviour of those who are in despair (lix. 3; cf. Jth 9^{11}), and of those who are in tribulation (lix. 4). Faithful Christians have 'conflict day and night for all the brotherhood, that the number of the elect may be saved' (ii. 4).

5. Relation of Christian teaching to the pagan mysteries.—The theories underlying the pagan mysteries bear some resemblance to Christian teaching, since they contain the idea of deliverance through a process of regeneration, and through participation in a Divine life which is operative for the future as well as for the present. They differ greatly because Christian teaching represents our

Lord as a historical Person who accomplishes and gives salvation, while the great figures in the pagan mysteries, *e.g.* Osiris and Attis, are mythological personifications, and also because the ethical element, always prominent in Christianity, has no real counterpart in the religion of the mysteries.

LITERATURE.—A. Tholuck, *Lehre von der Sünde und von der Versöhnung*, 1823; H. N. Oxenham, *The Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement*, 1865; M. d'Aubigné, *L'expiation de la croix*, 1868; A. Ritschl, *Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*, 1870–74 (Eng. tr., 1900); R. W. Dale, *The Doctrine of the Atonement*, 1875; H. S. Holland, *Logic and Life* (Sermons vi.–ix.), 1882; E. Ménégoz, *Le péché et la rédemption d'après St. Paul*, 1882; G. Thomasius, *Christi Person und Werk*, 1886–88; B. F. Westcott, *The Victory of the Cross*, 1888; W. P. DuBose, *The Soteriology of the NT*, 1892; A. Titius, *Die NT Lehre von der Seligkeit*, 1895–1900; R. C. Moberly, *Atonement and Personality*, 1901; G. A. F. Ecklin, *Erlösung und Versöhnung*, 1903; A. Ritter, *Christus der Erlöser*, 1903; J. Rivière, *Le Dogme de la rédemption*, 1905; R. Herrmann, *Erlösung*, 1905; E. Ménégoz, *La Mort de Jésus et le dogme de l'expiation*, 1905; G. B. Stevens, *The Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, 1905; A. Loisy, 'The Christian Mystery,' in *HJ* x. [1911] 45–64; F. von Hügel, *Eternal Life*, 1912; H. A. A. Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions*, 1913, pp. 199–228, 298, 299; W. M. Ramsay, *The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the NT*, 1915, pp. 173–198.

DARWELL STONE.

SAMARIA (Σαμάρεια [T WH -ία], from שֹׁמְרוֹן).—**1. The kingdom or district.**—Samaria originally denoted the capital of the kingdom of Israel, but the term was early applied to the kingdom itself, and in this sense 'the king of Samaria,' 'the cities of Samaria,' 'the mountains of Samaria' are familiar expressions in the OT writings. After the overthrow of the monarchy, the name was still attached to the old territory, whether under the government of Assyrians, Persians, Greeks, Hasmonæans, or Romans. The boundary of Samaria on the N. was the southern edge of the Plain of Esdraelon, on the W. the eastern fringe of Sharon, and on the E. the Jordan. On the S. the frontier was very mutable: Josephus names 'the Acrabbene toparchy' and 'the village Anuath, which is also named Borceos,' as the boundaries in his time, and these terms have been identified with *Akrabbeh* and *Burkit*, about 6 miles S. of Shechem. The *Wady Farah* on the E. of the watershed, and the *Wady Ishar*, called lower down *Wady Deir Ballut* and *Wady Auja*, on the western side, may be regarded as the dividing lines, which in our Lord's time were religious rather than political. Ginea (the modern *Jenîn*) is given as the most northerly town (*BJ* III. iii. 4), and Antipatris was just beyond the S.W. border (Talm. Bab. *Giṭṭin*, 76*a*).

Josephus' statement (*loc. cit.*) that Samaria 'is entirely of the same nature with Judæa' is inaccurate; for, while Judæa was a single massive table-land, with natural barriers which rendered it austerely solitary and inaccessible, Samaria consisted of groups of mountains separated by fertile valleys, meadows, and plains, while it was so exposed on its frontiers that neither could artificial fortresses protect it from hostile invasions nor spiritual barriers defend it from the subtler influences of environment. The physical difference between the two countries, however, does not explain that most bitter quarrel in history which came to a head some time before the Christian era began. It was after all a quarrel between brethren, the old tribal and national feud of Judah and Ephraim being accentuated and perpetuated as a religious controversy. The Jewish contention that the Samaritans were at once foreigners and heretics was on both counts an exaggeration. The Assyrian conqueror Shalmaneser (2 K 17^{24}), or, according to the inscriptions, his successor Sargon, deported from Samaria only the most influential families, which would have been those most likely to give trouble—27,000 persons in all—leaving the humbler classes in the cities, as well as whole minor towns and villages, undisturbed. The number of Assyrian colonists then and afterwards (Ezr 4^{2}) introduced into the country was no doubt small in proportion to the entire population. Only the most rigid Jewish exclusiveness could refuse to the Samaritans as a whole the right to the sacred name and traditions of Israel, and so to an equal share in the worship of Jahweh. Josephus, whose Jewish bias is obvious, presents the case against the Samaritans, or, as he frequently calls them, from the Assyrian origin of a fraction of them, the Cuthæans (2 K 17^{24}). He alleges that the rival worship on Mt. Gerizim was begun by a renegade Jewish priest —Manasseh the high priest's brother—who had married a Cuthæan satrap's daughter (*Ant.* XI. vii. 2, viii. 2); and that when Antiochus Epiphanes desecrated the Temple in Jerusalem, the Samaritans denied 'that the temple on Mt. Gerizim belonged to Almighty God,' and petitioned 'Antiochus, the god Epiphanes,' to permit them to name it 'the temple of Jupiter Hellenius' (*ib.* XII. v. 5). Josephus therefore glories in the Maccabæan zeal which 'subdued the nation of the Cuthæans, who dwelt round about that temple which was built in imitation of the Temple at Jerusalem,' 'demolished the city [of Samaria] and made slaves of its inhabitants' (*BJ* I. ii. 6, 7). He asserts that in his own time the Samaritans still continued to distress the Jews, 'cutting off parts of their land and carrying off slaves' (*Ant.* XII. iv. 1); that on one occasion they 'came privately into Jerusalem and threw about dead bodies in the cloisters' (*ib.* XVIII. ii. 2); that they harassed the Galilæans on their way to Jerusalem and 'killed a great many of them' (*ib.* XX. vi. 1); that in the days of Jewish prosperity they called themselves 'kindred,' but at other times declared that they were 'no way related to them, and that the Jews had 'no right to expect any kindness or marks of kindred from them,' who were 'sojourners that came from other countries' (*ib.* IX. xiv. 3). That there is some measure of truth in these allegations is quite probable, but there has unfortunately been no advocate for the defence, no historian who has eloquently presented the facts from the Samaritan point of view. The despised heretics have, however, found one Defender who has adjusted the balance. Jesus not only rebuked the fiery zeal of His disciples—in this respect thorough Jews—against the hated race (Lk 9^{51-56}), but made one Samaritan a pattern to all the world of neighbourly love (10^{30-37}) and another—'this alien' (ἀλλογενής)—of gratitude to God (17^{11-19}).

The Pentecostal Church, thrilled by the Spirit of the Risen Christ, is said to have awakened early to her duty to Samaria. The dispersion which followed the death of Stephen brought many preachers 'to the regions of . . . Samaria' (Ac $8^{1.4}$). While Philip, and afterwards Peter and John, probably laboured in the city of Samaria—now called Sebaste—itself (8^{5}), others evangelized in 'many villages of the Samaritans' (8^{25}), and their efforts were not without success. The church in Samaria, enjoying, like those in Judæa and Galilee, a time of peace, was built up and multiplied (9^{31}). St. Paul and Barnabas, going up to Jerusalem at the end of their first missionary tour, gave a complete account (ἐκδιηγούμενοι) of the conversion of the Gentiles as they went through Samaria (15^{3}). But from this moment Samaria passes out of view. After Christ's own work there—if Jn 4^{39-42} is a reflexion of facts—and the primitive mission of His apostles, history has nothing more to say of the evangelization of Samaria. In the Roman wars the Samaritans made common cause with the Jews and endured great sufferings. Gathered on the top of Gerizim, a company of them preferred death to surrender, and 11,600 are said to have been cut to pieces by Vespasian's fifth legion (*BJ* III. vii. 32). In later times they seem to have become as fanatical as the Jews, and under the Byzantine Emperors Zeno and Justinian they were punished for their cruelty to the Christian Church. In the Middle Ages there were colonies of them in Nâblus, Cæsarea, Damascus, and Cairo. They are now reduced to a little community—'forty families,' it is always said—who still sacrifice on Mt. Gerizim, 'the oldest and the smallest sect in the world' (A. P. Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 240).

2. The city.—The city of Samaria, rather than the territory, appears to be meant in Ac $8^{5.9.14}$, the best MSS having the article before *πόλιν τῆς Σαμαρίας* in 8^5, and the genitive being probably that of apposition. This is the view of Weiss, Wendt, Blass, Knowling, and others, and, if they are right, the character of the city chosen by Philip for a Christian mission is a matter of interest. The royal city of Omri occupied a strong position on a round and isolated hill in a broad and fertile vale, about 6 miles N.W. of Shechem, commanding a splendid view (as its name Shōmrōn, *i.e.* 'Wartburg' or 'Watch Tower,' would indicate) across the Plain of Sharon to the Western Sea, 23 miles distant. Already partly paganized (2 K 17^{24}) after its capture by the Assyrians (722 B.C.), it began to be Hellenized by Alexander the Great (331). He avenged the cruel death of Andromachus, his governor in Cœle-Syria, by killing many of the inhabitants of Samaria, deporting others to Shechem, and substituting Macedonian colonists, who continued to occupy the city till the time of John Hyrcanus. It was 'a very strong city' (Jos. *Ant.* XIII. x. 2) in the time of this victorious Maccabæan prince and high priest, whose sons destroyed it after a year's siege, and took possession of the whole district for the Jews (*BJ* I. ii. 7). Being afterwards separated from Judæa by Pompey, and made a free city (*Ant.* XIV. iv. 4, *BJ* I. vii. 7), it was rebuilt by Gabinius (*Ant.* XIV. v. 3, *BJ* I. viii. 4). Its second period of royal splendour began when Augustus presented it to Herod the Great, who made it an impregnable fortress with a wall 2½ miles in circumference, built in it a magnificent temple to Divus Cæsar, adorned it with public buildings, colonnades and gateways, settled in it thousands of his veterans along with people from the neighbourhood, and renamed it 'Sebaste' (=Augusta) in honour of his Imperial patron (*Ant.* XV. vii. 3, viii. 5, *BJ* I. xx. 3, xxi. 2; Strabo, XVI. ii. 34). That the populace was now non-Jewish—'chiefly heathen' (Schürer, *HJP* II. i. 126), 'half Greek, half Samaritan' (G. A. Smith, *HGHL*^{7}, p. 348)—is proved by their taking the side of the Romans, first in the conflicts that followed the death of Herod, and again in the great war which sealed the fate of the Jewish nation.

If this was the city which Philip went to evangelize, and in which he was joined by Peter and John (Ac 8^{14}), it is probable that their gospel was heard chiefly, if not solely, by members of the Samaritan race, whose faith did not essentially differ from that of the Jews by whom they were counted heretical. The time was not yet come for 'turning unto the Gentiles'; that was first done in the purely Gentile city of Antioch. But the apostles obeyed their marching orders: beginning at Jerusalem, they went to Judæa, Samaria, and the ends of the earth (Ac 1^8).

Herod's Hellenistic city, which he stained with the blood of his own family (Jos. *BJ* I. xxvii. 6), was re-created as a Roman colony under Septimius Severus; but when the need for a fortified 'Watch-tower' was past, the tide of prosperity returned to the ancient town of Shechem (re-named Neapolis, now Nâblus), and Samaria fell into decay.

Eusebius, in the 4th cent., describes it as Σεβαστήν, *τὴν νῦν πολίχνην τῆς Παλαιστίνης* (*Onom.* 292). A bishop of Samaria attended the Council of Nicæa (A.D. 325), and another that of Jerusalem (A.D. 536). A baseless tradition made it the scene of the death of John the Baptist, and a church of the 12th cent. stands over his supposed tomb. A small village retains the Imperial name—*Sebustiyeh*—and some of Herod's pillars are still standing. Excavations carried on by Harvard University since 1908 have resulted in many remarkable discoveries.

LITERATURE.—W. M. Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, 1910, p. 462 f.; A. P. Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, new ed., 1887, pp. 240–246; E. Schürer, *HJP*, 1886–91, II. i. 123–127; G. A. Smith, *HGHL*^{7}, 1900, pp. 345–350; D. G. Lyon, 'Hebrew Ostraca from Samaria,' in *Harvard Theological Review*, iv. [1911] 136 ff.; S. R. Driver, 'The Discoveries at Samaria,' in *PEFSt* xliii. [1911] 79 ff.

JAMES STRAHAN.

SAMOS (*Σάμος*).—Samos is one of the fairest and most fertile islands of the Ægean, 27 miles long from E. to W. and 14 miles at its greatest breadth, separated from the mainland by the strait of Mycale (the *Little Boghaz*), seven *stadia* in width, in which the Greek fleet gained a great victory over the Persians in 479 B.C. The island attained its highest prosperity in the days of Polycrates, and held for a time the naval supremacy of the Ægean. It was the birthplace of Pythagoras, and a Samian mariner, 'not without divine direction' (Herod. iv. 152), was the first to sail beyond the Pillars of Hercules. Its chief city, also called Samos, was a *libera civitas* in St. Paul's time. Situated in the S.E. of the island, it had the largest temple Herodotus ever saw (iii. 60), and disputed with Smyrna and Ephesus the title 'first city of Ionia.' There were many Jews in the island (1 Mac 15^{23}), which was visited by Herod in A.D. 14 (Jos. *Ant.* XVI. ii. 2).

In a voyage down the Ægean the ship in which St. Paul was sailing left Chios on a Wednesday morning, 'struck across to Samos'—here probably the island is meant—and rounded either the west or the east extremity. The RV rendering, 'touched at Samos,' conveys the idea of a stoppage, which is not implied in the Greek (*παρεβάλομεν εἰς Σάμον*, Ac 20^{15}). Probably the attempt was made to get as far as Miletus the same day, but when Trogyllium, a promontory 5 miles E. of the city of Samos, was reached, the Ægean N. wind apparently died away, as it generally does in the late afternoon throughout the summer months, and the passage had to be completed next day with the aid of the fresh breeze that springs up in the early morning. The clause in the Bezan text regarding Trogyllium, which is found in the AV but relegated to the margin of the RV, was in all probability omitted by the scribes of the great uncials under the mistaken notion that a night had been spent at the city of Samos, and that a second anchorage only 5 miles farther east was out of the question.

LITERATURE.—Strabo, XIV. i. 12–18; H. F. Tozer, *The Islands of the Ægean*, 1890; W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, 1895, p. 293 f.

JAMES STRAHAN.

SAMOTHRACE (*Σαμοθράκη*, the 'Thracian Samos,' in Homer *Σάμος Θρηικίη*; still called Samothraki).—Samothrace is an island about 30 miles S. of the coast of Thrace, 8 miles in length and 6 miles in breadth, rising to a height of 5240 ft. above the sea. Next to Pharos, it is the most conspicuous natural feature in the northern Ægean. According to Homer, Poseidon took his stand on its summit to survey 'all Ida, the city of Priam, and the ships of the Greeks' (*Il.* xiii. 12 f.). Samos is probably a Semitic (Phœnician) word, from the root *shamah*, 'to be high' (see W. Leaf, *Iliad*, 1902, ii. 4). The island, which always enjoyed autonomy on account of its sacred traditions, was celebrated for the mysterious worship of the Cabeiri (Herod. ii. 51), which was still in full vogue when St. Paul passed and repassed the island.

The Apostle and his companions, sailing from Troas, 'made a straight course,' running before the wind (*εὐθυδρομήσαμεν*, Ac 16^{11}), to Samothrace, where they cast anchor, and next day reached

Neapolis. In less favourable conditions, when tacking was required, the passage in the opposite direction took five days (Ac 20^{6}). Samothrace was quite harbourless — Pliny, in enumerating the Ægean islands, calls it *importuosissima omnium* (*HN* iv. 23)—but it had several good anchorages.

See, further, H. F. Tozer, *The Islands of the Ægean*, 1890, pp. 310–354. JAMES STRAHAN.

SAMSON (Σαμψών).—Samson was the popular hero of the tribe of Dan who began to deliver Israel from the Philistines, the Nazirite whose secret of strength lay in his hair, the blinded giant who prayed for power to avenge himself and his country in the hour of his death (Jg 13–16). He finds a place in the great Roll of Faith contained in He 11. Much has been written in recent years regarding the legendary elements of the story of Samson and the possibility of its being a solar myth, but such ideas were naturally far from the mind of the anonymous writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

LITERATURE.—For solar myth theory see Commentaries on Judges by G. F. Moore (*ICC*, 1895) and K. Budde (*Das Buch der Richter*, 1897); J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*^{2}, 1900, iii. 390 ff.; A. Jeremias, *The OT in the Light of the Ancient East*, Eng. tr., 2 vols., 1911, ii. 169 ff.. JAMES STRAHAN.

SAMUEL (Σαμουήλ).—Samuel is named in the roll of the OT heroes who lived and died in faith (He 11^{32}). His unique position in the history of Israel is indicated by two phrases in Acts—'all the prophets from Samuel' (3^{24}), and God 'gave them judges until Samuel the prophet' (13^{20}). He is regarded as the last of the Judges and the first of the Prophets. In one stratum—the earliest—of the two books which bear his name he is the 'seer' of a small town; in another he is the 'judge' who rules over the whole people; in a third he is the 'prophet' who speaks like an Amos or a Hosea. But the difficult critical problems raised by the composite story of his life and achievements (see artt. 'Samuel' in *HDB* and *EBi*) have no bearing upon the NT passages in which he is mentioned. That he played a highly important rôle, religious and political, as representative of Jahweh and as king-maker, at a turning-point in Hebrew history is a fact which criticism leaves unshaken.

JAMES STRAHAN.

SANCTIFICATION.—The meaning of ἁγιασμός in the NT is in conflict with its etymological form. The word (as also the verb ἁγιάζω) etymologically suggests a *process*, a gradual advance in moral attainment, an ethical emphasis. In the NT generally, however, the word expresses a *state*, a position of religious attainment, a religious emphasis. To 'sanctify' is to 'make holy,' and the word 'holy' essentially implies a certain relationship to God (see artt. SAINT, HOLINESS). Perfection of moral character is a derivative but necessary result of holiness, and not, strictly speaking, holiness itself. The 'saint' develops a certain type of character in accordance with certain inward moral demands that are essential to the preservation of the 'holy' relation to God. In the NT this God is the God and Father of Jesus Christ. ἅγιος being 'that which belongs to God,' 'sanctify' means 'to make to belong to God,' 'to dedicate' to God. The precise kind of relationship between God and the object 'sanctified' is determined by the nature and situation of the object. Thus in Hebrews, where the religious problem is focused in the question of providing a valid worship for those debarred from the Temple services, the 'people' are 'sanctified' through the blood of Christ, and thereby enabled to become a 'worshipping' people, standing in the relation of 'worshippers' to God, inasmuch as the sacrifice of Jesus was offered 'outside the gate,' *i.e.* outside the sacred enclosure of the Holy City (He 13^{12}). On the other hand, the barrier to the holy relationship may be a moral one, as in 1 Co 6^{9-11}. It is the removal of this barrier of guilt, or alienation from God, through the death of Jesus, that is emphasized in the striking words, καὶ ταῦτά τινες ἦτε· ἀλλὰ ἀπελούσασθε, ἀλλὰ ἡγιάσθητε, ἀλλὰ ἐδικαιώθητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν. ἀπελούσασθε refers to Christian baptism, as implying penitence and faith on the part of the worshipper. The conjunction of ἡγιάσθητε and ἐδικαιώθητε, and above all the order in which they are mentioned, show that in Christian experience no real distinction in time can be drawn between justification and sanctification (cf. He 10^{10}, where ἡγιασμένοι clearly has affinity with Pauline justification). When the NT—St. Paul in particular—speaks of justification and sanctification, it really speaks of justified and sanctified men and women, and has little concern with the theological abstraction. Justification and sanctification are both 'works of God's free grace' (*Shorter Catechism*, 1648). In both, God is the determining agent. The man who is 'justified' knows that God is not an enemy, but a friend. The 'sanctified' man knows also that he is now in a new relationship to God as son or child, and that in answer to the pardoning grace in justification a certain subjective attitude on his part must bring forth fruit in moral life. He must walk worthily of his vocation or standing before God. A good analogy with sanctification is patriotism, which is a social and political condition of individual life, in whose creation the individual has, strictly speaking, no part; which also carries with it certain practical duties that can be refused only at the cost of disloyalty to the State. Thus we are called on to 'render unto God the things that are God's,' as to 'Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's.' In other words, just as we are born members of a certain family, and citizens of a particular State, so as Christians we are 'born again' in Christian baptism into an obedience to the rule or Kingdom of God, and a responsibility for all the corresponding social duties that ought to be maintained as between man and man. The Christian is 'a new creation in Christ' (2 Co 5^{17}). He lives in a new world, where there stands out sharply a distinction between things permanent and things transient, things seen and things unseen; where a new moral valuation is at work; where the humblest and most despised individual claims a new, loving interest as one for whom Christ died. In the experience of 'conversion' or 'regeneration,' symbolized in Christian baptism, lies the root-idea of sanctification. The 'saint' belongs to God, and therefore thinks of things and men as God thinks of them. The determining agent in sanctification everywhere, both in experience and in the conduct that follows from it, is God, as revealed in the Cross and resurrection of Jesus Christ. It is quite true that, as we shall see later, sanctification is not incompatible with moral effort and daily renewal; indeed it implies them (2 Co 4^{10}, Col $3^{9f.}$, Eph $4^{22ff.}$). Yet in the act of sanctification, God has already exerted all His power, and the development of the Christian character is but the development of power already present in the individual 'saint.' God gives man a part in His own holiness, taking him out of the sphere of ungodliness, 'the authority of darkness,' and translating him into the sphere of His own purity, 'the kingdom of the son of his love' (Col 1^{13}).

For the sake of convenience, the NT doctrine of sanctification may be treated under two aspects: (1) sanctification as a correlate of justification; (2) sanctification and the Christian ethic. It is to be noted that these are but two aspects of the doctrine. Essentially, and especially in the minds of the NT writers, they are the same. Neither the question of a non-ethical religion nor that of a non-religious ethic would have entered into the minds of NT writers, save to be set aside. Reconciliation to God and love to men, which constitute the perfected experience of sanctification, in the two directions of religion and practical conduct, are both regarded as issuing from the same source, viz. the redemptive work of Jesus Christ, and the human response to it of faith which worketh by love (δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη, Gal 5^{6}). Sanctification on the human side is faith at work.

1. Sanctification as a correlate of justification.—Faith is a judgment of the whole personality that God means what He said and did in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. This is justification in the Pauline sense. Faith is also unswerving daily fidelity to such a judgment, to believe that God equally means us to become what we are when He raised Jesus from the dead. This 'is the will of God, even your sanctification' (1 Th 4^{3}). Justified by faith, we have peace with God. Our life is to be lived in the sphere of this gracious act of God; we are reconciled to God through the death of His Son, and, being reconciled, are saved by the life of Christ (Ro 5^{11}). Too much stress cannot be laid on the fact that in the NT doctrines both of justification and of sanctification the relationship is between living persons, and not between moral forces that germinate in a dead past. The Christian message is a gospel from a living Christ to living men. It requires to be daily uttered, and daily received.

The experience of *guilt* enters into the conception both of sanctification and of justification. Justification includes the idea of the willingness of God to remove it, and of its actual removal in an objective sense. It is the faith that God has, at infinite cost to Himself, taken back His erring child to His heart. There is always, however, a certain barrier to a complete response to this gracious act of God. Justification must be experienced not only as a sense of sonship, but as an actual force at work in our lives. As such, it is sanctification. The sense of guilt is the result not only of a judgment of God, but of an answering judgment of man. Guilt may be a barrier not only to the faith that God can justify us, but also to the faith that He can effect any change in us. In the OT all sin was ultimately regarded as an offence against God (Ps 51^{4}), even when it meant only failure to comply with national custom, which was practically religion, associated as it was with Divine sanction. With the enrichment of the moral sense, the increasing moralization of the idea of God, and the growth of individual responsibility which culminated in the teaching of Jesus, guilt became in the NT that condition of heart and life produced by offences, conscious or unconscious, against the love of God. It is a burden which must be removed, a barrier to be broken down, if sanctification is to be realized in the individual experience, and man is to be at peace with God. All the NT writers are agreed in this, that they attribute the removal of guilt to the atoning death of Jesus, who is our 'sanctification' (1 Co 1^{30}). They are agreed that the agent in sanctification is the Holy Spirit, but present certain differences in their application and statement of the doctrine.

(1) *The Epistle to the Hebrews.*—We may take the writer of this Epistle first, as his forms of thought have a closer connexion with the OT than either the Pauline or the Johannine. In Hebrews the ideas of purification, sanctification, and perfection (τελείωσις) are in close affinity to one another. Through the death of Christ the worshipper has the individual experiences of forgiveness, freedom from guilt, purification of conscience. Thus the 'new and living way' to God is open, and the believer's will is bound to serve the living God (He 10^{22}). While St. Paul develops his doctrine of sanctification in opposition on the one hand to antinomian teaching, and on the other to Jewish legalism, the doctrine of Hebrews is rather developed in opposition to a ritualistic spirit of dependence on the ancient rites of cleansing from sin. His readers have difficulty in emancipating themselves, in their condition of excommunication, from the local and ceremonial associations of the ancient worship which mingled with their former religious habits. It is the business of this writer to exhibit the ineffectiveness of the ancient sacrifices to take away sin. His God is 'a consuming fire' (12^{29}); the word of God is 'sharper than any two-edged sword,' penetrating to the inmost recesses of the human conscience (4^{12}). Such a far-reaching and comprehensive burden of guilt can be removed only through a perfect sacrifice, the sacrifice of Him who is both priest and victim. His death is the new and living way. He is the great High Priest who alone has passed 'through the heavens,' the tractless regions that intervene between man and God. He and His worshippers are united, through their faith, in the bond of perfect human sympathy. He sanctifies them, and presents them to God. The sanctifier and the sanctified are sons of the one Father (2^{11}). The sacrifice of Jesus, therefore, in virtue of this essential unity, realized in the Incarnation, is effective for the purification of the human conscience, and in making men fit to stand in the presence of the Holy God. How the sacrifice of Jesus is thus effective does not enter into the mind of the writer. He simply applies the principle, accepted and experienced in the case of the OT sacrifices, to the death of Christ. For him, as for St. Paul, Jesus is alive in this particular relationship, in the midst of His Church, leader of their praise, prototype of their faith, united to them by ties of flesh and blood. According to the demands of the Old Covenant, the relationship with God implied in 'holiness' was restored by the blood of bulls and goats, but the demands of the New Covenant are infinitely more exacting. The sphere in which the new relationship of sanctity is realized is no longer the earthly tabernacle or temple, but a sphere in which the worship is spiritual, and the relationship real. The OT worship took place amid the 'patterns' of heavenly things. The NT worshipper is introduced to the 'heavenly things themselves' ($9^{23\text{ff.}}$). The Incarnate Son, by His eternal sacrifice, has lifted humanity into the very presence of God Himself; and in the white light of that environment, with all its moral demands, the Christian life must be lived. The thought is nearly akin to Jn 4^{24}. We must pursue this holiness or sanctification (ἁγιασμός), without which no man shall see the Lord (He 12^{14}). These words indicate the direct passage of the writer's thought from the religious to the ethical, which will be dealt with later.

(2) *The Pauline writings.*—The doctrine of sanctification in St. Paul represents a somewhat earlier stage in apostolic thought. Both in St. Paul and in Hebrews the death of Jesus is that which establishes the new relationship between God and man (Eph $2^{13.\,14}$). The unsanctified man is in a state of enmity towards God, and sanctification means peace with God. The mind of St. Paul always tends to isolate the Cross as an act of redemption. Both Hebrews and St. Paul teach that God sent His pre-existent Son in the flesh (Ro 8^{3}, He 10^{5}), but in St. Paul the Incarnation took place in order that on the Cross a curse might

be pronounced upon sin. In both, Jesus is our representative, but in St. Paul He is regarded as dying the death that we deserved to die. Sin exhausted its power in His crucifixion, and was set aside as a beaten enemy in the supreme demonstration of the power of God in the resurrection of Jesus. God 'highly exalted' Him, and raised Him to His right hand. The epithet 'Lord' (κύριος) is Paul's most characteristic description of the Risen Jesus. It carries with it the notion of authority rather than of sympathy, although the latter is by no means absent. The barrier of guilt is constituted for Paul by inability to keep the law of God, understood as a moral demand quite as penetrating and comprehensive as in Hebrews. This moral inability presupposes a certain 'law' warring in his members against the 'law' of God. If we substitute 'authority' for 'law' in St. Paul, much of the difficulty constituted by his apparently ambiguous use of the term νόμος disappears. Through the death of Jesus Paul is delivered from the 'authority' of sin, which is broken, and is made subject to the 'constraint' or 'authority' of the love of God manifested in Jesus Christ, the Κύριος. The acceptance by faith of this 'authority' of Jesus Christ, in response to His grace and love, is the condition of being 'in Christ,' which is the characteristic Pauline phrase for the state of sanctification. It is a relationship to God of 'sonship,' of perfect freedom. 'The authority of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the authority of sin and of death' (Ro 8^{2}). The Spirit that sanctifies is shed abroad in our hearts, and we cry, 'Abba, Father.' This authority that so speaks in Jesus Christ is the authority and the power of the Creator. Even Nature shall yet be on our side. Ro $8^{19ff.}$ is not mere poetry. It is the utterance of a heart that looks out on a world both of men and of things that is in its misery far from God, and can yet see in it all the birth-pangs of a new creation (vv.$^{20.\,21}$). Amid the worst that men or things can accomplish, it is impossible to annul God's loving choice of the believer in Christ Jesus (vv.$^{35-39}$).

(3) *The Johannine writings.* — Much of the relevant matter in this connexion falls more properly to be treated under the art. HOLY SPIRIT. Here, however, it may be pointed out that the Johannine conception of sanctification has a strong affinity with the thought of Hebrews. In Jn 10^{36} Jesus in His earthly life is said to be sanctified by the Father, *i.e.* set apart for the holy purpose of the redemption of men, and in 17^{19} Jesus sanctifies Himself in death for the sake of His disciples, who are also 'sanctified in the truth' by virtue of their abiding 'in Him.' As in Hebrews, the unity of Jesus and His disciples (not His immediate followers only) is a corollary of the Incarnation, but the bond is not conceived of in terms of human sympathy so much as in a certain semi-physical sense, due no doubt to the atmosphere of Hellenistic thought that surrounds the Johannine writings. The self-sanctification or consecration of Jesus, however, in Jn 17^{19} is the same as in He 10^{10}. He is both Priest and Victim. In the OT when God 'sanctifies' Himself or His 'great name' (Ezk 36^{23}) it is equivalent to a display of His saving power on behalf of Israel as against their enemies. In Johannine thought the Cross is the supreme manifestation not only of Divine love, but of Divine power (Jn $12^{31.\,32}$). The Risen and Crucified Jesus 'draws all men unto himself.' This is really the same as to 'sanctify' them. In accordance also with Johannine thought, sometimes the Spirit, the *alter ego* of Jesus, sometimes the Glorified Jesus, is the sanctifying agent. In experience both are the same; Jesus is our Life. Believers abide in Him. They carry within them a χρίσμα (1 Jn 2^{20}) or σπέρμα (3^{9}). What in St. Paul is called 'adoption' corresponds in St. John to 'sanctification' (1 Jn 3^{1}). The work of the Spirit is to beget 'sons (τέκνα) of God.'

2. Sanctification and the Christian ethic.—It is extremely important that the NT teaching on the previous aspect of sanctification should be emphasized, in order that the inalienable connexion between the Christian religion and Christian morality should be preserved. In other words, the NT teaches everywhere that what a man believes has an all-determining effect on what he is and what he does. Every act of faith is in the NT an ethical force. The passages which contain ethical precepts (including the Sermon on the Mount) cannot be understood apart from the doctrinal teaching. All is ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν. 'This is the victory that hath overcome the world, even our faith' (1 Jn 5^{4}).

Is there, then, such a thing as progressive sanctification? Strictly speaking, the word ἁγιασμός, as we have seen, contains no such idea. It expresses a state of holiness, not a process of becoming holy. Any other interpretation would negative the NT idea of holiness itself. The primitive idea of holiness, indeed, still persists. The NT has deepened and moralized it, but has rejected decisively one aspect of it, viz. that there can be degrees or grades of holiness from the Divine point of view. The savage may take liberties with a certain tree or other natural object, and finds to his cost that he has unwittingly violated a holy place. He has interfered with the property of the god, and is taught by the consequences that a certain attitude and conduct are necessary if he is to continue to live in safety and security. The god has decreed, 'Certain things are mine,' and there are degrees by which one thing, place, or person is holier than another, with corresponding grades of penalties. In the NT things and places are seldom called holy except in a traditional sense. Only persons are holy, and no man has the right to say to another, 'Stand thou on one side, for I am holier than thou.' An equal degree of guilt belongs to every violation of what is God's. 'If any man destroyeth the temple of God, him shall God destroy . . . which temple ye are' (1 Co 3^{17}). On the one hand, through the influence of the prophets, first the nation and then the individual (as in Jeremiah) are regarded as 'holy' in the eyes of Jahweh, who, unlike other gods, has more than a mere proprietary interest in 'His own.' On the other hand, through the influence of the priestly caste, Jahweh's service became more and more a matter of correct ritual and observance of certain rules, and the result is a Holy God 'afar off' whose name dare not be mentioned, and who lives in a state of moral neutrality. The incarnation of Jesus Christ realized in perfection the prophetic teaching, and for ever made men aware that God is the Father, whose holiness is also love, and who reasserts His claim on each individual soul by an act of redemption. 'We are bought with a price.' NT 'holiness' is therefore a state of belonging to God, which depends not on a mere Divine fiat, but upon an act of salvation at the greatest possible cost to the Father. What God has once hallowed is always holy. We are holy by Divine choice, and there can be no degrees either in the Divine offer or in the human acceptance of salvation.

This condition, therefore, of absolute holiness demands on our part both faith and conduct. A certain 'walk' is demanded of us, if we are to maintain and affirm the new friendship with God. 'Our citizenship is in heaven' (Ph 3^{20}), or, as Moffatt translates it, 'we are a colony of heaven' (*The NT: a New Translation*^{3}, London, 1914), with all the obligations of loyalty and sacrifice that the mother-country lays upon us. In the NT the mother-country is just the Father's heart and the Father's presence. Our moral progress is not a growth into holiness out of a state of comparative unholiness. That would be to negative the Christian gospel. Rather it is a growth *in* holiness. The act that makes us holy is done once and for all.

On the ethical side, sanctification reveals itself chiefly as the basis of moral freedom. Freedom, creativeness, originality are the marks of the moral teaching of Jesus, and they are the marks of all true *imitatio Christi.* The Japanese artist, Yoshio Markino, has the following sentences: 'Don't imitate my art. Don't watch my hand or brush. Only feel what I am feeling. Communicate your spirits to the nature and find out everything yourselves. Judge your art with your own eyes, and judge your music with your ears' (*When I was a Child*, London, 1912, p. 253). The expression is at times quaint, but the words are not only true in art, but supremely true of Christian ethics. Growth in holiness in the NT sense is to be free from all merely legal compulsion and to know only one constraint, the love of Christ (2 Co 5[14ff.]). We live no longer unto ourselves, or under the Law, but unto Him who for our sakes died and rose again. We have not even yet fully realized the extraordinary daring of the conception of Christian freedom developed by St. Paul, largely as the result of his own experience of a legalistic morality. There is not a word in the recorded teaching of Jesus that can be construed into the position that the Mosaic Law was temporary. Yet this may be said to be the pivot of St. Paul's whole position. The liberty wherewith Christ has made us free is not only a religious but an ethical liberty, not merely the removal of guilt but the setting free of the will. Only one who knew what sanctification is could have been bold enough to preach it. It is neither more nor less than the doctrine that all legal statutes are out of place in the Christian life. Our norm is neither the teaching nor the example of Jesus by themselves, but the experience of His work, and of His risen life. We have as much right to examine the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount under the illumination of the Holy Spirit the Sanctifier as any of the ethical passages in St. Paul or St. John. The extent of our obedience to them is determined not by the statutory form of the precepts themselves, but by communion with the living mind of Him who uttered them. Nor is this illumination a mere isolated inner light. It springs from the communion of 'saints,' a word always used in the plural in the NT (see art. SAINT). Christ in us, and dwelling in His Church by His Holy Spirit, has a right to be His own commentator and interpreter. To the sanctified man, who understands that the God who will not let him go is Love and Holiness and Justice, either precepts or principles by themselves, no matter from what source, are as flowers broken off at the root. 'Precepts wither if they are alone,' says even Seneca (*Ep.* xcv. 59).

This is dangerous doctrine, but all great doctrines are dangerous. Freewill, by the teaching of Scripture itself, was a very dangerous experiment. It is not surprising that St. Paul's principle of freedom should not only have occasioned abuse, but also excited grave doubts in the minds of those who were morally in earnest. The existence of abuse is suggested in the question, 'Shall we sin that grace may abound?'; but, in the fact that the question is a quotation, it is equally suggested that he had to develop his doctrine of sanctification, as he does in Ro 6, also in opposition to those who were seriously concerned about the interests of morality. It is impossible to escape the feeling that the return of the Galatians to the observance of days, months, seasons, years, and to the moral precepts involved in it, was really for safety, and as a result of moral earnestness. They might have said, equally with Festus, 'Paul, thou art mad.'

If, then, the Pauline doctrine of sanctification is developed in opposition both to the morally lax and to the morally earnest, it is of deep interest to note the lines of his answer. It is typical of the NT ethic generally. He deals with the subject more than once—Ro 6 is perhaps the fullest answer he gives.

(1) He refuses to think in terms of abstractions or mere forces. His opponents were talking of 'sin' and 'grace' as though they were impersonal principles. To him, 'sin' is a personal power, the arch-demon; 'grace' is the grace of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. He reminds them that they are baptized 'into Christ Jesus' (Ro 6[3]); with Him they died, and with Him they rise again. 'If we died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him' (v.[8]). 'Even so reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God in Christ Jesus' (v.[11]). In short, the ethical motive is an enriched and reinforced form of *noblesse oblige.* The *noblesse* is not only a state of ennoblement that carries with it duties, but One to whom we stand in deepest indebtedness for pardon and life, in whose fellowship we are raised to high rank and high responsibility. We sit in heavenly places with Christ Jesus. Sin against grace is now the sin of those who have been adopted into the family of God. Our motive is a sense not only of honour, but above all of gratitude. The old bad habit of obedience to sin persists, but not in that direction urges our loyalty. Sanctification means the growth of grateful loyalty to Christ. We die to sin, and live to Christ. Forgiveness is needed and sought for unwilling obedience to an evil power that has now no dominion or authority over us. And at this point we may glance at the attitude of St. Paul to the Law. At one moment he seems utterly to depreciate it, at another he says that the Law is good, and holy, and righteous. It is an illustration of his idea of progress in sanctification. Obedience to law is good for those to whom God says only 'Thou shalt' or 'Thou shalt not'; for 'law' to St. Paul is not what we would understand by 'natural' or 'spiritual order' of things. He can speak of the law of sin and the law of death, as well as of the law of God. 'Law' is God speaking in an authoritative voice, and while his use of it is not confined to the Mosaic Law, yet he regards the Mosaic Law as the most definite embodiment of the Divine authority. For the Christian, for those that are 'sanctified,' the 'law' of sin and death is done away altogether, and obedience to the law of God is merged in a higher and nobler loyalty to the God and Father of Jesus Christ, and above all in a sense of supreme indebtedness. We are 'servants' of God, but our reward cannot be called 'wages.' It is a 'free gift' (Ro 6[23]). The progress is in the idea of God.

(2) St. Paul everywhere recognizes the need of strenuous moral effort on our part. In this regard, he is not alone among the NT writers. We find it equally in the Epistle to the Hebrews: 'Follow (pursue) peace with all men, and holiness (ἁγιασμός), without which no man shall see the Lord' (12[14]). 'Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling' (Ph 2[12]). In what does the effort primarily consist? It is in what might be called a persistent daily reaffirmation of the act of consecration: 'Present your members as servants to righteousness unto sanctification' (Ro 6[19]). Here

again we shall misunderstand the meaning of *εἰς ἁγιασμόν* unless we remember that St. Paul is not really expressing his thought in abstract nouns like 'righteousness,' 'sanctification.' These are really personifications, like 'sin' or 'lawlessness.' 'Sanctification' here is really the timeless act of God, which is gradually realized in time. There is a moment, as we shall see later, when we are 'wholly' sanctified, when God has been able to work His complete will in us, and to this end (*εἰς ἁγιασμόν*) we must co-operate by renewed acts of consecration. The ritualistic idea is still in the background. In the OT, as the idea of sacrifice became spiritualized, 'the sacrifices of God are a broken spirit,' and in the NT God is satisfied with no less than a constant and persistent offering of the whole personality—the *σῶμα* including the life-principle. 'Present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your reasonable service' (*λογικὴ λατρεία*, Ro 12^1; cf. R. Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, Berlin, 1910, pp. 24, 91, 155).

Human co-operation, then, in the work of sanctification is strongly emphasized, if 'the fruits of the Spirit' are to be brought forth in human character. It is no doubt to St. Paul that we first owe the idea that the Holy Spirit is the factor not only in the Christian as a member of the community (a saint among saints), but in the individual Christian in his daily thought and life. We are exhorted to 'walk by the Spirit' (Gal 5^{16}). It has often been shown that St. Paul rescued the conception of 'spiritual gifts' as confined to extraordinary manifestations such as took place at Pentecost, or are associated with ordinary meetings for worship in the Apostolic Church, and enabled these gifts to include the ethical requirements of daily life (1 Co 12–14). 1 Co 13 is not merely a song in praise of love; it is a landmark in the history of the Christian ethic. The Spirit is a gift not only of emotion, but of motion, and furnishes the driving power for the ministry which includes all other ministries, the ministry of love. It is, in Bengel's phrase, 'via maxime vialis,' a way that all may tread, in which even men incapable by temperament of great emotional disturbance may walk secure (cf. Denney, *The Way Everlasting*, London, 1911, p. 152 ff.). 'It shall be called The way of holiness; . . . the wayfaring men, yea fools, shall not err therein' (Is 35^8).

This ethical reference of the work of the Spirit is emphasized equally in nearly all the NT writers. We need mention only passages like He 12^{10}, where suffering is regarded as a Divine discipline, and intended to issue in participation in the Divine holiness: 1 P $1^{15f.}$, 'Ye shall be holy; for I am holy'; 2 P $1^{4ff.}$, and especially v.^{9}, where ethical failure is said to be due to 'short-sightedness,' imperfect vision of the 'cleansing from old sins.' In Rev 22^{11}, *ὁ ἅγιος ἁγιασθήτω ἔτι* should probably be translated 'Let the saint still act as a saint' on the analogy of the preceding clauses.

(3) In the NT sanctification is not equivalent to moral perfection. 'Holy and blameless' (*ἄμωμος*) is an expression St. Paul uses elsewhere (Eph 1^4 5^{27}, Col 1^{22}). He also speaks in 1 Th 5^{23} of his readers being 'sanctified wholly.' It is evident that 'blamelessness' is not regarded as equivalent to holiness, and it is also noticeable that in the Thessalonians passage this condition of complete sanctification ensues at the Parousia (cf. 1 Th 3^{13}). No doubt the controversy as to 'progressive sanctification' would have seemed to St. Paul unreal. We fall into the habit, of necessity, of drawing distinctions which never occurred to the NT writers. It is easily seen that there was no real place for the idea of moral progress in our sense of the word, so long as the Parousia was regarded as imminent. There can be little doubt, however, that the end became for him less near as time went on, and the idea of sanctification became more and more associated with moral progress, as a fruit of the Spirit's continuous working. The Risen Christ, whom one day he hopes to see face to face, manifests Himself more and more as a present spiritual power in the man himself. The mind removes Him to a farther distance, but the heart draws Him nearer. 'Christ in you, the hope of glory' (Col 1^{27}) breathes the sense of moral imperfection, and at the same time the sense that 'Christ . . . carries the man who clings to Him in faith through all the great crises which came to Him, on the path of His perfecting' (H. A. A. Kennedy, *EGT*, 'Philippians,' London, 1903, p. 455^b. See also the exposition of Ph $3^{8ff.}$ by R. Rainy, *Expositor's Bible*, 'Philippians,' 1893, pp. 199–256). More and more, as St. Paul's experience deepens, the work of the Spirit in sanctification is identified with the work of the Risen Christ. The sense of present fellowship with Him becomes more real, and has its corresponding ethical effect. 'Now the Lord is the Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. But we all, with unveiled face beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit' (2 Co 3^{17-18}). There are certain exegetical difficulties connected with this passage which cannot be dealt with here. The AV rendering 'beholding as in a mirror' has been adopted, as best suiting the thought. 'Glory' is just that type of character and life which is fully manifested in Jesus, risen and reigning, and St. Paul's present communion with the Saviour is the source of a daily moral progress. The thought is much the same as in 1 Jn 3^{1-3}. This cannot fairly, either in St. John or in St. Paul, be called mysticism. The 'beholding' is not immediate, but 'as in a mirror,' which, however obscure as an image, at least indicates a medium of communion, probably the Christian Church; and St. John speaks of a 'hope' which purifies, and of a moment yet to be realized when 'we shall see him as he is.' The Hellenic idea of *metamorphosis* is clearly present, but to what extent it colours St. Paul's thought is disputable. The idea that the risen body of Jesus is a kind of semi-physical light substance which mingles with ours in this communion is certainly not present in Paul's thought, notwithstanding that he may have robbed Hellenic mysticism of a word (*μεταμορφούμεθα*; cf. P. Kölbing, *Die geistige Einwirkung der Person Jesu auf Paulus*, Göttingen, 1906, p. 104 f.). The conception is, in any case, that progress is from within outwards (Ro 12^2, Eph 4^{23}), and the forces that prevent the influx of the new life are broken and overcome one by one (Ro 8^{13}, 1 Th 3^{10} 4^1, 2 Co 9^{10} 10^{15} 16^{13}, Ph $1^{9.25}$, Col $1^{10.11}$).

LITERATURE.—Besides the works mentioned in the art. see Literature under SAINT; J. Denney, *EGT*, 'Romans,' London, 1900 (esp. chs. 6–8); Sanday-Headlam, *ICC*, 'Romans'^{5}, Edinburgh, 1902; J. A. Beet, *Holiness*, London, 1880; see also J. Vernon Bartlet, art. 'Sanctification,' in *HDB*, and the Literature there appended.

R. H. STRACHAN.

SANCTUARY.—This term is used by AV and RV (1) in He 9^1 for *τὸ ἅγιον*, which denotes the sacred tent in both its parts, as is implied by the synonymous *σκηνή*, 'tabernacle,' in the following verse; and (2) in He 8^2 for *τὰ ἅγια*, the heavenly sanctuary or holy of holies (RVm 'holy things'). The word represents *ἅγια* in He 9^2 (RV 'the Holy place'), where the omission of the article, in contrast to the invariable LXX usage (Lv 10^4, Nu 3^{22}, etc.), serves to emphasize the holiness (M. Dods in *EGT*, 'Hebrews,' 1910, *in loco*). In this passage *ἅγια* stands in express contrast to *ἅγια ἁγίων* (9^3), 'the

Holiest of all' (AV), 'the Holy of holies' (RV). But the simple *τά ἅγια* frequently denotes 'the Holiest,' and is so translated by the AV in He 9^{8} 10^{19}, though elsewhere (9^{25} 13^{11}) 'the holy place,' which is the RV rendering in all these passages. This usage is justified by Lv 16^{2}, etc., where קֹדֶשׁ, LXX *τὸ ἅγιον*, denotes the holy place within the veil; Vulg. *sanctuarium quod est intra velum.* It is now recognized by all scholars that the central sanctuary and elaborate ritual of the desert wanderings are not historical realities but products of religious idealism, based in all essential features upon the architectural plan and sacerdotal rubric of the Second Temple. But the argument of the writer of Hebrews is scarcely affected by the change from the traditional to the critical view. Whether the earthly sanctuary, which he at once magnifies and depreciates, was the creation of Moses or of Ezekiel and Ezra, it has now had its day and must cease to be, since the true high priest has passed into the heavenly sanctuary, and become the minister of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, not man (He $9^{1.2}$).

LITERATURE.—Artt. 'Tabernacle' and 'Temple' in *HDB* and *EBi.* JAMES STRAHAN.

SANDAL.—See SHOE.

SANHEDRIN.—1. The name.—*Sanhedrin* (סַנְהֶדְרִין, pl. סַנְהֶדְרִיּוֹת; Targumic also סַנְדְרִין, pl. סַנְהֶדְרָתָא, Heb.-Aram. form of *συνέδριον*, 'council,' specifically 'court of justice' [so LXX Pr 22^{10} 26^{26} 31^{23}, *Ps.-Sol.* iv. 1; Josephus, *Ant.* XIV. v. 4]) is the name of the high court of justice and supreme council, specifically at Jerusalem (*Sanh.* iv. 3; *Sôṭā*, ix. 18), called also 'Sanhedrin of Seventy-one' (*Sheb.* ii. 2), 'the Great Sanhedrin' (*Sanh.* i. 6; *Midd.* v. 4) in contradistinction to 'the Little Sanhedrin of Twenty-three,' the *Bēth Dîn shel shib'îm wᵉ eḥād*, 'the court of justice of seventy-one' (*Sanh.* i. 5; *Tôs. Sanh.* iii. 4) and most frequently *Bēth Dîn hag-gadôl shebyerūshālaim*, 'the high court of justice of Jerusalem' (*Sôṭā*, i. 4; *Giṭṭ.* vi. 7; *Sanh.* xi. 4), also *Bēth Dîn hag-gadôl shebhlishkath hag-gāzîth*, 'the great court of justice which has its sessions in the hall of hewn stones' (*Sifrē* Dt. 154; *Sanh.* xi. 2). The older name is *γερουσία*, 'senate' (Jos. *Ant.* XII. iii. 3; 2 Mac 1^{10} 4^{44} 11^{27}, 1 Mac 12^{6}, Jth 4^{8}, and elsewhere; also simply 'the elders' or 'the elders of the people' (1 Mac 7^{33} 11^{23} 12^{35} 14^{20}); cf. *Ziḳnê 'amkā bēth Yisrāēl* in the ancient eighteen benedictions for the Sanhedrin, *zāḳēn*, 'elder,' being the name of the single member of the Sanhedrin = *σύνεδρος* (Jos. *Ant.* XIV. ix. 4). Another name for the Sanhedrin (possibly the Jerusalemic and not national Council of Justice) is *βουλή* (Jos. *BJ* II. xv. 6, xvi. 2, xvii. 1, V. xiii. 1), whence Jos. *ib.* II. xvii. 1; Mk 15^{43} *βουλευτής* = בּוּלְווּטִים (J. Levy, *Neuhebr. u. chald. Wörterbuch über die Talmudim u. Midraschim*, 1876–89, i. 199 f.). On Maccabæan coins the Sanhedrin is called *ḥeber hā-yᵉhūdîm*, 'representative assembly of the Jews' (F. W. Madden, *History of Jewish Coinage*, 1864, p. 58; A. Geiger, *Urschriften und Übersetzungen der Bibel*, 1857, p. 121; J. Wellhausen, *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer*, 1874, pp. 29, 34).

2. Origin and history.—The institution is based on Dt 17^{8-11} (*Sifrē* and *Sanh.* 2*a*) and the seventy elders on Nu 11^{16} (*Sifrē*). The Talmudic sources ascribe it to Moses; also that of 'the Little Sanhedrin of Twenty-three' for each tribe after Dt 16^{18} (*Sanh.* 16*b*, *Jer. Sanh.* i. 19*c*; cf. *Sôṭā*, 44*b*; *Targ. Jer.* Nu $25^{4.7}$ 7^{85} 9^{8}, Ex 21^{30} $32^{2bf.}$, Lv 24^{12}); and speak of its existence under Joshua, Jabez, Jerubbaal, Boaz, Jephthah, Samuel, David, and Solomon, and until the time of the captivity by Nebuchadnezzar (*Bābā bathrā*, 121*b*; *Yômā*, 80*a*; *Mak.* 23*b*; *Ḳoh. R.* 18; Targ. Ru 3^{11} 4^{1}, 1 Ch 4^{12} 5^{13} 18^{17}, Ps 69^{1} 80^{1}; *M.Ḳ.* 26*a*; *Bābā Ḳammā*, 61*a*; *Yeb.* 77*a*; *Ber.* 3*b*–4*a*; *Sanh.* 16*b*, 107*a*; Targ. Est. 1^{2}; *Jer. Sanh.* i. 18*b*). Again, during the Second Temple, after the men of the Great Synagogue from Ezra to Simon the Just II. had occupied the place of the Sanhedrin, Talmudic tradition holds that it was re-organized under the *zūggôth* (*duumviri* [*Ābôth*, i. 4–11; *Ḥag.* ii. 2; *Peah*, ii. 6; *Yad*, ii. 16; *Jer. Sôṭā*, ix. 24*a*]) and continued in power under such form until the destruction of the Temple, when it was transferred to Jabneh, to Usha, to Sepphoris, and, finally, to Tiberias (*Rôsh hash.* 31*b*). This whole view, however, bears the imprint of the schoolhouse, and forms part of the Pharisaic system which in support of the Oral Law postulated an unbroken chain of tradition without any interference by any priestly—that is, Sadducean—authority. In this sense Jose ben Ḥalaphtha, the great 2nd cent. authority for Talmudic historiography, says (*Tôs. Sanh.* vii. 1; *Ḥag.* ii. 9): 'In former times there were no dissensions in Israel. Every legal question that could not be decided in any city was submitted to the Sanhedrin of 23 on the Temple hill, and if not decided there, to the Little Sanhedrin of 23 in the Temple rampart, and if not decided there either, brought for final decision before the Great Sanhedrin in the hall of hewn stones which was in session from morning to evening, never allowing fewer than 23 of its members to be present for the discussion of the subject in the Temple schoolhouse. Thus the *Hălākah* was fixed and developed in Israel. Dissensions arose when the disciples of Hillel and Shammai increased in number and failed to acquire through personal contact with their master the necessary knowledge and thus the doctrine was divided into many doctrines.' As a matter of fact, pre-Exilic history presents nowhere a trace of an institution like the Sanhedrin. The seventy elders invested with spiritual powers (Nu $11^{16.24f.}$, Ex $24^{1.9}$; cf. אֲצִילֵי בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל [Ex 24^{11}] with וַיָּאצֶל [Nu 11^{25}]) point to the existence of some sort of representative body of the nation (cf. Ezr 8^{11} with Ex 3^{16} 18^{12}, Dt 21^{9}, 1 K 8^{1} 12^{8} 20^{7}, 2 K 23^{1}), but they form no judiciary like the Sanhedrin. The story in 2 Ch 19^{12} of a high court of justice established by king Jehoshaphat, after Dt $17^{8f.}$, consisting of Levites, priests, and heads of the families, with two chief members—the high priest to decide the religious, the governor of Judah to decide the monarchical, matters—cannot be adduced as proof of the Mosaic origin of the Sanhedrin, as does D. Hoffmann (*Der oberste Gerichtshof*, pp. 6, 20), but is, like all the Chronicler's stories, a reflexion of the views of the post-Exilic writer. In fact, it indicates, as pointed out by Wellhausen (*Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*^{3}, 1886, p. 199), the existence of the Sanhedrin in his time, *i.e.* in the 4th century. As to the *duumviri* see below.

The first positive record of the Sanhedrin, under the name of *Gerousia*, appears in the decree of Antiochus the Great about 200 (Jos. *Ant.* XII. iii. 33). This was an aristocratic body of elders of the nation with the high priest at its head, which had charge of the government of the Jewish people under Persian and then under Ptolemaic and Seleucidæan rule; nor was it different under Roman rule (*ib.* IV. viii. 17, XI. iv. 8, XX. x.; 1 Mac 12^{6} 13^{36} 14^{20}, 2 Mac 1^{10} 4^{44} 11^{27}). The name *Synhedrion* (Aramaized *Sanhedrin*), which denotes chiefly a court of justice, came into popular use under Ptolemaic rule; and, as its Hebrew equivalent, the name *Ḥeber hā-Yehūdîm* appears on Hasmonæan coins, which read: 'Joḥanan the high priest, the head, and the Council (representative) of the Jews' (Madden, *op. cit.*, p. 58; Wellhausen, *Phar. und Sadd.*, pp. 29, 34, *Israelit. und jüd. Geschichte*^{4}, p. 281). A Sanhedrin of the Hasmonæans is mentioned in *Sanh.* 82*a*, *Abôda Zārā*, 36*b*, which is probably identical with the Pharisaic Sanhedrin (called *kenîshtā*, 'assembly,' *Meg. Taʿănîth*, x.), whose triumph over the Sadducean Sanhedrin in the reign of queen Alexandra Salome and under the leadership of Simon b. Sheṭaḥ was celebrated as a festival. The Sanhedrin seems to have played a political rôle in the quarrel between Alexandra's two sons, when Gabinius, the Roman governor of Syria in 57 B.C., diminished its power by dividing the country into five districts and placing a Sanhedrin in Sepphoris and Jericho alongside of that at Jerusalem (Jos. *Ant.* XIV. v. 4). Soon afterwards, however, the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem was in full power again when sitting in judgment upon young Herod (*ib.* XIV. ix. 4), but forty-five of its members fell victims to the terrible revenge of the tyrant. Thus he rose to power, and a new Sanhedrin was chosen by him of servile men who passed sentences of death at his command (*ib.* XV. i. 2, vi. 2).

Under the Roman procurators when Judæa was shorn of all her sovereignty and independence, the Sanhedrin still continued to represent the supreme power and authority of the Jewish people (Mt 26^{59} and Ac 4^{15} 5^{21} 6^{12} 22^{30} 23^{1} 24^{20}). In the war against Rome it directed and organized the struggle, and when towards the last the Zealots took hold of the city of Jerusalem, they appointed their own Sanhedrin in place of the old to have a semblance of authority for their atrocious acts (Jos. *BJ* II. xv. 6, xvi. 1 ff., IV. v. 4). It must be noticed, however, that Josephus uses the term βουλή in *BJ* and κοινόν in *Vita*, 12, 13, 38, etc., instead of Sanhedrin, probably because the latter had become more what he calls (*Vita*, 12) 'the Sanhedrin of the Jerusalemites,' *i.e.* a city Senate. With the downfall of the State, the Sanhedrin as a national or political institution ceased to exist (*Sôṭā*, ix. 11; *Ēkāh R.* v. 16), but under the leadership of Joḥanan b. Zakkai, Hillel's great disciple, the new Sanhedrin was soon afterwards organized at Jabneh (Jamnia), of an entirely scholastic character, consisting only of teachers of the Law; and the form the new Sanhedrin assumed under his successor Gamaliel II., who took the title of Nāsî as the lineal descendant of Hillel, offered to the Talmudic tradition many of the features ascribed to the ancient Sanhedrin.

3. The presidency of the Sanhedrin.—The chief difficulty for the historian lies in the irreconcilable conflict between the Talmudic traditions and the above quoted historical records in Josephus and the NT concerning the presidency of the Sanhedrin. According to the latter, the authenticity of which cannot be questioned, the high priest, as the political head of the nation, was the president. The former assign to the high priest no place in the Sanhedrin (*Sanh.* ii. 1, 'The high priest can neither bring a case before the Sanhedrin nor be judged by them'; cf. *Yômā*, 1^{3}, according to which he receives his mandates from the Sanhedrin), and instead have masters of the Pharisean schools placed regularly at its head. Two such masters known under the name of *zûggôth* (=*duumviri*), one with the title of Nāsî (prince), the other with that of Ab Bēth Dîn ('father of the court of justice'), are recorded to have presided over the Sanhedrin from about the middle of the 2nd to the middle of the 1st cent. B.C. (*Ḥag.* ii. 2; cf. *Abôth*, i. 4–12; *Peah*, ii. 6; *Yad*, ii. 16; *Jer. Sôṭā*, ix. 24*a*): Jose b. Joezer of Zereda (a relative of Alkimos the high priest) (*Ber. R.* 65, 18), and most probably identical with the Hasidæan leader Razis (?) (2 Mac 14^{37} 'an elder and father of the Jews') and Jose b. Joḥanan—the first duumvirate; Joshua b. Peraḥya and Nittai of Arbela—the second; Simon b. Sheṭaḥ (contemporary of Alexander Jannæus and relative of queen Alexandra) (H. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, iii.^{4} [1888] 137; E. Schürer, *GJV* ii.^{4} 421), and Judah b. Tabbai—the third; Shemaiah (=Sameas, Jos. *Ant.* XIV. ix. 4) and Abtalion (=Ptolion, *ib.* XV. i. 1)—the fifth. According to *Sheb.* 15*a*, Hillel's successor as Nāsî was his son Simon, and he was followed by his son Gamaliel I., and he again by his own son Simon, the last president of the Sanhedrin before the destruction of the Temple. The untrustworthiness of these traditions, however, is shown first of all by the confusion in the sources, some of which place Judah b. Tabbai above Simon b. Sheṭaḥ, and Shammai above Hillel (*Ḥag.* ii. 2, 16*b*; cf. *Sheb.* 17*a*), and then by the significant fact that nowhere else are these men spoken of as Nāsî, Hillel being simply called 'the elder'= senator (*Suk.* 53*a* and elsewhere), but above all by the direct mention of Sameas and Ptolion (Jos. *Ant.* XIV. ix. 4, XV. i. 1), of Gamaliel I. (Ac 5^{34}) and Simon b. Gamaliel (Jos. *Vita*, 38), as 'certain members of the Sanhedrin belonging to the Pharisean party,' while in each case the high priest appears as chief of the Sanhedrin. It is, therefore, impossible to escape the conclusion that the conditions existing under Gamaliel II. at the close of the 1st cent. were transferred to former times, and so the title of Nāsî (ethnarch) held by the Hillelites down to the 4th cent. (Orig. *Epp. ad Africanum*, quoted in Schürer, *GJV* ii.^{4} 248, n. 28) was claimed for Hillel, the ancestor believed to be of Davidic descent (Jos. *Vita*, 38; *Ber. R.* xlix. 10; *Sanh.* 5*a*); and, finally, the whole system of the duumvirate was carried back to the beginning of Pharisaism.

4. The title Ab Bēth Dîn and the duumvirate.—It is nevertheless unwarranted to dismiss as fictitious, as Schürer, Wellhausen, and Kuenen do, the whole tradition concerning the leadership of the so-called Nᵉsīîm and the duumvirate. As a matter of fact, the important innovations (*ṭekkānōth*) ascribed to such masters as Jose b. Joezer, Simon b. Sheṭaḥ, Hillel, and Gamaliel I. (cf. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, iii. and iv. [see Index], and Jelski, *Die innere Einrichtung des grossen Synedrions zu Jerusalem*, pp. 43–81) could have been brought about only under a Pharisean leadership of greater authority on the Law than was the high priest, who as a rule lacked both learning and piety. Apart from this, however, the tradition of a duumvirate is corroborated by Josephus in a remarkable passage which failed to receive the attention its importance deserves. In giving an exposition of the Mosaic constitution, in all probability taken from an older Pharisaic source, he writes (*Ant.* IV. viii. 14): 'Each city shall have for its magistrates seven men known for their practice of virtue and zeal for righteousness, and to each magistracy two men of the tribe of Levi shall be assigned as assistants [secretaries]. These elected as judges shall be held in the utmost esteem. . . . For the power to judge cometh from God. . . . But if these judges do not know how to decide on matters submitted to them . . . they shall send the undecided case to the holy city, and there shall the high priest and the prophet and the Senate come together and give the final decision.'

It is plain that these rules must have been taken from the practice of the time and regarded as ancient traditional law. Now there is a trace of seven judges instead of the Talmudic three in each city court (*Sanh.* i. 1), found in the seven city aldermen (*ṭôbē hā ʿîr* [*Meg.* 26*a*; cf. *Jer. Meg.* iii. 1, 74*a*; *Tôs. Meg.* iii. 1], probably *ḥeber hā ʿîr* [*Bik.* iii. 12; *Tôs. Peah*, iv. 16; *Sheb.* vii. 9]). And the seven judges recur in Jos. *Ant.* IV. viii. 38 with reference to Ex 22$^{7-8}$, Elohim being taken as judges (cf. Targ. and *Meḳ.* to the passage). As governor of Galilee, Josephus appointed seven judges for each town and a Sanhedrin of seventy for the whole province (Jos. *BJ* II. xx. 5). For the high court at Jerusalem, however, a duumvirate, consisting of the high priest and the prophet, is ordained, and neither Kuenen (*Gesamm. Abhandlungen*, p. 66) nor Wellhausen (*Phar. und Sadd.*, p. 26) nor Hoffmann (*Der oberste Gerichtshof*, p. 25) nor Büchler (*Das Synedrion in Jerus.*, p. 62) explains the mention of the prophet here satisfactorily. The fact is that the Law (Dt $17^{9.\,12}$) mentions alongside of the priest also 'the judge,' implying thereby a man of judicial competence and authority, and thus suggests a sort of duumvirate such as the Chronicler (2 Ch 19^{11}) has. It is easy to see how, in view of the decline of the Sadducean priesthood, the necessity arose of having as the spiritual head of the Sanhedrin a Pharisean scribe who was to be consulted in all difficult questions. Such a scribe could well be called prophet, as the one filled with the Divine spirit of wisdom (Dt 34^{9}; cf. Jos. *Ant.* IV. viii. 46, *BJ* II. viii. 12; Wis 7^{27}; *Didache*, x. 7; see also *Hor.* i. 4, *mufla*), while as the patriarch he received the title 'Ab Bēth Dîn' (cf. Jg 17^{10} 18^{19}, 2 K 2^{12}, and the title 'Aboth' for the ancient sages). It is especially noteworthy that Jose b. Joezer, the first of the duumviri, was called 'the father of the Jews' (2 Mac 14^{37}). The duumvirate was, no doubt, the result of a compromise between Sadducean priesthood and the Pharisean scribes, the Ab Bēth Dîn being for the Pharisees the actual president, whereas the Sadducean high priest was consigned to oblivion, wherefore a later tradition referred the duumvirate to the leaders of the two Pharisean schools of each generation, giving to the foremost one the title of Nāsî (cf. *JE*, art. 'Nasi'). It is not as president, but as the patriarch, that Gamaliel I. speaks with authority (Ac 5^{34}).

5. Composition and meeting-place of the Sanhedrin.—The Great Sanhedrin consisted of seventy-one members, the seventy elders and the Nāsî or president (*Sanh.* i. 5; cf. *BJ* II. xx. 5 and IV. v. 4). When Gamaliel II. and Eleazar b. Azariah alternated as presidents, they counted seventy-two (*Yad*, ii. 5; *Zeb.* i. 3).

The Little Sanhedrin in the provinces (*Sanh.* i. 16*b*) and in Jerusalem, one at the entrance to the Temple hill, the other at the entrance to the Temple Court or the Rampart (*Sanh.* xi. 1; *Tôs. Sanh.* ix. 1; *Sifrē* Dt. 152) consisted, according to the Talmudic tradition, of twenty-three. Of the former, one is mentioned as the *βουλή* of Tiberias (Josephus, *Vita*, 12), whereas the Great Sanhedrin is referred to as the Sanhedrin of Jerusalem. Possibly the Great Sanhedrin of seventy-one was composed of the two Little Sanhedrins, the one on the Temple hill, which may be identified with the Senate of Jerusalem (Jos. *Ant.* XX. i. 2, *BJ* II. xv. 6, xvi. 2), and the other before the Temple court, probably the one concerned with the Temple practice and the priestly legitimacy (*Ant.* XX. ix. 6), and the main body of the high court, also consisting of twenty-three (*Tôs. Sanh.* ix. 1), that is, 3 × 23 = 69, besides the patriarch of the court and the president or Nāsî. This would also account for the forty-five slain by king Herod, if it may be assumed that the Senate of Jerusalem sided with him (*Ant.* XV. i. 2).

As to the elements constituting the Sanhedrin, the ruling priests representing the Sadducean party were, according to Josephus (*BJ* II. xiv. 8, xv. 2 f., xvii. 2 ff., V. i. 5) and the NT (Mt 26^{59} 27^{41} and elsewhere), dominant in influence, and the patricians, called 'the men of power' (*δυνατοί*) in Josephus (*locc. citt.*), formed the bulk of the Sanhedrin, until king Herod replaced them by *homines novi*, whereas the Pharisees, who rose to power under Alexandra Salome, were but few in number (Jos. *Ant.* XIII. xv. 5; Mk 10^{33}; only the later Gospels mention the Pharisees). Only those were admitted into the Sanhedrin who were of pure blood, so as to be able to intermarry with the priestly families (*Sanh.* iv. 2). Little historic value can be attached to Jose b. Ḥalaphtha's statement (*Tôs. Sanh.* ix. 1) that the Sanhedrin selected for each city court the one found to be wise, humble, sin-fearing, of blameless character, and popular as judge, and then had him promoted to membership, first of the two Little Sanhedrins in Jerusalem, and finally to the Great Sanhedrin in the hall of hewn stones. The same holds good of the description in *Sanh.* iv. 3–4, *Tôs. Sanh.* viii. 1–2, according to which 'the Sanhedrin sat in a semi-circle, the Nāsî in the centre and the two secretaries standing at both sides, while the disciples sat before them in three rows according to their rank; and when a vacancy arose, the new member was chosen from the first row, and his place again filled by one in the second row and so forth.' This seems to be a picture taken from the Sanhedrin of Jabneh. Likewise academic are the prerequisites of the Sanhedrin given in *Sifrē* Nu. 92: 'They must be wise, courageous, high-principled (not 'strong' as Bacher has) and humble.' R. Joḥanan of the 3rd cent. (*Sanh.* 17*b*) says: 'They must also be of high stature, of pleasing appearance and of advanced age, conversant with the art of magic and the seventy spoken languages,' to which Judah han-Nāsî is said to have added 'the dialectic power by which Levitically unclean things can be proven to be clean.'

There is, however, no cause for questioning the correctness of the tradition that the meeting-place of the Great Sanhedrin was in the hall of hewn stones, the *lishkath hag-gāzîth* on the south side of the great court in which the priests held their daily morning service and where other priestly functions were performed (*Midd.* v. 4; *Tâmīd*, ii., iv.). Schürer's identification of *lishkath hag-gāzîth* with the Senate assembly house (*βουλή*) near the Xystos (Jos. *BJ* V. iv. 2, VI. vi. 3) cannot be accepted in the face of these traditions, which prove that the *lishkah* (always the name of a Temple cell) must have been within the Temple area.

The Senate house near the Xystos in Josephus may refer, as Bacher thinks, to the time of the removal of the Sanhedrin to the city during the siege (*Rôsh hash.* 31). Besides this there was a special hall assigned to the high priest and the foremost men of the Sanhedrin called *lishkath Parhedrîn* (*πάρεδροι*), 'the men of the front rank,' also called *lishkath būleuṭîn, i.e.* 'senators' hall' (*Yômā*, I. i. 8*b*).

6. Functions of the Sanhedrin.—According to the Mishna (*Sanh.* i. 4), capital punishment was pronounced and executed by the Little Sanhedrin of twenty-three in the various provinces or tribes, but the tribunal of seventy-one in the Temple of Jerusalem was the only body vested with power and authority (1) to pronounce a verdict in a process affecting a tribe, a false prophet, or the high priest; (2) to declare war against a nation not belonging to ancient Canaan or Amalek; (3) to extend the character of holiness to additional parts of the Temple, or of Jerusalem; (4) to appoint Sanhedrin over the tribes; (5) to execute judgment against a city that had lapsed into idolatry. All these points, derived directly or indirectly from Scripture (Jg 21, Dt $13^{7f.\,18ff.}$; *Sanh.* 16*a* f.), refer to a time when the twelve tribes still had their existence, and are consequently theoretical rather than real life issues. Nor can it be taken as an actual practice of the Sanhedrin when it is charged with the burning of the red heifer (Nu 19), or the breaking of the neck of the heifer to atone for a murder the perpetrator of which cannot be found (Dt 21$^{1f.}$), the final judgment of a rebellious elder (Dt 17^{12}), the bringing of a guilt offering in the case of an unintentional sin committed by the whole congregation of Israel (Lv 4^{13}), the installation of a king or of a high priest (*Tôs. Sanh.* iii. 4), the ordeal of a woman suspected of adultery (*Sôṭā*, i. 4; cf. Philo, ed Mangey, ii. 308), or the fixing of the calendar each new moon (*Rôsh hash.* ii. 5, 9). It may be taken for certain, however, that the three branches of the government, the political, the religious, and the judicial administration, were centralized in the Sanhedrin; yet at the same time these three different functions were assigned to three separate bodies. Hence mention is made of a Sanhedrin of the judges (Jos. *Ant.* XX. ix. 1), a Bēth Dîn of the priests (*Ket.* i. 5; *Tôs. Sanh.* iv. 4), which had in charge also the investigation of the legitimacy of the priesthood (*Tôs. Sanh.* vii. 1), and the Sanhedrin of the Jerusalemites (Jos. *Vita*, 12), *i.e.* the Senate of Jerusalem, to which the political administration of the country was entrusted. Possibly the name τὸ κοινόν, 'the common administration,' used almost exclusively in *Vita* (12, 13, 38, etc.), refers to this centralization. Hoffmann (*op. cit.*, p. 46) refers the name to the democratic government established by the Zealots (*Vita*, 39), and compares the Talmudic *'ēdāh* ('congregation') with the Sanhedrin (*Sanh.* 16*a*). In all matters of great importance, or in cases when the lower courts could come to no decision, the Great Sanhedrin, composed of three departments (3 × 23 = 69), together with the president and the patriarch (Nāsî and Ab Bēth Dîn), and forming the supreme tribunal 'from which the law went forth to all Israel' (*Sanh.* xi. 2; Jos. *Ant.* IV. viii. 14; Philo, ed. Mangey, ii. 367), gave its decision, which was final and inviolable, and wilful opposition to which on the part of an elder or judge was punished with death. It held its sessions in day-time only, and only on week-days, not on Sabbath and holidays (*Tôs. Sanh.* vii. 1; *Beza*, v. 2; Philo, ed. Mangey, i. 450). Cases of capital punishment were not taken up on the eve of Sabbath or of holy days, because the sentence was always to be given on the following day (*Sanh.* iv. 1). The attendance of at least twenty-three members was required for cases of capital punishment, and unless the full number of seventy-one were present, a majority of one could not decide the condemnation. Talmudic tradition, however, states that forty years (which is a round number) before the destruction of the Temple the right of jurisdiction in cases of capital punishment was taken from Israel (*Jer. Sanh.* i. 18*a*; *Bab. Shab.* 15*b*). This agrees with Jos. *Ant.* XX. ix. 1, Jn 18^{31}, and the whole procedure of the Crucifixion. Otherwise the conflicting Gospel stories concerning the condemnation and crucifixion of Jesus show, to say the least, irregularities for which only the high priests (cf. Jos. *Ant.* XVIII. iii. 3, 'the foremost men') were responsible.

As regards the death penalty on sacrilegious intruders on the Temple ground, this was, as the inscription indicates (see T. Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte*, v.^{2} [1885] 513), a law against the Zealots sanctioned by the people and the Roman government (see art. 'Zealots' in *JE* xii. 641^b), and has nothing to do with the Sanhedrin, as Schürer thinks (*GJV* ii.^{4} 260 f.).

Characteristic of later times is the academic view of the 2nd cent. masters of the Mishna (*Mak.* i. 10): 'A Sanhedrin that passes a sentence of death once within 7 years, others say, every 70 years, and still others, only once, deserves the epithet murderous.' The Mishnaic rules of procedure in cases of capital punishment (*Sanh.* iv. 2, 5) may accordingly be regarded as of academic rather than historical value. The Sanhedrin had its jurisdiction over the Jews throughout the world as far as their religious life was concerned (*Rôsh hash.* i. 3 f.; cf. W. Bousset, *Religion des Judentums*, 1903, p. 83). As a religious tribunal it outlasted the Temple and State of Judæa, existing in the shape of a body of academicians down to the 5th cent. when its name was transferred to the seventy members of the academy of Babylonia called Kallāh ('the circle').

LITERATURE.—E. Schürer, *GJV* ii.^{4} [1907] 237–267, where the entire literature is given; H. L. Strack, art. 'Synedrium' in *PRE*^{3} xix.; W. Bacher, art. 'Sanhedrin' in *HDB*. Especially to be mentioned are A. Kuenen, 'Über die Zusammensetzung des Sanhedrin' (in *Gesamm. Abhandl. zur bibl. Wissenschaft*, tr. K. Budde, 1894, pp. 49–81); I. Jelski, *Die innere Einrichtung des grossen Synedrions zu Jerusalem*, 1894; D. Hoffmann, 'Der oberste Gerichtshof in der Stadt des Heiligtums,' in *Programm des Rabbinerseminars zu Berlin*, 1877–78 (only apologetic in character); A. Büchler, *Das Synedrion in Jerusalem und das grosse Beth Din in der Quaderkammer des jerusalemischen Tempels*, 1902 (valuable for its large material on the subject, but unsound in its argumentation and its historical conclusions).

K. KOHLER.

SAPPHIRA.—See ANANIAS.

SAPPHIRE (σάπφειρος, from סַפִּיר).—Sapphire is the second foundation stone of the New Jerusalem (Rev 21^{19}), an idea probably suggested by Is 54^{11}. Doubtless the lapis lazuli is meant (so Rev 21^{19} RVm). According to Theophrastus (*Lap.* 23) the sapphire is 'as it were spotted with gold dust' (ὥσπερ χρυσόπαστος), and Pliny (*HN* xxxvii. 38) alludes to its 'aureus pulvis,' and again (39), 'in iis [sapphiris] enim aurum punctis conlucet cæruleis.' This description does not suit the stone now called sapphire, but is fully applicable to the lapis lazuli, which 'frequently contains disseminated particles of iron-pyrites of gold-like appearance' (*EBr*^{11} xvi. 199). In Ex 24^{10} the LXX says that under God's feet is ὡσεὶ ἔργον πλίνθου σαπφείρου—a fine simile for the star-gemmed azure sky (cf. Ezk 1^{26}). The modern sapphire is probably the ancient ὑάκινθος, or 'jacinth' (*q.v.*).

LITERATURE.—C. W. King, *The Natural History of Precious Stones and Gems*, 1865, pp. 273–277; J. H. Middleton, *The Engraved Gems of Classical Times*, 1891.

JAMES STRAHAN.

SARAH (Σάρρα).—(1) Sarah has a place in the Roll of Faith (He 11^{11}). By faith even she herself (καὶ αὐτή) won the title to this great honour. The meaning of αὐτή is doubtful: it may be expanded into 'though she was the weaker vessel' (*vas infirmius*, Bengel); or, 'though she was barren' (D adds the gloss στεῖρα); or, 'though she had been so incredulous.' She received strength for conception (εἰς καταβολὴν σπέρματος), believing, even when she was beyond the proper time of life (παρὰ καιρὸν ἡλικίας), that God could by a miracle give her a child. Motherhood after long childlessness is a recurrent theme in Bible narratives: Rebekah, Rachel, the mother of Samson, of Samuel, of John Baptist had each a happiness like Sarah's. (2) St. Peter (1 P 3^6) praises the holy women of the olden time, who trusted in God and were in subjection to their husbands, 'as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord.' Her reverential use of this term in reference to her husband occurs but once (Gn 18^{12}), and would in itself be an insufficient ground for making her a pattern of wifely obedience, especially as words of quite another import stand recorded against her (16^5). But the Apostle evidently felt that the dutiful word was weighted with the love and loyalty of a lifetime.

LITERATURE.—A. Whyte, *Bible Characters: Adam to Achan*, 1896; R. F. Horton, *Women of the OT*, 1897.

JAMES STRAHAN.

SARDIS (Σάρδεις, Lat. Sardes or Sardis; the sing. form Σάρδις is found in Ptolemy).—Sardis, the capital of the kingdom of Lydia, was one of the most ancient and renowned cities of Asia Minor. Built on a strong hill projecting, with smooth and steep flanks, from the northern side of Mt. Tmolus, it commanded the wide and fertile plain through which the Hermus, about 3 miles N., flowed westward to the Ægean Sea. On three sides it was deemed inaccessible, the only approach being the neck of land which joined the hill to the Tmolus range. It was thus an ideal capital in days of primitive warfare between Lydia and Phrygia. In later times a second city was built around the foot of the hill, 1500 ft. lower than the acropolis.

In Sardis the kings of Lydia, whom the Greeks counted 'barbarians' (Herod. i. 6), reigned in Oriental splendour and luxury. But centuries of material prosperity made the Lydian character soft and voluptuous, and the fall of Crœsus, whom Solon warned in vain of the fickleness of fortune, became to the Greeks the supreme illustration of the danger of careless security.

When Cyrus, king of Persia, besieged the city (549 B.C.), and offered a reward to the soldier who should first mount the wall, 'a Mardian named Hyrœades endeavoured to climb up on that part of the citadel where no guard was stationed, because there did not appear to be any danger that it would be taken on that part, for on that side the citadel was precipitous and impracticable. . . . Having seen a Lydian come down this precipice the day before, for a helmet that had rolled down, and carry it up again, he noticed it carefully, and reflected on it in his mind; he thereupon ascended the same way, followed by divers Persians; and when great numbers had gone up, Sardis was thus taken and the town plundered' (Herod. i. 84). The same daring exploit was performed by the Cretan Lagoras, who scaled the heights and captured the citadel for Antiochus the Great (218 B.C.). After the defeat of Antiochus at Magnesia (190 B.C.), Sardis was gifted by the Romans to the kings of Pergamos. From the time of Alexander the Great it had enjoyed the constitution of a self-governing city of the Greek type, and under the Romans it became the head of a *conventus juridicus* in the Hermus valley. It still amassed wealth, but its ancient power and prestige were gone. The once brave, warlike, victorious Sardians had long been despised as 'tender-footed Lydians,' who could only 'play on the cithara, strike the guitar, and sell by retail' (Herod. i. 55, 155). Living on the traditions of a splendid past, Sardis sank into a second-rate provincial town. It seemed to have no power of material or moral self-recovery. In A.D. 17 it was destroyed by an earthquake, and rebuilt with the aid of Imperial funds.

The delineation which the Apocalypse gives of the Church of Sardis is singularly like that which history gives of the city. It is scarcely possible to imagine that the writer was unconscious of the resemblance when he added touch after touch to his picture, and the parallel could not but strike every intelligent reader. In the time of Domitian the Christian community needed to be told humiliating truths regarding itself. Years of evangelism had not delivered it from the spirit of the city which boasted her great name and fame, while she lapped herself in soft Lydian airs and closed her eyes to the dangers of overweening self-confidence. Within a single generation the Church is repeating the city's history of a thousand years. (1) It has a name to live and is dead (Rev 3^1). It is now only apparently what it once was really—a living Church. The youthful vitality is spent, its spiritual renown has become a *nominis umbra*. Religiously as well as politically decadent, Sardis seemed incapable of reanimation. Ramsay characterizes it as 'the city of death.' (2) The Church, like the city, has 'fulfilled' none of its works. Beginning with great ambitions, high hopes, and noble endeavours, it has lacked the grace of perseverance, and so has realized nothing. After a springtime rich in promise, how meagre the harvest! (3) The Church is warned that it must watch, if it is not to be surprised as by a thief in the night (3^3). To any public-spirited Sardian that was 'the most unkindest cut of all,' for in the critical times of history Sardis had always been caught napping. (4) It is implied, though not directly asserted, that the Church of Sardis had defiled its garments with the immorality of the soft and dissolute city which had been the age-long worshipper of Cybele, when it ought by this time to be like an *urbs candida*, wearing the white robes of purity and victory. No one of the Seven Churches of the province of Asia, not even Laodicea, is so severely rebuked as Sardis. All the more warm and tender are the words of praise addressed to the few who have kept themselves unspotted 'even in Sardis.' Their virtue has a peculiar grace because it blooms in such an atmosphere, and the reward of their purity will be fellowship with the perfectly pure—God and His holy angels.

LITERATURE.—W. M. Ramsay, *The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia*, 1904, p. 354 f.; C. Wilson, in Murray's *Handbook to Asia Minor*, 1895. JAMES STRAHAN.

SARDIUS (*σάρδιον*, a much better attested form in Rev 4^3 than the TR *σάρδιος* = Vulg. 'sardinus').—The writer of the Apocalypse compares Him that sits upon the throne of heaven to a sardius (Rev 4^3, AV 'sardine stone'). The sixth foundation of the wall of the New Jerusalem is a sardius (21^{20}). This stone is doubtless the modern orange-red or golden 'sard,' which is a translucent quartz coloured with iron, nearly allied with the clearer and lighter-tinted carnelian. The Greeks commonly connected the word with Sardis, where the stone was said to have been first found; but it may be related to the Persian *zerd*, 'yellow.' Pliny says that the sardius of Babylonia was more highly prized than that of Sardis (*HN* xxxvii. 7). This stone was more frequently engraved than any other. It was used for Assyrian cylinder seals, Egyptian scarabs, and early Greek and Etruscan gems.

LITERATURE.—C. W. King, *The Natural History of Precious Stones and Gems*, 1865, pp. 278–286.

JAMES STRAHAN.

SARDONYX (*σαρδόνυξ*).—The sardonyx is the fifth foundation of the New Jerusalem (Rev 21^{20}). This stone is a beautiful variety of onyx, consisting, as the name implies, of a layer of sard (or of carnelian) with one of white chalcedony, or presenting several alternating layers of these minerals. The finest kind known to ancient writers—now called the 'Oriental sardonyx'—had at least three strata—a black base, an intermediate band of white chalcedony, and a superficial layer of red or brown. The black was regarded as typifying humility, the white chastity, and the red modesty or martyrdom. The sardonyx was frequently used for seals and cameos. The best kind was obtained from India or Arabia. Imitations are made by cementing together stones of the required colours, or by placing a sard or carnelian, coated with sodium carbonate, on a red-hot iron and so producing a white layer. JAMES STRAHAN.

SATAN.—See DEVIL.

SAUL (Σαούλ).—Saul the son of Kish, of the tribe of Benjamin, is mentioned in St. Paul's address at Pisidian Antioch as the first king whom God gave to Israel. After he had reigned 40 years, God removed him, and raised up David to be king over Israel, a man after His heart (Ac $13^{21.22}$). Saul of Tarsus could not fail to be profoundly interested in the career of the great king whose name he bore and to whose tribe he belonged. The story of the hero who was called against his will to the throne, and who lived and died fighting for the liberty of his country, has all the elements of high tragedy. By separating the later from the earlier and more authentic narrative contained in 1 Sam., historical criticism enables the reader to understand more fully and to appraise more highly the real services of this protagonist who turned the tide of Philistine conquest into defeat and paved the way for the still greater king who consolidated the Hebrew monarchy. For a fine psychological study of his character, see A. B. Davidson, *The Called of God*, 1902, p. 143 ff.

JAMES STRAHAN.

SAVIOUR.—See SALVATION; CHRIST, CHRISTOLOGY.

SCARLET.—See COLOURS.

SCEVA.—See EXORCISM.

SCHISM.—This word occurs only once in the NT, viz. in 1 Co 12^{25}. St. Paul, in writing to the Corinthians on spiritual gifts, teaches them that one member of the Church should not look down upon another because he has not the same spiritual gift. All members are necessary to the perfection of the Body of Christ. He illustrates this from the analogy of the human body, showing that even the smallest member is necessary to its perfection and that 'there should be no schism in the body.' In this passage σχίσμα has its simple meaning of 'rent' or 'division.' The Gr. word occurs in other passages, where it is tr. 'divisions.' The later ecclesiastical use of 'schism' does not occur in the NT. See HERESY, DIVISIONS.

MORLEY STEVENSON.

SCHOOL.—See EDUCATION, TYRANNUS.

SCHOOLMASTER.—This is the AV rendering of παιδαγωγός in Gal $3^{24f.}$ (1 Co 4^{15}, 'instructer'), but in the RV it has given place to 'tutor' (*q.v.*) in both passages. The latter rendering is scarcely less inadequate than the former. The παιδαγωγός is to be distinguished from the παιδονόμος, who is one of the official guardians of public instruction in a Greek city, and from the παιδευτής, the educator who trains the youth and corrects his foolishness (Ro 2^{20}), and from the διδάσκαλος, the teacher who actually imparts instruction (Ac 13^{1}, 1 Co 12^{28}, and elsewhere). His office in the old Greek system of education was to accompany the children of the family to and from their schools, the school of the music-master and the school of the physical trainer. He carried the books and instruments, the lyre and writing materials of his pupils. He was responsible for their guardianship and protection out of school hours, and was expected to protect them, not only from danger to life and limb, but also from the perils of evil companionship. His pupils remained under his charge till they reached the age of puberty, when they were supposed to be able to care for themselves. His status was that of a slave for the most part, but the most respected and trustworthy of the household; and care was taken that he should be correct in his language and should not tell stories to his charges likely to corrupt or deprave their morals. He appears frequently on the Greek stage both in tragedy and in comedy. Only on rare occasions was he admitted to the presence of his master's daughters. Among the Romans the *pædagogus* attended on girls as well as boys, but Roman girls were allowed to appear out of doors as Greek girls were not. He also gave home instruction to the child, and as he was a Greek-speaking slave, he taught him Greek, which in the days of the Empire was thought a good foundation for learning. The Roman *pædagogi*, however, under the degeneration of pagan manners in the Empire, soon got a bad name.

In the Galatian reference St. Paul represents the Law as exercising a severe but salutary moral influence calculated to make those who were under it feel the need of something better, and to bring them to Christ. As Lightfoot says (*Galatians*, *ad loc.*), 'as well in his inferior rank, as in his recognised duty of enforcing discipline, the *pædagogus* was a fit emblem of the Mosaic law.' But the context of the passage, dwelling upon the close tutelage and supervision of an exacting Law, points not only to the satisfaction, but also to the liberty and devotion as of sons, to be found in Christ.

The Fathers liked to think of Christ Himself, the Incarnate Word, as the παιδαγωγός. One of the works of Clement of Alexandria is so designated. The παιδαγωγός is 'God in the form of man undefiled, minister to the Father's will, the unsullied image of God' (i. 2). He is ὁ πάντα φιλάνθρωπος, the True Friend of Man (i. 1), and He trains His children both by chastisement and by love to beauty of character.

LITERATURE.—W. M. Ramsay, *Historical Commentary on Galatians*, 1899, p. 381 ff.; J. B. Lightfoot, *Galatians*^{5}, 1876, p. 148 f.; W. Smith, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*^{2}, 1875, art. 'Pædagogus.'

THOMAS NICOL.

SCIENCE.—The word 'science' (γνῶσις) occurs only once in the NT, in 1 Ti 6^{20}, and then only in the AV. The Revisers use the word 'knowledge,' and this gives its real meaning. The knowledge which the Apostle has in view and here condemns was a mystical interpretation of the OT, and particularly its legal parts. But the age of science, as this word is now understood, had not then arrived; and the word in its modern significance is nowhere found in NT writings.

J. W. LIGHTLEY.

SCORPION (σκορπίος).—The only books in the NT in which reference is made to the scorpion are the Gospel according to St. Luke and the Apocalypse. Scorpions are mentioned three times in the apocalyptic vision of the Fifth Trumpet or the First Woe (Rev $9^{3.\ 5.\ 10}$), and on each occasion they form part of the description of the locusts themselves or of their mission. These locusts have the power of scorpions while their tails also resemble that of a scorpion and are similarly armed with stings. The sting of the scorpion was proverbial (cf. 1 K $12^{11.\ 14}$, 2 Ch $10^{11.\ 14}$, Ezk 2^{6}, Lk 10^{19}), but is seldom fatal. The mission of the locusts is thus not to slay, but to inflict pain worse than death itself.

Scorpions belong to the *Arachnidæ* or spider family. They are common in all warm climates, and are especially ubiquitous in the wilderness of Sinai (cf. Dt 8^{15}). During the cold weather they lie dormant, but when it becomes hot they emerge from their hiding-places and make their way even into houses. More than eight species have been noted in Palestine. They vary in size and colour; the largest and most dangerous species is black, and measures about 6 ins. in length. Others are yellow, white, black, or reddish, while others again are striped. The females carry their young on their backs until they are old enough to provide for themselves. They swarm in every part of the country and have a particular partiality for ruins (cf. Ezk 2^{6}), where they secrete themselves in the chinks of the walls, as well as under the loose stones. The scorpion resembles a lobster in shape, only it has a jointed tail, which, when running, it holds over its back in a threatening attitude. The tail has a venomous sting, and the reptile always attacks with its tail in this position, with the result that it sometimes strikes it own head and commits suicide thereby. It is carnivorous and feeds chiefly on beetles and locusts, and this fact adds to the hideousness and the formidability of the apocalyptic locusts, whose very tails are compared to the scorpions which normally feed on them. See, further, LOCUST.

LITERATURE.—H. B. Tristram, *The Natural History of the Bible*^{10}, London, 1911, pp. 301–303; W. M. Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, new ed., do., 1910, pp. 224–225, do., ed. 1881–86, vol. ii., 'Central Palestine and Phœnicia,' pp. 478–480; C. Geikie, *The Holy Land and the Bible*, do., 1903, pp. 356–357; *SDB*, p. 832; *HDB* iv. 419; *EBi* iv. 4317–4319; H. B. Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*^{2}, London, 1907, pp. 115, 116, 119.

P. S. P. HANDCOCK.

SCOURGING.—Among both Jews and Romans the common mode of corporal punishment to which offenders were subjected was that of scourging.

1. Jewish scourging.—The supreme Sanhedrin at Jerusalem and the local Sanhedrins connected with all the synagogues were in the habit of punishing by scourging secondary misdemeanours, civil and ecclesiastical. Their authority for the infliction was derived from the statute of the Mosaic Law (Dt 25^{1-3}) which ordained that the misdemeanant should receive a number of stripes not exceeding forty. To ensure that the legal limit was not exceeded, the number was restricted in practice to thirty-nine for one offence. These were administered with a scourge composed of leather strands, the usual executioner being the *Chazzan*, or attendant, of the synagogue (Lk 4^{20}).

Among the sufferings which he heroically endured, St. Paul records his subjection to this form of severe maltreatment on five different occasions, not one of which is mentioned in the Acts (2 Co 11^{24}). Jesus warned His disciples to expect the same sort of persecution at the hands of the Jewish authorities (Mt 10^{17}), a forewarning which was soon verified. The beating (δέρειν) which the apostles received on the occasion of their second collision with the Sanhedrin was that with stripes (Ac 5^{40}). During the period of his career as persecutor, St. Paul searched out the members of every synagogue suspected of being believers, and endeavoured to secure their retractation by the use of the same drastic method (22^{19}; cf. 26^{11}).

2. Roman scourging.—(*a*) Roman scourging is distinguished from Jewish in 2 Co $11^{24f.}$ by the fact that the former was inflicted with rods (ἐραβδίσθην). St. Paul suffered this mode of punishment on three occasions. Only one of these inflictions, that shared by Silas, is recorded in the Acts (16^{22}). In carrying out the orders of the Roman magistrates, the lictors would seem to have executed their task with merciless rigour (v.^{23}). According to the Porcian Law (300 B.C.), scourging was forbidden in the case of Roman citizens, this particular penalty being reserved for slaves and foreigners; and to make matters worse, the magistrates acted also *ultra vires* by failing to investigate the case fully (v.^{37}). (*b*) In the absence of lictors, the flagellation was inflicted with a different instrument, consisting of a 'knout' or 'cat' with 'lashes of knotted cord, or even wire, which might be loaded with knuckle bones or other cruel aggravations.' This dreadful weapon was sometimes employed for extorting confession from persons accused of crime. The chiliarch who had St. Paul under arrest ordered the whip (μάστιξ) to be used for this purpose. Arrangements for subjecting the Apostle to the terrible ordeal had been completed by the centurion, but he escaped it by a successful assertion of his rights as a Roman citizen (22^{24-29}).

3. Among the heroes of faith mentioned in He 11 some had trial of scourgings (v.^{36}), the reference being to tortures inflicted by Jewish or heathen persecutors (2 Mac 7^{1}).

LITERATURE.—For mode of scourging and other details, see artt. 'Flagrum' in Smith's *DGRA*^{3}, London, 1901, 'Scourge' in *HDB* and *DCG*, 'Stripes' in *JE*; F. W. Farrar, *The Life and Work of St. Paul*, do., 1897, pp. 715–717; T. Keim, *History of Jesus of Nazareth*, Eng. tr., 6 vols., do., 1873–83, vi. 116 f.

W. S. MONTGOMERY.

SCRIBE.—Judaism was a religious system which regulated the lives of its adherents in the minutest particulars. The necessary regulations were contained partly in a written Law, partly in a mass of oral tradition and authoritative precedents. Hence a class was needful who should make it their business to preserve and expound these. This class was the scribes.

1. Functions.—(*a*) Their primary function has just been indicated. It involved the making of accurate copies of the Scriptures, and the laborious memorizing of tradition. (*b*) In the synagogue a scribe acted as the expounder of Scripture to the people. (*c*) The scribe was a lawyer who had to decide all legal disputes. (*d*) To meet new cases for which there was no regulation written or oral, and no precedent to guide, he had to determine what the law should be. Hence the mass of traditions and precedents assumed overwhelming proportions. (*e*) The education of the young in schools was the charge of the scribe. As the Law was regulative of all human activities, the knowledge of the scribe was encyclopædic. In his person were combined the offices now distributed among clergymen, doctors, lawyers, and teachers.

2. Training.—The period of training for such a profession was naturally long. When it was finished and he had been called to a particular post, the scribe was ordained, and received the title Rabbi (see DOCTOR).

3. Schools.—Scribes were divided into various schools. While doubtless the majority were Pharisees, the Sadducees had their scribes also (implied in Ac 23^{9}). Further, the Pharisee scribes were divided into two great schools, the followers of Hillel and of Shammai. It was only on points of detail, and on no fundamental principle, that they divided. On the whole, the school of Shammai was the more rigid.

4. Influence.—The influence of the scribes was naturally very great, and they were highly esteemed. After the fall of Jerusalem, they became more important than ever. Temple and priesthood disappeared. The synagogue became the sole centre of Jewish religious and national life, and the scribe the most important official (see under PHARISEES).

5. Relation to the early Church.—In the early history of Christianity we have only three references to the scribes. (1) Gamaliel, a scribe and the teacher of St. Paul (Ac 22^{3}), on the occasion of the trial of St. Peter and his associates counselled toleration, and his advice was accepted ($5^{34ff.}$). (2) When St. Paul was on his trial, the Pharisaic scribes repeated Gamaliel's advice (23^{9}). (3) On the other hand, 6^{12} mentions scribes among those who proceeded against Stephen. Probably we should regard them as Sadducees. But in nearly all cases of Jews rising against Christians, especially outside Jerusalem, we may be sure that the scribes, the recognized leaders of the people, were the instigators.

LITERATURE.—Artt. 'Scribe' in *HDB*, *DCG*, *EBi*, *JE*; E. Schürer, *HJP* ii. i. [Edinburgh, 1885] 312 ff.; W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutest. Zeitalter*, Berlin, 1903, p. 139 ff.; W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Books of the Apocrypha, their Origin, Teaching and Contents*, London, 1914, p. 113 ff.

W. D. NIVEN.

SCRIPTURE.—**1. Terms.**—The general designation for 'Scripture' is γραφή or plur. γραφαί, the former occurring some 30 times in the NT (Gospels 14, Acts 3, Paul 9, Catholic Epistles 5), the latter about 20 times (Gospels 10, Acts 4, Paul 5, Catholic Epistles 2). The terms are almost invariably preceded by the definite article, the only exceptions being in Jn 19^{37}, 2 Ti 3^{16}, where the article before *γραφή* is replaced by *ἑτέρα* and *πᾶσα* respectively, 1 P 2^{6}, 2 P 1^{20}, where *γραφή* has become a real proper name, and Ro 1^{2} 16^{26}, where the Scriptures are more explicitly characterized as *γραφαὶ ἅγιαι* and *γραφαὶ προφητικαί*, 'holy Scriptures' and 'prophetic Scriptures.' In one text, 2 Ti 3^{15}, another designation is used, viz. *ἱερὰ γράμματα*, 'sacred writings' (a direct translation of the Hebrew phrase כִּתְבֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ), which we find also in Philo and Josephus.

2. Connotation of terms. — Both *γραφή* and *γράμμα* are derived from the verb *γράφω*, 'draw,' 'inscribe,' or 'write,' and thus suggest *writing* in the most general sense. Classical Greek shows the transition in each case from the rudimentary conception of *written characters*, or the *art of alphabetic writing*, to the higher thought of real *literature*. In the NT *γράμμα* alone shows any such variety of meaning. Here the word is applied, not merely to the 'letter' of the Law as contrasted with the living, life-giving spirit (Ro $2^{27\text{ff.}}$, 2 Co $3^{6\text{f.}}$), but in its plural form *γράμματα* to the elements of penmanship (Gal 6^{11}), literature as a subject of study (Jn 7^{15}, Ac 26^{24}), and documents of various kinds, such as the debtors' bills reduced by the unjust steward (Lk $16^{6\text{f.}}$), letters of commendation or the reverse (Ac 28^{21}), the writings of Moses (Jn 5^{47}), as well as the Sacred Scriptures (in the phrase cited from 2 Ti 3^{15}). The parallel term *γραφή* is used only in the last sense. The question has been widely canvassed whether the singular *γραφή* applies to the Scriptures as a unified whole, or to some single section or 'passage' of Scripture. In his famous note on Gal 3^{22} Lightfoot lays down the principle that 'the singular *γραφή* in the NT always means *a particular passage* of Scripture,' though in a subsequent comment on Ro 4^{3}, while insisting that St. Paul's practice 'is absolute and uniform,' he admits a doubt as to St. John's usage. On the other hand, Warfield maintains that the prevailing classical application of *γραφή* to entire documents, carrying with it 'a general implication of completeness,' extends also to the NT,—that 'in its more common reference' the term 'designates the OT, to which it is applied in its completeness as a unitary whole' (*DCG* ii. 586). In the present writer's judgment the former contention vindicates itself, even in the Fourth Gospel and in the crucial text Gal 3^{22} (the Apostle having in mind the passages of Scripture adduced either in 2^{16} 3^{10} or in the longer argument of Ro $3^{9\text{ff.}}$). The only clear instances of *γραφή* applied to the Scriptures as a whole appear to be found in 1 P 2^{6} and 2 P 1^{20}, where the word is already a proper name, the full development of the personifying tendency observable in Gal 3^{8}. As regards the significance of the plural *γραφαί* there is general agreement. Where the term is qualified by the adjectives *ἅγιαι* and *προφητικαί* (cf. above), the reference is to the character, not the scope, of the Scriptures. In 2 P 3^{16} *αἱ λοιπαὶ γραφαί* are most probably to be understood of apostolic writings. But the technical phrase *αἱ γραφαί* undoubtedly denotes the body of Scriptural writings as an organic unity, with a spirit and character of its own.

3. Authority of Scripture.—The peculiar quality of the Scriptures is indicated by the three defining adjectives, *ἅγιαι*, *ἱεραί*, and *προφητικαί*, the notions of 'holiness' and 'sacredness' bringing the Books into direct relationship with God, and that of 'prophecy' leading forward to the revelation of the mystery of God in Christ. The high Jewish theory of the *inspiration* of Scripture is fully accepted in the NT. The term *θεόπνευστος*, 'God-inspired' (cf. Heb. בְּרוּחַ הַקֹּדֶשׁ), applied to Scripture in all its parts (*πᾶσα γραφή*), is found indeed only in 2 Ti 3^{16}; but the theory underlies the whole attitude of the NT writers to the older revelation. 'No prophecy ever came by the will of man: but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit' (2 P 1^{21}). Thus the words of Moses, David, Isaiah, and the other prophets may be attributed directly to God (Ro 9^{25}, He $1^{5\text{ff.}}$ $5^{5\text{f.}}$), or the Holy Spirit (Ac 1^{16}, He $3^{7\text{ff.}}$ $10^{15\text{ff.}}$), or God speaking through the Holy Spirit (Ac $4^{25\text{f.}}$, He $4^{3\text{ff.}}$ $8^{8\text{ff.}}$), or even the Messiah (He $2^{12\text{f.}}$ $10^{5\text{ff.}}$). As the 'living oracles' of God, then, the Scriptures are the final norm alike of faith and of conduct. The true servant of God believes 'all things which are according to the law, and which are written in the prophets' (Ac 24^{14}), and sets an example to others not, even in their estimate of the apostles, to go 'beyond the things which are written' (1 Co 4^{6}). The appeal to 'what is written' (*καθὼς γέγραπται* or *γεγραμμένον ἐστίν*, the Christian rendering of the Rabbinic formula שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר or דִּכְתִיב) is decisive, not merely in clinching a theological argument (esp. in Romans and Galatians), but in interpreting the mission and person of Christ, and the significance of His death, resurrection, and ascension (Ac $2^{25\text{ff.}}$, 1 Co 15^{4}, He $2^{6\text{ff.}}$), with the subsequent outpouring of the Spirit, the persecution of the Church, the rejection of the Jews and mission to the Gentiles, the resurrection of the body, and the final salvation (Ac $1^{16\text{ff.}}$, Ro 2^{24} 8^{36} $9^{25\text{ff.}}$, 1 Co $1^{18\text{f.}}$ $15^{45\text{ff.}}$, etc.), and equally as the authoritative guide to Christian conduct (cf. Ac 23^{5}, Ro 12^{19}, 1 Co 9^{9}, 2 Co 4^{13} $6^{17\text{f.}}$ 8^{15}, Eph $6^{2\text{f.}}$, 1 P 1^{16} $3^{10\text{ff.}}$); for 'whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that through patience and through comfort of the scriptures we might have hope' (Ro 15^{4}), while the very quality of their 'inspiration' is tested by their helpfulness 'for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for discipline which is in righteousness' (2 Ti 3^{16}). It must be admitted, however, that the new spirit of Christianity can move freely within the limits of the older Scriptures only by a frequent straining, and even 'wresting,' of their natural sense (see art. OLD TESTAMENT).

4. Extent of Scripture.—The canon of the NT writers was that inherited from the Jewish Church, and thus corresponded to our OT. There is frequent reference to the canonical groups of the 'Law' and the 'Prophets.' Of the Hagiographa, the Books of Psalms, Proverbs, and Job (in 1 Co 3^{19}) are explicitly cited as Scripture, while a phrase from Ec 7^{20} is introduced in the remarkable conflate of OT texts in Ro $3^{10\text{ff.}}$, with the formula *καθὼς γέγραπται*. Though the remaining books are passed over in silence, there is no real reason to doubt that the writers knew and recognized the full Jewish canon. In the NT, too, there is no such sense of the inferiority of the Hagiographa as haunted the Jewish Rabbis. The whole book is of God, and bears witness to Him and His salvation. In addition to OT texts there are numerous allusions to apocryphal literature, such as the Wisdom of Ben Sira, the Wisdom of Solomon, 1 and 2 Maccabees, the *Book of Enoch*, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, and the *Assumption of Moses* (see art. QUOTATIONS). It is remarkable, however, that the usual formula of Scriptural quotation is nowhere attached to apocryphal texts, the only approach to such canonical recognition being found in the 'prophesying' of Enoch in Jude ^{14}. Though the NT writers follow the LXX, they apparently regard the Palestinian canon as alone authoritative in the full sense of the term. Naturally their own writings have not yet attained to the dignity of Scripture; but a true feeling for the spiritual value of apostolic letters is already evident in 2 P $3^{15f.}$, and the application to these writings of the technical term *γραφαί* shows how easy and inevitable was the extension of the Canon to cover both the OT and the NT.

Literature.—On the usage and significance of the terms, cf. the NT Dictionaries and Commentaries, esp. J. B. Lightfoot, *Galatians*, 1890, p. 147 f.; F. J. A. Hort, *The First Epistle of St. Peter, I. 1–II. 17*, 1898, p. 114 ff.; B. F. Westcott, *Hebrews*, 1889, p. 474 ff.; also D. M. Turpie, *The New Testament View of the Old*, 1872; G. A. Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, Eng. tr., 1901, pp. 112 ff., 249 f.; B. B. Warfield, art. 'Scripture,' in *DCG* ii. 584 ff., with literature. On the formation of the Canon see F. Buhl, *Kanon und Text des AT*, 1891 (Eng. tr., 1892); G. Wildeboer, *Het outstaan van den Kanon des Ouden Verbonds*^{4}, 1908 (Germ. tr., 1891, Eng. tr., 1895); H. E. Ryle, *The Canon of the OT*, 1892; K. Budde, art. 'Canon (OT),' in *EBi*; F. H. Woods, art. 'OT Canon,' in *HDB*. On Jewish theories of Inspiration, cf. F. Weber, *Jüd. Theologie*, 1897, p. 80 ff., and E. Schürer, *GJV*^{4} ii. [1907] 363 ff. (*HJP* II. i. [1885] 306 ff.).

A. R. Gordon.

SCROLL (ROLL) [*βιβλίον*, סֵפֶר].—So long as writing material was manufactured from the papyrus plant, the usual form of a book was that of the *volumen* or roll, wound round a stick or sticks. The modern form of book, called in Latin *codex*, did not come into use till the 3rd cent. of our era, when parchment (*περγαμηνή*, from Pergamos, where it originated) began to supersede papyrus. According to Pliny (*HN* xiii. 11 f.), the standard roll (*scapus*) consisted of 20 sheets (*shedæ* or *plagulæ*) joined together with paste. Rolls, however, were often much longer; the longest Egyptian one known measures 144 ft. To this day the Scriptures are always read in the synagogue from rolls, never from a *codex*. One of the most impressive eschatological metaphors was suggested by the idea of the once familiar *βιβλίον*—'and the heaven was removed as a scroll when it is rolled up' (*ὡς βιβλίον ἑλισσόμενον*, Rev 6^{14} ‖ Is 34^4, 'et cœlium recessit sicut liber involutus' [Vulg.]); 'a unique simile, reminding us of the later Stoic conception of the sky as a *βίβλος θεοῦ*, of which heavenly bodies are the *στοιχεῖα* or characters' (T. K. Cheyne, *The Prophecies of Isaiah*^{4}, 1886, i. 195).

Literature.—A. W. Pollard, art. 'Book' in *EBr*^{11}; artt. 'Writing' in *HDB* (F. G. Kenyon) and *EBi* (A. A. Bevan).

James Strahan.

SCYTHIAN (*Σκύθης*). — The Scythians were a barbarous nomadic tribe of Indo-Germanic origin living in the region between the Caucasus Mountains and the Caspian Sea. The Greek colonists who settled on the northern shores of the Black Sea in the 7th cent. B.C. found the South Russian steppe in their possession. Their name 'Scythians' is first found in Hesiod (Strabo, VII. iii. 7. 8), while Herodotus (iv. 1–82, 97–142) gives a great deal of information regarding the people, although the fact that the Greeks soon came to extend the name 'Scythian' to all the nations to the north and north-east of the Black Sea makes some of the statements of Greek writers regarding them questionable.

The Scythians proper were a purely nomadic race living on the South Russian steppe the usual life of nomads, moving from place to place as the needs of their flocks demanded. Herodotus (iv. 46, 114, 121) tells us that the men rode on horseback while the women were conveyed in wagons drawn by oxen. They lived on boiled flesh, mares' milk, and cheese. Like most barbarians, they existed in a condition of filth, never washing themselves, and the women daubed themselves with paste containing the dust of fragrant woods and removing it the second day (iv. 75). Hippocrates (ed. Littré, ii. 72) informs us that they were not a very hardy race, suffering greatly from dysentery and rheumatism, and being soft and flabby in body.

The cruelty of the whole race and the despotism of their kings were notorious in the ancient world. When the king put a man to death all the male relations of the unfortunate victim were slain as well, for fear of blood revenge. When engaged in battle, the Scythian warrior drank the blood of the first of the foe he slew, using the skull as a drinking cup. No one was allowed to share in the booty who did not bring the head of a foeman to the king. The scalps of those slain in battle were tanned and hung on the bridle of the warrior (Herod. iv. 64 f.). The eyes of those taken captive and held as slaves were put out. The kings were invested with absolute despotic powers. On their death a vast multitude of slaves and even free-born servants were slain and buried in great funeral mounds along with horses and vessels of gold and silver.

The Scythians first come into history in connexion with their invasion of Asia and particularly of Media in the 7th cent. B.C. At this time there took place one of those great movements among the uncivilized peoples of the north which the Germans call a *Völkerwanderung*. Pressed on by Asiatic tribes, the Scythians seem to have driven the Cimmerians into Asia Minor and invaded Media. Herodotus speaks (i. 103–105) of a great victory of the Scythians over Cyaxares and the Medes which compelled the latter to raise the siege of Nineveh. Thereafter the victorious hordes overran all Asia, plundering at will for thirty years, from 634–604 B.C., till the Medes again under Cyaxares destroyed most of them after making them drunk at a banquet (i. 106). He also tells (i. 105) of king Psammetichus, who died 611 B.C., buying off these northern invaders who had come as far south as Philistia. The panic of these invading hordes reached Palestine, and several times the land seems to have been threatened and actually overrun with marauding bands. The reports of warriors fighting on horseback with bow and arrows, and drinking the blood of the slain, were fitted to appeal to the imagination of the Hebrew prophets, who thought of the messengers of God's wrath on a sinful nation. Jeremiah's description of 'the evil coming from the north' (1^{13} 4^6 $5^{15ff.}$ 6^1) and of the mighty nation of riders and bowmen, as well as Zephaniah's picture of the Day of the Lord, was probably suggested by the Scythian invasion and the terror it inspired. The memory of this invasion was perpetuated in the name Scythopolis, which was given to the old town Beth-shean (*Σκύθων πόλις*, Jth 3^{10}; cf. *Σκυθωπολεῖται*, 2 Mac 12^{30}), which was probably taken, and, as Pliny (*HN* v. 16) and G. Syncellus (*Chronographia*, ed. P. J. Goar, Venice, 1729, p. 171) state, rebuilt by the remnant of the Scythians who remained after the main body was bought off by the king of Egypt.

To the Jews the name 'Scythian' became synonymous with 'barbarian.' Just as terrors which are only partially known assume gigantic proportions, so these Scythians, by their rapid descent on Palestine, their unwonted appearance, their savage cruelty, and their short sojourn, impressed the imagination. They became the symbol of savagery, inhumanity, barbarity, treachery, cruelty, and perhaps under the names Gog and Magog (*q.v.*) became types of the evil world-powers opposed to the Kingdom of God. Thus Josephus (*Ant.* I. vi. 1) identifies Gog and Magog of Ezk 38. 39 with the Scythians. When the apostle Paul is speaking of the absolute way in which the gospel of Christ abolishes all racial distinctions, he mentions in the list 'Greek and Jew . . . barbarian, Scythian' (Col 3^{11}), where undoubtedly 'Scythian' is referred to as being universally regarded as the lowest in the scale of humanity, the most savage of barbarians—'Scythæ barbaris barbariores' (Bengel) (cf. J. B. Lightfoot, *Colossians*^{2}, 1879, p. 216). Even Scythians, the Apostle maintains, can be renewed unto the knowledge of Jesus Christ and become one in Him along with members of other races. Justin Martyr, the apologist (*Dial.* 28), in extolling Christianity, refers to its having room for Scythians and Persians, the ferocity of the former and the licentiousness of the latter being notorious, while the pseudo-Lucian (*Philopatris*, 17) satirizes Christianity for suggesting that Scythians should have any place in heaven. The opponents of Christianity, such as Celsus and the pseudo-Lucian, could not understand a religion which had a place for those so low in the scale of humanity as the Scythians. The Apostle, on the other hand, gloried in a religion which could redeem and elevate the most degraded.

LITERATURE.—Herodotus, iv. 1–82, 97–142; Hippocrates, *de Aëre, aquis et locis*, xvii.–xxii., ed. P. M. E. Littré, 10 vols., Paris, 1839–61, ii. 66–82; J. C. Zeuss, *Die Deutschen und die Nachbarstämme*, 1837; K. Neumann, *Die Hellenen im Skythenlande*, 1855; G. Grote, *History of Greece*, 10 vols., new ed., 1888; H. Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, iii.^{3} [1866] 742–748; J. B. Lightfoot, *Colossians*^{2}, 1879, p. 216; artt. 'Scythians' in *HDB* and *EBi*, and art. 'Scythia' in *EBr*^{9}.

W. F. BOYD.

SEA (*θάλασσα*).—The term is employed in apostolic history to designate (1) a large body of water or collection of waters; (2) the Red Sea; (3) the Mediterranean Sea; (4) with *γῆ* and *οὐρανός*, the whole created universe; and (5) the 'sea of glass' before the throne of God.

1. A large body of water or collection of waters (Ac 27$^{30.\,38.\,40\,(41)}$ 28^4, Ro 9^{27}, 2 Co 11^{26}, He 11^{12}, Ja 1^6, Jude^{13}, Rev 7$^{1\text{-}3}$ 8$^{8.\,9}$ 10$^{2.\,5.\,8}$ 12^{12} 13^1 16^3 18$^{17.\,19.\,21}$ 20$^{8.\,13}$ 21^1; cf. Ac 27^5, *πέλαγος*; Ja 3^7, *εὐάλιος*).—In the first of these passages, the sailors with Paul on his memorable voyage to Rome, pretending that additional anchors from the prow of the vessel would help to steady the ship, and that they must go off in a boat to carry them out to cables' length rather than drop them over the prow, 'lowered the boat into the sea' (Ac 27^{30}). But he saw through their scheme and warned the centurion. Later they cast the cargo of wheat into the sea (v.^{38}); and again they loosened the cables of the anchors and let them fall off into the sea (v.^{40}). Then, chancing on a sand bank between two seas, in the narrow channel leading into St. Paul's Bay, between the little island of Salmonetta and the mainland of Melita, they ran the vessel aground (v.^{41}). Going on shore, the barbarians, seeing a viper clinging to Paul's hand, regarded him as a murderer, whom, though he had escaped from the sea, the goddess Justice would not suffer to live (28^4).

Paul was thrice shipwrecked. He also suffered other 'perils in the sea' (2 Co 11^{26}); but he does not pause to specify them. In writing to the Romans he again alludes to the 'sea.' Quoting Is 10^{22}, he says that though Israel be as numerous 'as the sand of the sea,' yet it is not the unbelieving many but the faithful few who are the object of God's care. Only the remnant shall be saved (Ro 9^{27}). A similar reference is found in He 11^{12}, in which the writer emphasized how faith on Abraham's part brought life out of death, giving him posterity 'as the sand which is upon the sea shore innumerable.' On the other hand, another writer describes the doubter as 'like the surge of the sea' (*ἔοικεν κλύδωνι θαλάσσης*, Ja 1^6), driven by the wind and tossed. The instability of a billow changing rapidly from moment to moment furnishes a wonderfully apt symbol of the mind that cannot steady itself in belief. Jude uses a similar figure when he describes the ungodly and libertines as 'wild waves of the sea' (*κύματα ἄγρια θαλάσσης*, v.^{13}), foaming out their own lawlessness and shame (cf. Is 57^{20}).

John likewise, in the Apocalypse, often uses the term in its natural sense. Thus, no hurt is to befall the earth or the sea until the servants of God are sealed in their foreheads; no physical convulsions are to take place until the saints of God are secured (Rev 7$^{1\text{-}3}$). On the other hand, judgment is imminent. Pausing in the process of unrolling judgment and consolation, the Seer beholds a strong angel standing like a colossus astride the earth and sea, holding in his hand an open book (10$^{2.\,5.\,8}$). He hears woes pronounced upon the earth and sea (12^{12}). A monster dragon comes up out of the sea, as the father of cruelty and blasphemy (13^1; cf. Dn 7$^{2\text{ff.}}$). When the second angel sounds, one third of the creatures which are in the sea die (8$^{8.\,9}$); when the same angel pours out his bowl into the sea, it becomes blood and every living thing dies (16^3). At the fall of Babylon (*i.e.* Rome) mariners on every hand take up a lamentation because of her commercial loss to the world of trade (18$^{17.\,19.\,21}$); while in the final issue of events, after the millennium and after Satan has been loosed to deceive the nations, 'the number of whom is as the sand of the sea,' and after he is cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, and the dead are summoned to judgment, then, we read, 'the sea gave up the dead which were in it'—in its great maw—to be judged every man according to his works (20$^{8.\,13}$). But when heaven is described and the abode of the blessed is portrayed, and a new heaven and a new earth are created, the Seer is careful to say, 'and the sea is no more' (21^1). This passage is a most instructive witness to the estimate of the sea among the ancient Hebrews. They had a universal horror of it. To them it was a synonym of turbulence, estrangement, hostility, fickleness, isolation, and separation. It was the home of storms and tempests and vague terrors. As a great monster enemy it devoured men; yea, the sea was the prolific mother of monsters. Naturally the sea, therefore, could have no place in an ideal universe. According to Plutarch, the ancient Egyptians regarded the sea as no part of nature, but an alien element full of destruction and disease. The priests of Isis are said to have shunned it as impure and unsocial for swallowing up the sacred Nile. One favourite tradition made the sea disappear in the final conflagration of the world. But John ignores this view, and regards the sea rather as no longer existent. God's dread opponent, the dragon, he practically says, shall disappear from the abode of the redeemed; and the powers hostile to God, whether men or demons, shall be brought to naught.

2. The Red Sea (Ac 7^{36}, 1 Co 10$^{1.\,2}$, He 11^{29}).—In some respects this is the most remarkable body of water on the globe. It is subject to extreme evaporation; and, though no rivers empty into it, it is never exhausted. It is 1350 miles long, and 205 miles broad at its widest part. There are three references to it in apostolic history: (*a*) Stephen in his memorable apology speaks of Moses thus: 'This man led them forth, having wrought wonders and signs in Egypt, and in the Red sea, and in the wilderness forty years' (Ac 7^{36}). His argument is that, as Moses' Divine appointment was attested by signs and wonders, so signs and wonders formed part of the credentials of Christ. (*b*) Paul also, in writing to the Corinthians, says, 'For I would not, brethren, have you ignorant, how that our fathers were all under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea' (1 Co 10$^{1.\,2}$). The Apostle's point is that ancient Israel started well; all were protected and guided by the cloud; all were safely brought through the sea; all were sealed as by a baptism into trustful allegiance to Moses as their deliverer; yet in the end all except two failed to enter Canaan. Those who sang victory at the crossing of the Red Sea never reached the promised land. (*c*) A different use is made of the same fact in He 11^{29}. The author here emphasizes how faith finds a path in life. 'By faith they passed through the Red sea as by dry land: which the Egyptians assaying to do were swallowed up.' What the writer means to teach is, that Israel's passage through the Red Sea was due to the discovery of faith. It was not a path which anyone could find. Indeed, to the Egyptians who had no faith, it became a sea. Hence it is an example of the wonder-working power of faith.

3. The Mediterranean Sea (Ac $10^{6.\,32}$ 17^{14}).—The Mediterranean was to the Hebrews 'the great sea' (Nu 34^{6}). It was probably the largest expanse of water with which they were familiar; it was like a mighty mirror flashing the glories of the sun. Two passages are in point here, though one refers more particularly to the Ægean. (*a*) The first recounts how Cornelius sent to Joppa to fetch Peter, who lodged with one Simon, a tanner, 'whose house is by the sea side' (Ac $10^{6.\,32}$). The sea here alluded to is obviously the Mediterranean. Simon's house, which doubtless was a very humble abode, was by the sea because there he would have easy access to water; and it was outside the city, at least 50 cubits, because tanning was held to be an 'unclean' employment, bringing one constantly into contact with dead animals. (*b*) The other passage tells how the brethren of Berœa sent forth Paul, whose safety was in jeopardy, 'to go as far as to the sea' (Ac 17^{14}). The main road from Macedonia to Thessaly bent about the base of Mt. Olympus close along the sea. Whether St. Paul, on arriving at the coast, changed his plan, and, instead of taking ship for Athens at Methone or Pydna, went on foot, it is impossible to say.

4. With γῆ and οὐρανός, the whole created universe (Ac 4^{24} 14^{15}, Rev 5^{13} 10^{6} 14^{7}).—For example, in Ac $4^{24\text{ff.}}$, after the healing of the lame man, Peter and John, who had been accused and brought before the elders, and charged and even threatened by them not to speak any more in the name of Jesus, prayed, 'O Lord, thou that didst make the heaven and the earth and the sea and all that in them is . . . grant unto thy servants to speak thy word with all boldness' (v.$^{24.\,29}$). The opening words were probably not altogether unfamiliar to them, as they seem to have belonged to the earliest known psalm of thanksgiving in the Christian Church (cf. Is $37^{16.\,20}$). In similar language, Barnabas and Paul remonstrated with the men of Lystra, saying, 'We also are men of like passions with you, and bring you good tidings, that ye should turn from these vain things unto the living God, who made the heaven and the earth and the sea, and all that in them is' (Ac 14^{15}). The Lystrans are thus introduced by the apostles to the true and living God. In Rev 14^{7} there is a striking parallel to their summons, the implication being that the God who creates has a right also to judge His creatures. In 5^{13}, also, by a sweep of prophetic imagination, even sea-monsters join with departed spirits in a doxology of praise to the Lamb; while in 10^{6} the thought of God's creatorship, of earth and heaven and sea, prepares the way for the announcement that the God of creation and providence is also a God of judgment.

5. The apocalyptic sea of glass before the throne of God (Rev 4^{6} 15^{2}).—The first passage (4^{6}) reminds one of the 'molten sea' in Solomon's Temple (1 K $7^{23.\,39}$). In fancy the Rabbis compared the shining floor of the Temple to crystal. To John heaven is a sort of glorified Temple, and the crystal pavement is a kind of sea. The figure greatly enhances the splendour of the picture. The Apostle was probably attempting to portray the ether with all its clearness and calm, shimmering yet motionless. In the other and only remaining passage (15^{2}) he beholds 'a glassy sea mingled with fire.' On its shores the redeemed stand, as the children of Israel did on the shores of the Red Sea, victorious, singing the song of Moses and of the Lamb. See, further, next article.

GEORGE L. ROBINSON.

SEA OF GLASS.—In the literature of the Apostolic Age the conception of the Sea of Glass occurs only in Rev 4^{6} 15^{2}. In the former passage, the Sea of Glass like crystal (*θάλασσα ὑαλίνη ὁμοία κρυστάλλῳ*) forms a part of the surroundings of the throne in heaven. In the latter passage the position of the Sea is not mentioned, but is no doubt understood to be the same, and the Sea itself is further described as 'mingled with fire' (*μεμιγμένην πυρί*). The martyrs are seen standing upon it, singing the song of Moses and of the Lamb.

It is easier to trace back into the OT the origin of the symbolism of the Apocalypse, and to collect parallels from the religious literature of other nations, than to interpret the precise meaning of this particular symbol in the mind of the author of the Apocalypse. We shall in this article endeavour to collect the various parallels and possible sources of this conception, afterwards attempting to classify them, in order to show the various streams of thought that have combined to yield this climax of apocalyptic symbolism. Finally, an attempt will be made to interpret its meaning in the Apocalypse.

1. Sources of the symbol.—It may be remarked that all the parallels collected below are not of necessity to be regarded as sources of this particular conception, but they all offer possible links of connexion with it.

(*a*) We have, first, the conception, at once mythological and cosmological, of the upper sea, the waters in the heavens, separated by the firmament (*στερέωμα*) from the waters below (Gn $1^{6\text{-}7}$). This is directly connected with the Babylonian chaos-myth of the conquest of the chaos-dragon Tiâmat by Marduk. Moreover, in the Babylonian cosmogony the heavenly universe is divided into three parts corresponding to those of the earthly universe, the third and lowest division being the heavenly ocean (cf. A. Jeremias, *The OT in the Light of the Ancient East*, Eng. tr., 2 vols., London, 1911, i. 6 ff.). See *2 En.* xxvii. 1–3.

(*b*) In the theophany in Ex 24^{10} a pavement of sapphire is described as being under the feet of God.

(*c*) In the apocalyptic vision of Ezekiel, upon which the symbolism of Rev 4 is most directly based, a firmament like the colour of the terrible crystal is stretched over the heads of the four living creatures, and upon it is placed the throne like sapphire stone (Ezk $1^{22.\,26}$).

(*d*) In the vision of the Ancient of Days in Dn $7^{9\text{-}10}$ a fiery stream issues from the throne.

(*e*) In *1 En.* xiv. 10–17, in the similar vision of the house and of the throne of God, the floor of the first house is of crystal and that of the second house is of fire, also from underneath the throne come streams of flaming fire (cf. also lxxi. 6).

(*f*) In *Test. Lev.* ii. 7 a hanging sea divides the first heaven from the second in the later recension; in the earliest form of the document the hanging sea is in the first heaven.

(*g*) Finally, an interesting passage from the *Bundahiš* may be quoted (*SBE* v. 125 f.): 'Afterwards, the fire and halo melt the metal of Shatvaîrô, in the hills *and* mountains, *and* it remains on this earth like a river. Then all men will pass into that melted metal and become pure' (cf. *Sib. Orac.* iii. 84 f., ii. 285 f.). The list might be enlarged, but these passages are representative both of the distribution of the conception and of the different forms which it assumed.

2. Classification of motives underlying the symbol.—(*a*) We find the cosmological significance of the heavenly sea. The celestial universe is the counterpart of the earthly. The Zodiac, the abode of the gods, rises above and upon the heavenly sea. Later the sea itself and the solid firmament conceived of as supporting it seem to unite in the symbol, and we have the throne resting upon a crystalline sapphire foundation or pavement. There may also enter into the symbol some element of the myth of the conquest of Tiâmat. The sea stretched out calm and glassy before the throne may in part symbolize the victory of the divinity over the element of chaos.

(*b*) There is the eschatological element. In the period view of history based on astronomical observations and characteristic of Babylonian religion, the world was to be destroyed by a fire-flood at the close of the age which was ushered in by the water-flood. This idea is present also in the Avesta and in most early religions. Hence the sea of glass mingled with fire may contain a trace of this conception. From the throne proceeded not only the heavenly river of water of life, clear as crystal, but also the fire-stream of judgment. The martyrs also standing upon the fiery sea suggest the symbolism of purification and triumph (cf. the idea in the passage quoted above from the *Bundahiš*, where the righteous walking through the fire-flood are unharmed by it).

(*c*) It is possible to find links with the Jewish ritual system. Before the approach to the holy place stood the brazen sea, whose form and decoration suggest remoter links with Babylonian cosmology. In the priestly system, whatever the past significance of the laver, it certainly stood for the necessity of purification for entry into the presence of God.

(*d*) There may enter into the form of the imagery details taken from the local surroundings of the vision. It has been suggested that much of the form of early eschatological schemes is due to the local characteristics (cf. Gressmann, *Der Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie*, p. 31 ff.). H. B. Swete (*The Apocalypse of St. John*^{2}, London, 1907, p. 70) suggests that the Ægean Sea, fired by the rays of the setting sun, has yielded the form of the splendid imagery of this vision. While this may be so, yet all the elements of the vision and their ensemble are an inheritance from the past.

3. Interpretation.—The central motive in the Seer's vision is certainly the relation between heaven and earth. The apparently confused and disorderly sequence of events on earth is really being ordered and determined by what takes place in heaven. Hence the Seer's first vision, as he gazes through the open door, is the throne, the centre and source of all the subsequent action of the book. The history of the world for him is dominated by that throne. The description of scenery surrounding the throne gathers up all the symbolism of the past, the cosmological, eschatological, and ritual elements, coloured, it may be, by the local scenery of Patmos. Before the throne the Sea, the emblem of chaos and destruction, lies calm and motionless, petrified and clear, the symbol of the throne's victory over the opposing forces of darkness and disorder. As the approach to the throne it symbolizes the holiness required of those who draw near. As the final tribulation draws to a close, that sea mingled with fire symbolizes the source of the throne's judgment on the earth below. The martyrs, having passed through those judgments, stand triumphant on it and sing the song of the new Exodus. Finally it becomes the source of the healing and purifying streams for the redeemed earth.

LITERATURE.—H. Gressmann, *Der Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie*, Göttingen, 1905; R. H. Charles, *Eschatology, Hebrew, Jewish, and Christian*, London, 1899, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the OT*, Oxford, 1913; H. B. Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*^{2}, London, 1907; C Clemen, *Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources*, Edinburgh, 1912.

S. H. HOOKE.

SEAL (σφραγίς, vb. σφραγίζω).—A seal is (1) the graven implement with which an impression is made on wax, clay, or other soft substance; and (2) the impression itself. The use of seals can be traced back almost to the dawn of civilization. The scarab seal was peculiar to Egypt and the cylinder to Babylonia. Having a distinctive character, requiring to be always at hand for use, and being a highly-prized and carefully-guarded possession, the seal naturally became a means of personal adornment. Seal and staff were the insignia of a man of rank among the Israelites as among the Babylonians (Herodotus, i. 195). A cord was passed through the seal, which was worn either as a necklace or as a bracelet (Gn 38^{18}, Ca 8^{6}, Jer 22^{24}). In later times the signet-ring came into use among the Jews. The ring displayed by the rich worshipper (χρυσοδακτύλιος) in the early Christian assembly (Ja 2^{2}) was probably of this description. Signet-rings were largely in use among the Greeks and Romans, and many of these have been preserved.

The seal was used at all times for the purpose of safeguarding valuable possessions: wine jars were stopped and sealed, letters written and sealed, rolls folded and sealed, doors closed and sealed. Horace associates locks and seals—*claves et sigilla* (*Ep.* I. xx. 3). Property, security, secrecy, finality are the ideas suggested by the act of solemnly attaching one's seal to anything.

The figurative uses of the term are numerous. (*a*) Circumcision is regarded by St. Paul as the seal of a righteousness which existed before the rite was instituted (Ro 4^{11}). The same figure of speech was frequently used, though somewhat differently interpreted, by the Rabbis. 'Ye shall not eat of the passover unless the seal of Abraham be in your flesh' (*Shemoth Rabba*, 19). Many parallels are given by J. J. Wetstein, *Novum Testamentum Græcum*, 1752, *ad loc.* (*b*) Vindicating his apostleship, St. Paul points to his converts as the seal which Christ Himself has affixed to his work (1 Co 9^{2}). Can his opponents dispute a claim so clearly and authoritatively attested? (*c*) Believers are sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise (Eph 1^{13}). They gave themselves to Christ at their conversion, and the Spirit marked them as Christ's *peculium*, consecrated to His service and destined for His eternal Kingdom. Sealed unto the day of redemption (4^{30}), they receive in time an earnest of what they are to be in eternity (2 Co 1^{22}). On all such believers, who are God's firm foundation, there is impressed the seal, 'The Lord knoweth them that are his' (2 Ti 2^{19}). It is often said that the Scriptural seal with which Christians are sealed is baptism, a natural enough interpretation, seeing that baptism early took the place of circumcision, which was expressly called a seal. J. H. Bernard (*EGT*, '2 Corinthians,' 1903) argues that the aorists in 2 Co 1^{22} (σφραγισάμενος, δούς) 'point to acts completed at a definite moment in the past; and this can only mean the moment of *baptism*.' But why not the hour of conscious regeneration or personal consecration? Lightfoot, Hatch, and Harnack question whether any apostle ever transferred the metaphor of the seal to baptism (see Sanday-Headlam, *ICC*, 'Romans'^{5}, 1902, p. 107) (*d*) When St. Paul speaks of sealing the contribution (κοινωνία) of the Gentiles (Ro $15^{26.\,28}$) to the poor saints at Jerusalem, he means, not that he needs, as a good steward, literally to seal and secure the collection which has been made for them, but that he figuratively sets his seal (cf. Jn 3^{33}) to the offering of material things which is the 'fruit' of their spiritual gifts to the Gentile world. He uses language of great dignity and solemnity, for he knows that money, which is sometimes mere filthy lucre (Tit 1^{11}), comes to have almost a sacramental value when it is the outward and visible sign or seal of an inward and spiritual love. (*e*) The apocalyptic roll of destiny, containing the Divine counsel regarding the order of events which is to usher in the end, is sealed with seven seals. No angel is able to open them, but they are opened one after the other by Christ (Rev 5. 6). Roman wills required to be attested with seven seals, and T. Zahn (*Introduction to the NT*, 3 vols., 1909, iii. 394, following E. Huschke, *Das Buch mit sieben Siegeln*, 1860; cf. E. Hicks, *Traces of Greek Philosophy and Roman Law in the NT*, 1896, pp. 157, 158) holds that the roll (*βιβλίον*) is here a *testamentum*. As he confesses, *omne simile claudicat*; but this one would halt too badly, since God the Testator cannot die, and the *βιβλίον* is a book of doom rather than a will bequeathing a heritage. And the Roman parallel is unnecessary, for the use of seals was as familiar to the Jews as to the Romans, and seven was the Jewish sacred number. (*f*) According to the writer of the Revelation, the servants of God are sealed on their foreheads with the seal of the living God; 12,000 of every tribe of Israel are sealed. Those who have not the seal are exposed to great danger (Rev $7^{3.\ 4.\ 5\text{-}8}$ 9^{4}). (*g*) Satan is to be cast into the abyss, which will be shut and sealed upon him (20^{3}). (*h*) The roll of the apocalypse is not to be sealed (22^{10}), because its contents—unlike those of Daniel ($12^{4.\ 9}$)—are not intended for a distant age, but are for use at the present juncture and in the immediate future.

Literature.—Art. 'Gem' in *EBr*^{11}; art. 'Seal, Sealing,' in *HDB*; C. W. King, *Antique Gems and Rings*, 2 vols., 1872.

James Strahan.

SECOND ADAM.—See Adam; Christ, Christology.

SECOND ADVENT.—See Parousia.

SECT.—See Heresy.

SECUNDUS (*Σεκοῦνδος* TR], *Σέκουνδος* [WH, Blass]).—Secundus was a Macedonian Christian belonging to the church of Thessalonica, by which he and Aristarchus were deputed to convey to Jerusalem the contributions of the Thessalonians on behalf of the poor brethren of the mother church. He accompanied St. Paul on his last journey to Jerusalem (Ac 20^{4}). The Apostle on this occasion intended to sail from Corinth, but the discovery of a plot at the last moment caused him to sail for Macedonia, where he may have met the deputies of the churches of Thessalonica and Berœa. It is more probable, however, that they had been previously instructed to join the Apostle at Troas, where we find them along with deputies from Asia (Ac 20^{5}). It is uncertain whether Secundus remained in Syria after St. Paul's arrest or returned to Thessalonica. He is never again mentioned in the NT, but the name occurs in the well-known inscription of Thessalonica (*CIG* ii. 1967), which gives a list of politarchs.

Literature.—W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*^{3}, 1897, p. 287; R. J. Knowling in *EGT* ii. [1900] 422; also artt. in *HDB* and *EBi*.

W. F. Boyd.

SECURITY.—It is only in Ac 17^{9} that the word concerns us at present: 'And when they had taken security from Jason and the rest, they let them go.' The idiom is *λαβόντες τὸ ἱκανὸν* and is a translation of the Latin *satis accipere*. Cf. *τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιῆσαι* in Mk 15^{15}, which occurs 'as early as Polybius' (J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of NT Greek*, vol. i., 'Prolegomena,' 1908, p. 20 f.). It is natural to meet a Latin legal term in this Roman court; the politarchs of Thessalonica may even have used the Latin instead of the *κοινή*. The security demanded might be in the form either of money or of sponsors for good behaviour. It is not clear what is meant by saying that the politarchs 'let them go.' It is uncertain also whether the security was for the 'good behaviour' of Jason and the rest, for the production of St. Paul and Silas before the politarchs, or for the 'good behaviour' of St. Paul and Silas (cf. R. J. Knowling, *EGT*, 'Acts,' 1900, *in loco*). F. Blass (*Acta Apostolorum*, 1895, *in loco*) considers the phrase a commercial, not a legal, term. In any case, 'the brethren immediately sent away Paul and Silas by night unto Berœa' (Ac 17^{10}). The haste and the cover of darkness indicate the urgency of the predicament, which concerned, apparently, the welfare not merely of St. Paul and Silas, but also of Jason and the rest, because of 'the security' given to the politarchs. It is not open to make a charge of cowardice here against either Jason or St. Paul. It was a practical question of how to meet an emergency due to jealousy and prejudice.

A. T. Robertson.

SEED.—The early Christians used 'seed' in its natural sense, of that which contains the germ-cell (1) of plants (*σπέρμα*, Mt $13^{24.\ 27.\ 32.\ 37\text{f.}}$, Mk 4^{31}, 1 Co 15^{38}, 2 Co 9^{10}; *σπόρος*, Mk $4^{26\text{f.}}$, Lk $8^{5.\ 11}$), and (2) of man (*σπέρμα*, He 11^{11}; *σπορά*, 1 P 1^{23}). Metaphorically, 'seed' (*σπέρμα*) was used (1) of the nucleus of the Jewish race left from the Captivity (Ro 9^{29}); (2) of offspring in general, either (*a*) taken literally (Mt $22^{24\text{f.}}$, Mk $12^{19\text{-}23}$, Lk 1^{55} 20^{28}, Jn 7^{42} $8^{33.\ 37}$, Ac 3^{25} $7^{5\text{f.}}$ 13^{23}, Ro 1^{3} 4^{13} 9^{7} 11^{1}, 2 Co 11^{22}, 2 Ti 2^{8}, He 2^{16} 11^{18}, Rev 12^{17}), or (*b*) figuratively, as when believers were called Abraham's seed because they emulated his faith (Ro $4^{16.\ 18}$ 9^{8}, Gal $3^{16.\ 19.\ 29}$); and, finally, (3) of the generating power of God acting through His Word (cf. 1 P 1^{23}) and His Spirit (1 Jn 3^{9}). St. Paul argued in Rabbinical fashion from the distinction between 'seed' and 'seeds' (Gal $3^{16\text{ff.}}$). Since the singular stood in Gn $13^{15\text{f.}}$ and $17^{7\text{f.}}$, he concluded that the promise made to Abraham pointed to Christ as an individual and not collectively to Jews. For this and similar examples of artificial exegesis in the NT, see Interpretation.

S. J. Case.

SELEUCIA (*Σελεύκεια*).—Seleucia was the seaport of Antioch and the maritime stronghold of the Macedonian monarchy in Syria. It lay 5 miles to the north of the mouth of the Orontes, on the southern skirts of Mt. Pieria, whence it was called *Σελεύκεια ἡ ἐν Πιερίᾳ*, in distinction from the many other foundations of the same name. It was one of the cities which formed the Syrian Tetrapolis, the others being Antioch, Apameia, and Laodicea. 'They were called sisters from the concord which existed between them. They were founded by Seleucus Nicator. The largest bore the name of his father, and the strongest his own. Of the others, Apameia had its name from his wife Apama, and Laodicea from his mother' (Strabo, XVI. ii. 4).

Seleucia overlooked a bay 'not unlike the Bay of Naples and scarcely less beautiful' (G. L. Bell, *Syria, the Desert and the Sown*, 1908, p. 329). It was built partly at the foot and partly on the top of precipitous cliffs, the lower and the upper city being connected by a cutting through the solid rock 1100 yards long. Strongly protected by nature and by fortifications, Seleucia was regarded as the key of Syria (Polybius, v. 58). Ptolemy

Euergetes seized it in 246 B.C., and Antiochus III. (the Great) achieved renown by recapturing it in 220. Ptolemy Philometor took it in 146 B.C. and 'put on himself the diadem of Asia' (1 Mac 11$^{8. 13}$), but after his death the city had to be restored to the Seleucids (*ib.* $^{18. 19}$). When Syria came under the sway of the Romans, they made Seleucia a free city —'Seleucia libera, Pieria appellata' (Pliny, *HN* v. xviii. 21).

Seleucia had great importance as an emporium of Levantine commerce. The Orontes was navigable as far as Antioch (Strabo, XVI. ii. 7), but only for smaller craft, while the harbour of Seleucia received the largest transport ships of Egypt, Phœnicia, Cyprus, Asia Minor, Greece, and Italy. From this seaport St. Paul and Barnabas sailed on their first missionary journey (Ac 13^{4}), and at the end of the adventure they 'sailed to Antioch' (14^{26}), landing probably at Seleucia.

The remains of Seleucia—citadel, amphitheatre, temples, etc. — are numerous and impressive. 'Some day there will be much to disclose here, but excavation will be exceedingly costly owing to the deep silt' (G. L. Bell, *op. cit.*, p. 334).

LITERATURE.—E. R. Bevan, *The House of Seleucus*, 2 vols., 1902, i. 208 ff.; Murray's *Handbook to Syria and Palestine*, 1903, p. 390 f.; C. Baedeker, *Palestine and Syria*^{4}, 1906, p. 358 f.

JAMES STRAHAN.

SELF-DENIAL.—Jesus emphasized the necessity of self-denial (*ἑαυτὸν ἀπαρνεῖσθαι*, Mk 8$^{34\text{ff.}}$) and the taking up of the cross if outward following was to become real discipleship. Self-denial looks primarily to the initial struggle by which the disciple cuts himself adrift from his former way of living, renouncing parents, wife, possessions, hating life itself when these stand in the way (Mt 10$^{37\text{f.}}$, Lk 14$^{26\text{f.}}$). Taking up the cross looks rather to the acceptance of the stern conditions and dread possibilities of the new life itself. By the former the individual tears himself out of the old conditions, by the latter he shoulders the burdens of the new and as yet untried service. The difference between the two may be illustrated from the experience of the man who volunteers to serve his country in war. He has first to wrench himself from the glad associations of home, and then to take his post of hardship, danger, and perhaps death in the ranks and on the field of battle. Both are acts of will characterized by immediacy and decisiveness (aor. Mk 8^{34}, Lk 9^{23}, Mt 16^{24}); but Luke's addition of 'daily' is psychologically true. The original choice has to be constantly re-affirmed if the acolyte is not to become an apostate.

The best commentary on these two ideas is found in Ph 3$^{4\text{-}14}$, where St. Paul describes both his own self-denial and his taking up of the cross. What things were gain to him these he counted loss for Christ, *i.e.* he gave up friends, privileges, earthly prospects—in reality his old self—and he accepted to the full the conditions of the new service (cf. Ac 9^{16}), the fellowship of Christ's sufferings and conformity to His death. Similar is the thought in Gal 2$^{19\text{f.}}$. The Apostle speaks of what he calls his own death, his own crucifixion, and Christ now living in him.

Thus, although the evangelic phrase *ἑαυτὸν ἀπαρνεῖσθαι* is not found in the apostolic literature, the idea underlies the whole apostolic view of the Christian life.

(*a*) The idea was primarily used in the martyr sense of willingness to suffer death or persecution for Jesus' sake. Death and persecution in themselves have no spiritual value (1 Co 13^{3}, 1 P 4^{15}), but to deny the 'name' or the 'faith' (Rev 2^{13} 3^{8}) in order to escape them is to renounce Christ. 'Whoever denies himself to be a Christian and makes that plain by his actions, *i.e.* by worshipping our gods, . . . shall gain forgiveness' (Trajan's letter to Pliny, *Ep.* xcvii. [xcviii.], in E. G. Hardy's ed. of Pliny, *Epp. ad Traianum*, London, 1889, p. 217). To do that is the very opposite of Christian self-denial in this martyr sense. The Apocalypse is a warning against 'cowardice' (Rev 21^{8}), and an encouragement to be faithful unto death (2^{10}). The Christian was in constant danger of a violent death for Christ's sake (Ro 8^{36}, 2 Co 4^{10}, Ph. 3^{10}, Col 1^{24}, 1 Co 15^{31}, 2 Ti 2$^{11\text{-}13}$). This *νέκρωσις*, or dying to the world, was, however, the sure foretaste of eternal life. 'God cannot deny himself,' and this Divine moral consistency ensures future glory to those who deny Him not, as it ensures shame to those who do (2 Ti 2$^{11\text{-}13}$). Some explain 2 Ti 2^{11} of the Christian's death with Christ in conversion (J. Moffatt, in *EGT*, London, 1910), and 1 Co 15^{31} of 'the utter self-denial with which he [St. Paul] devoted himself to the work of preaching Christ' (T. C. Edwards, *1 Corinthians*^{2}, London, 1885, p. 425); but both passages can be as well explained as referring to the danger of violent death and persecution for Christ's sake. Christian self-denial in this sense is the assertion of Christ's unconditional Lordship and the repudiation of all other claims (like the *Κύριος καῖσαρ* claim) to determine Christian conduct.

(*b*) Self-denial describes also the initial stage of the Christian life when by faith the individual wholly yields himself to Christ. When St. Paul said: 'Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?' (Ac 9^{6}), that is self-denial. Man apart from God is selfish, controlled from below. 'Homo extra Deum quærit pabulum in creatura materiali vel per voluptatem vel per avaritiam' (Bengel, on Ro 1^{29}). While the *ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος* (Ro 7^{22}; cf. 1 P 3^{4}) or the *νοῦς* acknowledges the higher law of God, in actual experience the self is enslaved. To obtain freedom total self-denial is required. This is done by an act of faith in Christ. The old sinful self dies with Christ (Gal 2$^{20\text{f.}}$, Ro 6^{6}, Col 2^{20}). This self-denial is typified by baptism. It is 'the crucifixion of personal desire and pretension in order to the reception of communicated life' (T. H. Green, *Works*^{5}, London, 1906, iii. 194). The death of Christ is the objective condition of this initial act of self-denial. The identification of the personality with Christ is possible because Christ first identified Himself with us. This is the Divine moment in Christian self-denial, and this is what distinguishes it from the Platonic or Hegelian. Plato speaks of the 'inner man' (*Rep.* ix. 589 A.; cf. Plotinus, *Enn.* i. 1. 10), or the 'god within.' This was also a favourite Stoic conception. To the Stoics self-denial was due to the inherent native energy of this Divine element, just as to the Hegelian it is a process immanent in humanity as such. Such a view takes no account of guilt as an infringement of the Divine law, and as something which man *per se* cannot remove. It is superficial also in its analysis of the actual moral weakness of man. By faith the Christian is united with Christ in His death and so guilt is removed. Death cancels all claims (Ro 6$^{7\text{-}14}$), and the result is a new man (*νέος, καινὸς ἄνθρωπος*, Col 3^{10}, Eph 4^{24}, Gal 6^{15}). Christian self-denial is not thus simply a bare moral act—it is redemptively conditioned—nor is it an end in itself, nor self-destruction as it seems to be in Buddhism. Its object is self-renewal, self-re-creation in Christ.

(*c*) This leads to another self-denial, which is the gradual life-long process of sanctification negatively viewed, just as the former self-denial 'which is its root' is 'the one decisive ideal act' taking place at conversion (Sanday-Headlam, *ICC*, 'Romans'^{5}, Edinburgh, 1902, p. 158). We must not separate the two and make the one forensic and the other ethical. 'Paul never presents Christ's death as a substitution for ours in the sense that we need not die as well' (Green, iii. 194). It is equally true—and this is what Green does not sufficiently emphasize—that he never thinks of our dying as possible apart from the prior substitutionary death of Christ for us. The modern tendency is to over-emphasize in St. Paul's teaching what Green neglects. J. Weiss (*Paul and Jesus*, Eng. tr., London, 1909), *e.g.*, makes it a radical distinction between St. Paul and Jesus that for St. Paul the ethical content of the new life is an effect of Divine acts, while for Jesus it is an effect of man's own ethical endeavour. But to St. Paul it is an act both of will and of Divine working at one and the same time (Ph 2$^{12. 13}$).

The self to be denied is the sinful self and its works. The phrases used for this self-denial are to 'put off' (*ἀποτίθεσθαι*), 'to cleanse' (*καθαρίζειν*), 'to slay' (*θανατοῦν*) the flesh and its works. The new life of the Christian in virtue of his faith and of the presence of the Holy Spirit is hid with Christ in God, it is a walk in the Spirit, it is Christ in us and we in Him. Hence it is inconsistent that the fruits of this new life should spring from the flesh. The Christian life is not a life of moral indifferentism, *τὸ ἀδιαφόρως ζῆν* (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iii. 5. 40), as some of the early sects held. It is because this moral indifferentism was associated with intellectual error concerning Christ that John, Jude, Peter, and Paul (Col. and Pastorals) oppose Christian self-denial to intellectual error and to moral delinquency. Self-denial in this sense is the personal regaining, through conflict, of all the personality and of society for God. It is the gradual realization of all that is involved in our dying with Christ in conversion and our rising with Him to newness of life.

(*d*) But Christian self-denial rises to even higher heights. The Christian life is one of self-denial in the sense that the life of Jesus was also one of supreme self-denial. His life was one of complete obedience to His Father's will (He 5^{8}; cf. Mk 14^{36}). It was a life of self-emptying for the sake of redemption (Ph 2^{7}), and the Christian is under law to Christ (*ἔννομος Χριστοῦ*, 1 Co 9^{21}). The law of Christ is that each one must bear the burdens of others (Gal 6^{2}). The Christian law of self-denial is thus that we serve one another through love (Gal 5^{13}). The example of Christ constrains us to renounce privileges, liberties, ease, even life itself, for the sake of bringing blessing to others—'we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren' (1 Jn 3^{16}). How far this may go we can judge from Ro 9$^{3ff.}$, a 'spark from the fire of Christ's substitutionary love' (Dorner, quoted in *EGT*, London, 1900, *in loc.*). It is in this light that we must view the giving up of property by Barnabas and others. This self-denial is not consciously directed against sin as described above (*c*), but is rather the out-flowings of Christ's love in the heart. St. Paul connects the example of Jesus often with this self-denial, and this example is not simply a human example but that of One who, though He was rich, for our sakes became poor; of One who, though He was Divine, yet became obedient unto death, the death of the Cross. The Christian life of self-denial is motived by love. This is the immanent principle which is present all along and which unifies in one Christian experience all these forms of self-denial. Without this all is worthless (1 Co 13^{3}). It was in Christ that this love dawned on men. It is the love of Christ shed abroad in our hearts.

LITERATURE.—W. F. Adeney, art. 'Self-Surrender' in *HDB* iv.; W. L. Walker, *The Spirit and the Incarnation*, Edinburgh, 1899, Index, *s.v.* 'Self-Renunciation'; J. Köstlin, *Christliche Ethik*, Berlin, 1888–89, p. 119; A. Harnack, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*, Eng. tr., London, 1904, vol. i. bk. i. ch. iii.; T. H. Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics*^{4}, Oxford, 1899, bk. iii. ch. v.; see also various Commentaries on passages quoted.

DONALD MACKENZIE.

SELF-EXAMINATION.—In two passages of the NT (1 Co 11^{28} and 2 Co 13^{5}) the duty of self-examination is expressly inculcated. In the former the verb used is *δοκιμάζω*; in the latter *πειράζω* is combined with *δοκιμάζω*. Both these words are more appropriate to the act of introspection than the more general terms signifying investigation, like *ἀνετάζω* or *ἀνακρίνω*: for the object of self-knowledge in the Christian is to discover his relationship with the Good. 'Self-examination is often a direct result of a new awakening to a sense of the moral imperative such as we have already described as conversion; but it may be carried on by men periodically, without any such reawakening' (J. S. Mackenzie, *Manual of Ethics*^{4}, London, 1900, p. 378).

For the purpose of self-examination *δοκιμάζω* carries with it the suggestion that the scrutiny will end in acceptance or approval, while *πειράζω* more commonly indicates a test which will issue in the disclosure of what is defective and evil. But this distinction is not always obvious, nor can it always be pressed, for in 2 Co 13^{5} St. Paul uses both words together: 'Try yourselves (*πειράζετε*) if you are in the faith; prove yourselves (*δοκιμάζετε*)'; and he proceeds, 'or do you not see when you look at yourselves (*ἐπιγινώσκετε*, 'know ye not as to your own selves,' RV) that Jesus Christ is in you? unless it should be that you fail in the test' (*ἀδόκιμοι*). The passage is so rendered by A. Menzies (*Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, London, 1912, p. 103), who explains that 'the examination enjoined must lead to one of two results: either the convert must conclude that what is required of him is too much; then he does not stand the test, he is not fit for the kingdom; Jesus Christ is not so much a part of his life that he must give up everything in order to be with Him; or he will conclude, on putting the necessary questions to himself, that Jesus Christ is in him and must dominate his whole life and action.' Thus, the Apostle throws his converts back upon the test of their own heart-experience so as to produce a complete severance from pagan vices, and further so that he himself, who has to condemn these vices, will be approved as having done his duty and will be found to be undeserving of the censure that has been poured on him.

In 1 Co 11$^{28. 29}$ the exhortation is concerned with the Lord's Supper: by self-scrutiny the believer may be saved from eating and drinking judgment (*κρίμα*) to himself. The Communion had been allowed to degenerate into an ordinary feast instead of being a means of sanctifying grace. The Apostle urges upon the Christians the duty of self-examination on the ground that a right estimate of themselves is necessary for a right estimate of the Lord's 'body,' *i.e.* the spiritual significance of His glorified humanity.

Generally speaking, St. Paul appears to commend self-examination not so much with a view to the disclosure of personal weakness as in order to provide a stimulus to the spiritual life, an intelligent realization of what the faith claims from the Christian, ethical obedience and a clear apprehension of duty. The fact of unworthiness in motive and life is already detected even if not generally admitted by the believer: self-examination will bring it home to the conscience and show the necessity for aiming at the higher spiritual ideal in thought and action.

The duty of self-examination is not so familiar a feature in the early literature of Christian experience as it was afterwards to become under monasticism and in the writings of mystics in all ages. Among the mediæval mystics the purification of self as the result of the painful descent into the 'cell of self-knowledge' is a well-marked stage in the ascent to the uncreated good (E. Underhill, *Mysticism*^{2}, London, 1911, p. 240 ff.). The apostolic Christian is urged to follow his Lord's example (1 Ti 2^{6}, 1 P 2^{21}), and to look away to Jesus (He 12^{2}) rather than to engage in the exercises of self-scrutiny. One seeks in vain among the mystic Johannine writings for any such incentives to self-examination as were afterwards to be adduced by St. Catherine of Siena: 'If thou wilt arrive at a perfect knowledge of Me, the Eternal Truth, thou shouldst never go outside the knowledge of thyself' (cf. E. Underhill, *op. cit.*, p. 241); or by Thomas à Kempis, *humilis tui cognitio certior via est ad Deum, quam profunda scientiæ inquisitio* (*de Imit. Christi*, i. 3. 4). Self-examination is a conspicuous element in all forms of pietism: it passed into evangelical Christianity; and chiefly in the mystical autobiographies of Quakerism, like the diaries of T. Ellwood and J. Woolman, and in the hymnology of early Methodism we discover it to be a recognized exercise of the soul.

The NT gives no encouragement to a morbid or excessive self-scrutiny, as an end in itself. Introspection is implied in 1 Jn 3^{20}, but only to issue in the encouraging declaration that 'God is greater than our heart': and in Gal 6^{1} (*σκοπῶν σεαυτόν*) we are reminded that the inspection of our own hearts tends to stimulate charitableness towards the erring. On the other hand, Apostolic Christianity lends no weight to the modern tendency to rule introspection altogether out of the religious life.

Literature.—In addition to the works cited above, see R. C. Trench, *Synonyms of the NT*^{9}, London, 1880, p. 278 ff.

R. Martin Pope.

SENATE.—See Sanhedrin.

SENTENCE.—In the NT this word is used only three times: (1) as indicating a judicial sentence (*ἐπικρίνω*, Lk 23^{24}; see Trial-at-Law); (2) as giving a decision or judgment on a matter submitted for settlement (*κρίνω*): 'My sentence (RV 'judgement') is, that we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles are turned to God' (Ac 15^{19}); (3) as a conclusion come to, or an answer given to a question put in certain circumstances (*ἀπόκριμα*): 'But we had the sentence of death in ourselves' (2 Co 1^{9} AV; RV, 'Yea, we ourselves have had the answer [RVm 'sentence'] of death within ourselves'). The word is of very frequent use in Acts and the Epistles in the sense of expressing a personal judgment or decision, or of holding an opinion (Ac 26^{8}, 1 Co 2^{2}, etc.). John Reid.

SEPULCHRE.—Three Greek words are employed in the NT to express the idea of tomb or burial-place: (1) *μνῆμα*, Ac 2^{29} 7^{16}, Rev 11^{9}; cf. Lk 8^{27} 23^{53} 24^{1}, Mk 5$^{3.5}$; (2) *μνημεῖον*, Ac 13^{29}; cf. Mt 23^{29} 27$^{52.60}$; (3) *τάφος*, Rev 3^{13}; cf. Mt 23$^{27.29}$ 27$^{61.64.66}$ 28^{1}; the Hebrew equivalent of all three being קֶבֶר. The word 'grave,' though found eight times in the AV, is not regarded by the Revisers as an adequate English equivalent.

1. Ancient burial customs.—The Hebrews universally disposed of their dead by burial; otherwise they felt the soul of the deceased in Sheol would not find rest. The aboriginal cave-dwellers in Canaan, however, seem to have disposed of their dead by cremation (cf. R. A. S. Macalister, *Bible Side-Lights from the Mound of Gezer*, 1906, p. 48 ff.). Burning was resorted to by the Hebrews only in the case of those who had committed crime (Gn 38^{24}, Lv 20^{14}). They used spices in preparing the body for burial, but they did not embalm. There was not the same incentive for it as prevailed in Egypt, where other-worldliness was so emphatically illustrated by temple and pyramid. Still, to the later Jews as well as to the Egyptians the tomb was 'the house of the living.' Swift burial was necessary because of the climate, and as a rule took place on the same day as the person died. Stones were placed over a grave, not only to mark the site, but to prevent jackals and other beasts from disturbing the body (cf. 2 S 18^{17}). In the case of a criminal the heap of stones over his grave kept on growing, as every passer-by felt compelled to express his contempt for him by adding new stones to the heap. Ancient tombs are still very numerous in Petra, which is indeed 'the city of tombs.' Of the 750 (more or less) sepulchres extant there, some date back as far as the 6th cent. B.C., or even earlier, probably belonging to the ancient Edomites who once inhabited those parts. Others, perhaps the great majority, are those of the Nabatæans, or early Arabs, who flourished in Petra from 350 B.C. till A.D. 100. These tombs, which are of varied styles and types, are all cut in the sides of the massive sandstone mountains. One is filled with columbaria for receiving the ashes of the dead. As a necropolis Petra is worthy of special study.

2. Ancient types of sepulchre. — Like their neighbours, the Hebrews through their sepulchres gave expression to their belief in immortality. The limestone rocks of Canaan yielded to their desire for a permanent place of abode. And yet, though they must have been perfectly familiar with the Babylonian and Egyptian custom of building costly mausolea, the Hebrews insisted on simplicity. No elaborate or extravagant sepulchres were ever erected by them. They regarded such monuments as tending towards ancestor-worship, and they studiously avoided all kinds of idolatry. In preparing sepulchres for the dead they aimed at safety and endurance rather than elaborateness and ornamentation. Men of position sometimes prepared their sepulchres while yet alive; but, though the Phœnicians were their models, they seldom used a sarcophagus. The practice of raising monuments over their tombs was first inaugurated by Simon the Maccabee (1 Mac 13$^{27\text{ff.}}$). Through the influence of the Greeks, the Hebrews began to build separate tomb-chambers. These varied in style as follows:

(1) The simplest type of Jewish sepulchre was *a sunken receptacle for a single body, hewn in the rock*. Oftentimes caves were appropriated and used by them to save labour and expense. Abraham, for example, buried Sarah in the cave of Machpelah (Gn 23$^{9.17}$). A slab of stone was prepared to cover tightly the rectangular depression. This was whitewashed annually, to guard against ceremonial defilement (Mt 23^{27}; cf. Lk 11^{44}). Ancient tombs of this kind are very common in Palestine still. Some have been found with shafts, as at Tell el-Judeideh (cf. Bliss and Macalister, *PEF Excavations, 1898–1900*, p. 199 ff.).

(2) *Chambers with rectangular recesses* called *kokim*, or *loculi*, for receiving the body. These were usually secured by means of slabs which were plastered and ceiled. Some were cut in the face of the rock lengthwise. They are known as shelf-tombs; others were cut at right angles to the surface of the wall, to a depth of 5 or 6 ft., the body being laid in with the feet towards the opening. The recesses were usually low, almost on a level with the floor of the chamber. It was probably in a shelf-tomb that our Lord was buried (Mt 27^{60}, Mk 15^{46}, Lk 23^{53}, Jn 20^{12}). Over the shelf, ledge, or trough, as the case might be, arches were usually cut. This *kokim* kind of sepulchre was

the family type. Sometimes double chambers were made, with a rock-cut passage-way leading from one into the other. The so-called 'Tombs of the Kings' and 'Tombs of the Prophets' at Jerusalem are of this type. The Greeks built such sepulchres from 200 B.C. onwards. A heavy stone door swinging in a socket, or a large rolling stone-disk, protected the entrance against robbers and other wilful violators (Mt 27^{60}, Jn 11^{38}). Curses were often invoked on those who would disturb the dead (cf. the inscription on Shakespeare's tomb at Stratford-on-Avon, 'And curs'd be he who moves my bones'). No outsider was allowed to bury in a private family sepulchre, because such tombs were holy ground. If unused and empty, they might be, indeed often were, occupied by outcasts and homeless ones who took refuge in them (Mk 5^{2}). Chamber-tombs frequently had porches, vestibules, or antechambers. Even the single tomb might have its antechamber as well as its chamber proper. C. M. Doughty describes sepulchres of this type as existing in Arabia (*Travels in Arabia Deserta*, 1888, i. 108).

(3) *Tombs built of stones.* Masonry tombs are all of later date. Some of them, however, carry us as far back as the Greek Age. Certain very interesting antique examples still exist at Kedesh-Naphtali, Tell Hum, Malal, Teiasir, and 'Ain el-B'anieh. The one probably best known to the student of the Bible is the so-called Tomb of Rachel at the fork of the road leading to Bethlehem. At Palmyra the most remarkable masonry tombs are to be seen. They are known as 'sepulchral towers.' One stands 59 ft. high and contains a tomb-chamber 27 by 20 ft. in size. Other tombs built of masonry are to be found at Rabbath Ammon, and formerly at Modin, the home of the Maccabees. In certain cases limestone sarcophagi, ornamented and highly polished, received the dead. Not infrequently such tombs are revered by the Arabs as sacred, being regarded as the sepulchres of saints and heroes. The Arabs make pilgrimages to them, call them *makâms*, and carefully guard them against all possible profanation. Religious services are frequently held at them, and votive offerings are repeatedly brought and placed on the walls under the saint's protection. Clothing, implements of agriculture, and other such peasant belongings are considered perfectly safe when deposited by a saint's tomb; for, if they are injured or stolen, the act incurs the saint's wrath. Even the Jews perpetuate the memory of certain celebrated Rabbis by honouring their tombs through the building of synagogues over them, which in turn have become centres of pilgrimage; that of the celebrated Talmudist Rabbi Meir, near Tiberias, is an illustrious example.

3. NT passages.—There are but five passages in apostolic history which speak of tombs or sepulchres: (1) Ac 2^{29}, in which Peter says, 'Brethren, I may say unto you freely of the patriarch David, that he both died and was buried, and his tomb (τὸ μνῆμα αὐτοῦ) is with us unto this day.' The Apostle's argument is that, in spite of the fact that David was a patriarch and the founder of a royal family or clan, and wrote Ps 16^{10} ('For thou wilt not leave my soul in Sheol,' etc.), he nevertheless himself came to the grave and was buried; therefore, he must have had in mind One greater than himself. According to 1 K 2^{10}, David was buried 'in the city of David.' Nehemiah (3^{16}) mentions 'the sepulchres of David.' To buy off Antiochus Epiphanes, Hyrcanus opened one of the chambers of David's sepulchre and took out 3000 talents; Herod the Great rifled another in the time of Hadrian (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* VII. xv. 3, XIII. viii. 4). David's tomb is said to have fallen into ruins. Its site was probably within the city walls. F. de Saulcy erroneously identifies it with the 'Tombs of the Kings,' which are of Roman origin (*Journey round the Dead Sea*, new ed., 1854, ii. 111 ff.). Jerome, writing in the 4th cent. A.D. to Marcella, expresses a hope that they might pray together in the mausoleum of David (*Ep.* xlvi.).

(2) Ac 7^{16}, 'And they [the fathers] were carried over unto Shechem, and laid in the tomb (ἐν τῷ μνήματι) that Abraham bought for a price in silver of the sons of Hamor in Shechem.' Stephen here seems to have confused OT statements with ancient Jewish tradition. According to Gn 50^{13}, Jacob was buried in Hebron; and, according to Jos 24^{32}, Joseph was buried in Shechem. Jewish tradition adds much to these facts: *e.g.* Josephus (*Ant.* II. viii. 2) regards all the patriarchs as buried in Hebron. The *Book of Jubilees* (ch. 46) speculates about the bones of Joseph's brethren, declaring that they were buried in Shechem. This is possible. There is nothing to prevent our supposing that the bodies of all twelve of the sons of Jacob were removed to the Promised Land. Shechem was more central than Hebron. It was there that Abram first settled when he came into Canaan; there he built an altar to Jahweh (Gn $12^{6.7}$); and it is only reasonable to suppose that he also purchased the ground on which it stood; otherwise it would have been exposed to desecration and destruction. 'The purchase of the ground on which an altar stood would therefore seem to follow as a kind of corollary from the erection of an altar on that ground' (cf. R. J. Knowling, *EGT*, 'Acts,' 1900, *in loc.*). This does not preclude the possibility of Jacob's purchase of the field of Shechem from the sons of Hamor (Gn 33^{19}, Jos 24^{32}). Stephen, accordingly, only enlarges upon the statements of the OT in keeping with both tradition and possibility. To-day the tomb of Joseph is shown a few hundred yards to the N. of Jacob's well, and the same distance almost due E. from Shechem. Tradition fixed upon this location, as early as the 4th cent. A.D., as the place where Joseph was buried. The present tomb, which was restored in 1868, has the usual appearance of a Muslim *wêli.* On the other hand, the *Ḥarâm*, or sacred area, which encloses the Cave of Machpelah in Hebron marks the place where Abraham and Sarah, Isaac and Rebekah, Jacob and Leah were buried. Few Europeans can boast of having been permitted to enter it; the present writer had this privilege in April 1914.

(3) Ac 13^{29}, 'And when they had fulfilled all things that were written of him, they took him down from the tree and laid him in a tomb' (εἰς μνημεῖον). St. Paul here treats of Christ's burial with a freedom analogous to that of St. Peter when speaking of David's (Ac 2^{29}). The motive of both was the same, namely, to prove the reality of the death, and, therefore, of the resurrection from the dead. Unlike Enoch and Elijah, Christ had died and been actually buried; hence His death was a reality, and because He had risen from the tomb His resurrection was an indisputable fact. But did the Jews bury Jesus? The *Gospel of Peter* says that they did (21–24). And surely Joseph of Arimathæa and Nicodemus were both Jews and members of the Sanhedrin. Where is His tomb to be located? Certain authorities are unwilling to commit themselves; but the present writer is free to acknowledge that the traditional place, marked as it is by the Cathedral of the Holy Sepulchre, despite all that is repulsive and idolatrous about it, best satisfies him as the approximate site. Eusebius (*Onom.*, ed. P. de Lagarde, 1870, pp. 229, 248) favours this opinion (cf. H. Guthe, art. 'Holy Sepulcher,' in Schaff-Herzog, v. [1909] 328–331).

(4) Ro 3^{13}, 'Their throat is an open sepulchre' (τάφος). These words are quoted from the LXX

version of Ps 5^{10}. The Psalmist is describing enemies whose false and treacherous language threatened ruin to Israel. Just as a grave stands yawning to receive the corpse, and gives forth foul and pestilent vapours, so the throat of the wicked is open to besmirch by slander and malice some one's fair name. The modern custom of secreting tomb cavities and re-opening them to make fresh interments affords a partial illustration of what the Apostle means.

(5) Rev 11^{9}, 'And from among the peoples and tribes and tongues and nations do men look upon their dead bodies three days and a half, and suffer not their dead bodies to be laid in a tomb' (εἰς μνῆμα). The picture drawn here by John is that of a degenerate Church refusing to allow the bodies of its true witnesses the rite of burial. To the apostles, such a spirit was paralleled only by pagan malice. For the enemies of the Church to be willing not only to see the bodies of the faithful lie exposed in the open way, but to invite the world to the spectacle, and to celebrate the event with holiday joy and the exchange of gifts (v.^{10}), was the climax of insolence and contumely.

LITERATURE.—Compare the artt. 'Burial,' 'Tomb,' 'Grave,' 'Sepulchre,' in the various Dictionaries of the Bible and Religious Encyclopædias; also R. A. S. Macalister, *PEFSt* xxxiv. [1902], xli. [1909]; F. J. Bliss and R. A. S. Macalister, *Excavations in Palestine during the years 1898–1900* (*PEF*, 1902); J. P. Peters and H. Thiersch, *Painted Tombs in the Necropolis of Marissa* (*PEF*, 1905); R. E. Brünnow and A. v. Domaszewski, *Die Provincia Arabia*, i. and ii. [1904–05]; G. Dalman, *Petra und seine Felsheiligtümer*, 1908; E. Robinson, *Biblical Researches*^{2}, 1856; K. Mommert, *Golgotha und das heilige Grab zu Jerusalem*, 1900; Baedeker-Benzinger, *Palestine and Syria*, 1912; *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palaestina-Vereins*, 1878 ff.; *Mittheilungen und Nachrichten des deutschen Palaestina-Vereins*, 1895 ff.; *RB*, 1882 ff.

GEORGE L. ROBINSON.

SERGIUS PAULUS.—Sergius Paulus is mentioned in Ac 13^{4-12}, where he is described as the proconsul in Cyprus, 'a man of understanding' who 'called unto him Barnabas and Saul, and sought to hear the word of God.' With Sergius Paulus was Elymas the sorcerer who sought 'to turn aside the proconsul from the faith.' St. Paul's power brought blindness upon Elymas. 'Then the proconsul, when he saw what was done, believed, being astonished at the teaching of the Lord.'

The Sergii were a Roman patrician gens who furnished more than one consul. Two possible references to Sergius Paulus occur outside the NT. A Sergius Paulus is mentioned in the Index of Authors to Pliny's *Natural History*, as an authority on bks. ii. and xviii., which give special information about Cyprus. A Greek inscription from the N. coast of Cyprus is dated 'in the proconsulship of Paulus,' who is probably the same governor.

NT references, though incidental (for the interest of the story centres in the duel between St. Paul and Elymas), describe a triumph for the Christian preachers. It was customary for a high Roman official to have in his train of *comites* not only personal friends and attachés, but also 'provincials, men of letters or of scientific knowledge or of tastes and habits that rendered them agreeable or useful to the great man' (W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 77). Sergius Paulus is described as συνετός—a man of understanding, or of keen intelligence. This description does not favour the idea that he was weakly under the influence of a mountebank. Elymas was evidently a powerful exponent of a subtle theosophical system; and as a man of unusual intelligence, with a religious bent, the governor encouraged the presence and enjoyed the company of such scientists and philosophers. For the same reason he sent for Barnabas and St. Paul, when news reached him of their work in Cyprus. These travelling teachers were summoned to Court. The governor listened to their message with such evident pleasure and approval that the jealousy of Elymas was roused, and he tried to dissuade his patron from hearing them. But St. Paul's challenge reduced Elymas to impotent blindness. Sergius Paulus had been impressed already by the missionaries' exposition of Christianity. He was 'astonished at the teaching of the Lord.' His astonishment is said to have been due not to the miracle but to the teaching (C. v. Weizsäcker is wrong, therefore, in ascribing the conversion of Sergius Paulus to 'the Apostle striking his favourite, the Magian Barjesus, blind' [*Apostolic Age*, i. 111; and cf. 274]). The Christian message made a deep impression on this 'man of understanding'; and, when he saw the issue of the conflict between the two champions, 'he believed.' The governor of Cyprus was a notable convert. Renan and others have regarded the conversion of a Roman proconsul as incredible. It has to be said that we know nothing more of his Christian life—whether he professed Christianity openly by baptism, and used his influence to further the religion, or whether he relapsed. Possibly the word ἐπίστευσεν is used here to describe something less than full Christian faith; cf. 8^{13}, 'Simon believed' (though Simon became a pervert), and Jn 12^{42}, 'the rulers believed . . . but did not confess,' and especially Jn 20^{8}. Anyhow, the unembellished statement is entirely in favour of its historical integrity: Sergius Paulus did make some profession of faith which sent the apostles on their way rejoicing in the Christian victory. We are not told whether this man's heart was the good soil in which the seed bears fruit, or the shallow soil in which the shoot is scorched, or the preoccupied soil in which the growing corn is choked. We are told only that the seed took root and sprang up.

Probably this proconsul's favourable reception of St. Paul's preaching was one of the earliest suggestions to the Apostle that the dominant power of Rome might be an asset for Christianity rather than a hostile influence. It is possible, also, that it encouraged St. Paul and Barnabas to develop a more extended missionary campaign on the mainland than was originally intended; and this may have been one reason for John Mark's withdrawal from the party.

LITERATURE.—G. G. Findlay, art. 'Paul the Apostle,' in *HDB* iii. 704; A. C. Headlam, art. 'Paulus, Sergius,' *ib.*, p. 731; W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, London, 1895, pp. 73–88, *The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the NT*, do., 1915; R. J. Knowling, *EGT*, 'Acts,' 1900, *in loc.* For meaning of 'believed' cf. B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel according to St. John*, 2 vols., London, 1908, ii. 290; B. B. Warfield, art. 'Faith,' in *HDB* i. 829.

J. E. ROBERTS.

SERJEANTS, LICTORS.—These officials are mentioned only in Ac $16^{35.38}$, as taking a message from the prætors of Philippi (see under art. PRÆTOR) to St. Paul and Silas, and conveying back to the magistrates their reply. The name in Greek means 'rod-carriers,' and is the official equivalent of the Latin *lictores* ('beadles'). These men were taken from the lowest class of the people or from the class of freedmen to act as attendants upon the leading magistrates in Rome. A *dictator* was allowed 24, a *consul* 12, and a *prætor* 6. Each carried a bundle of rods with an axe included, as symbols of the power of punishment and of life and death possessed by the higher magistrates. They marched in single file in front of the magistrate and cleared a space for him through the crowd. They had to see that proper respect was paid to the magistrate, and had also to carry out the punishment ordered by him. A minor offender (not a citizen) was bound hand and foot and beaten with the rods; a more serious offender was beheaded by the axe. This power during the Republic was held by generals commanding-in-chief in the field, but the *insignia* had to be dropped before they passed within the city gates, unless they had been awarded the dignity of a triumph. Within the city a citizen had always the right of appeal against a death sentence of a magistrate (see J. S. Reid in *JRS* i. [1911] 68–99). The constitution of Rome was copied in *coloniæ*, which were in theory parts of Rome itself. Just as Rome had *prætores* and *lictores*, so had the *coloniæ*, even where the chief magistrates did not bear that name. Philippi was a *colonia*, and the two chief magistrates there had their *lictores*. But in all probability they had no such powers as their originals in Rome had. Their bundles of rods were mostly ornamental, and so was the axe, if indeed there was an axe at all. These magistrates were proud of the forms of the parent city, even if the power possessed by them was merely a shadow. The Acts narrative shows that it was in their power to scourge recalcitrant subjects of the Empire, but not Roman citizens, when known to be such. St. Paul and Silas could indeed have successfully appealed against the treatment which they received.

A. SOUTER.

SERPENT (*ὄφις*).—Apart from the Gospels, the only occurrences of the word 'serpent' in the NT are in the Epistles to the Corinthians (1 Co 10[9], 2 Co 11[3]) and in the Apocalypse (Rev 9[19] 12[9. 14. 15] 20[2]). In 1 Co 10[9] the writer exhorts his readers not to tempt Christ sorely as the Israelites did, with the result that they were allowed to perish from time to time (*ἀπώλλυντο*) by the inflammatory bites of serpents. In the second passage (2 Co 11[3]) he expressed the fear lest, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, so the minds of the Corinthian converts should be corrupted from the simplicity and single-mindedness of Christ. In both cases the tempter is Satan, and in both cases his nefarious work is accomplished by subtlety and deception, but in Genesis his agent is the serpent, while here the 'ministers' of Satan (v.[15]) are the Judaizers (v.[13]). In Rev 12[9] the Devil appears in his time-honoured rôle as a serpent, and he is identified both with the great Dragon and with the person called 'Satan' in the later books of the OT and in Jewish literature. The name 'Satan' was familiar to the later Jews, and occurs fourteen times (*ὁ σατανᾶς*) in the Gospels, twice in the Acts of the Apostles, ten times in the Pauline Epistles, and eight times in the Apocalypse. The earth was no new sphere for the exercise of his devilish activities, but henceforth his scope was to be confined thereto, and this limitation of his powers seems only to have intensified his animosity and desire for revenge. A torrent of water issued from his mouth (v.[15]) which was designed to sweep away the Woman, but this malicious attempt recoiled on the Devil's own head, and the destructive flood was swallowed up by the earth which was his own domain. The purpose to which the Roman Emperors set themselves was to eradicate and stamp out the very name of Christianity as well as the memory of the Founder of that religion. The futility and complete failure of the attempt are too obvious to admit of comment. In Rev 20[2] the Devil is again identified with the great Dragon and Satan. The Dragon has from the outset (13[2. 4]) been the real instigator and author of the revolt led by the Beast and the False Prophet, but hitherto he has escaped justice. Now, however, he is seized and bound for a period of a thousand years. The period of his imprisonment is indeed limited, but its length forms a striking contrast to the short duration of heathenism—a thousand two hundred and threescore days (Rev 11[3ff.]).

In Rev 9[19] the tails of the horses in the vision are likened to serpents, just as the tails of the locusts in 9[3] are compared to scorpions. The power of these horses resides in their mouth and in their tails. The tails are incongruously said to have heads, but the incongruity is perhaps atoned for by the additional horror thereby imparted to these superhuman animals.

Serpents are very common in Palestine and in the wilderness of Sinai; over thirty species are known, the majority of which are, however, harmless. Most of the innocuous serpents belong to the genera *Ablabes* and *Zamanis* of the Colubrine family. Many of these are brilliantly coloured; they are well proportioned and slender, with a gradually tapering tail, and they live exclusively on land. The majority are of rather small size, but some are very large. A species very frequently found in the marshes and lakes is the *Tropidonotus hydrus*. A few species of harmless sand-snakes have also been found, of which the *Eryx jaculus* is the most common.

The poisonous snakes of the country are the following: the cobra (*Naja haje*), and four viperine snakes, two true vipers, the *Vipera euphratica* and the *Vipera ammodytes*, the *Daboia xanthina*, and the *Echis arenicola*, a dangerous reptile which is very frequently encountered in the hotter and drier parts of the country. With the exception of the *Daboia xanthina*, they all belong to the Mediterranean and North African fauna, or are closely allied thereto. The *Daboia xanthina* is a beautifully marked yellow serpent and the largest of the vipers in Palestine, as well as one of the most dangerous. The *Naja haje*, or Egyptian cobra, is of rare occurrence. It is the species especially popular with snake-charmers. Another very deadly serpent is the *Cerastes hasselquistii*, or 'horned serpent.' It lies in ambush in depressions in the way (cf. Gn 49[17]) and attacks the wayfarer. It is 12 or 18 ins. long, and of a sandy colour with brown or blackish spots. See, further, ASP, VIPER.

LITERATURE.—H. B. Tristram, *Survey of Western Palestine*, London, 1884, p. 140 f., *The Natural History of the Bible*[10], do., 1911, pp. 269–277; W. M. Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, 3 vols., do., 1881–86, vol. i. 'South Palestine and Jerusalem,' pp. 188–189; J. C. Geikie, *The Holy Land and the Bible*, do., 1903, pp. 88–90; *SDB*, p. 837; *HDB* iv. 459–460; *EBi* iv. 4391–4397; H. B. Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*[2], London, 1907, pp. 124, 154, 159, 260; *The Speaker's Commentary*, do., 1881, vol. iii. pp. 310–311, 457–458.

P. S. P. HANDCOCK.

SERVANT.—See MINISTRY, SLAVE.

SESSION (OF CHRIST).—See ASCENSION.

SEVEN.—See NUMBERS.

SEVEN, THE.—See CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

SEVENTY.—See NUMBERS.

SHADOW (*σκιά*). — **1. Healing property of shadow.** — The shadow of St. Peter had the property of healing the sick (Ac 5[15]). Similarly, articles of clothing touched by St. Paul caused disease and evil spirits to depart from the afflicted (Ac 19[12]), just as those who touched the border of Christ's garment were healed (Mk 6[56], Lk 8[44]). Even the name of Jesus was effectual in some cases (Ac 3[6] 4[10]). The therapeutic power of suggestion in all such instances is recognized by modern psychology.

2. The metaphysical use of the term 'shadow.'—This use occurs in Hebrews (8[5] 10[1]), affording an interesting link with the Epistle to the Colossians, where St. Paul declares that the Jewish ceremonial observances were but 'a shadow of the things to come (*σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων*); but the body is Christ's' (Col 2[17]). Here 'shadow' is contrasted with 'body,' or substantial reality. The 'things to come' are the Christian dispensation, which from the Jewish standpoint, was yet in the future. Christianity embodies the Divine reality, whereas Mosaism was only a 'shadow' cast temporarily into human history by the 'body,' the eternal fact of the heavenly Christ yet to be revealed. The interpretation of Calvin, that 'shadow' means the sketch of which Christianity is the finished picture, is unlikely when the occurrence and significance of the term in Hebrews are taken into consideration. The fundamental conception of this Epistle is the Alexandrian one that there are two worlds or orders of things, a higher and a lower—the one heavenly, eternal, and real; the other earthly, temporal, and merely phenomenal. The material, sensible world is not the real, but only the shadowy copy of the heavenly pattern. This conception the writer of Hebrews takes up and fills with a religious content. The Mosaic Law, so reverenced by the Jews, has only 'a shadow of the good things to come, not the very image of the things' (10^{1}). Here 'shadow' (*σκιά*) is contrasted with 'image' (*εἰκών*). Judaism is the 'shadow,' Christianity is the 'very image' of the good things. The Christian religion gives us possession of the reality only dimly foreshadowed in the Jewish system. The Law is a shadow, inseparable indeed from the eternal image; but in comparison with that reality, it is only a dim flickering and transient outline, lacking the abiding substantiality and content of that which cast it. Furthermore, the priests of the Levitical system only 'serve a copy (*ὑπόδειγμα*) and shadow (*σκιά*) of the heavenly things' (8^{5}). The tabernacle itself was made by Moses only according to the 'pattern' (*τύπον*) of the heavenly original, the 'true tabernacle' pitched by God (v.^{2}). Like every other part of the Levitical system, the tabernacle was only a 'copy,' the 'pattern' (*τύπον*) of which exists eternally in heaven. This use of the term 'shadow' in contrast with 'image' is more than an illustration taken from art. It may well be that, but it seems rather an explanation of Christian truth by means of the categories of Platonic and Philonic philosophy. Plato's famous allegory of the Cave (*Rep.* vii. 514), wherein men are described as seeing on the wall of the den but the shadows of real objects passing outside, illustrates his theory of Ideas. The relation of eternal realities (archetypal Ideas) to visible things is like the relation between substantial bodies and their transient shadows. This theory was taken up by the Alexandrian philosophy, and the OT is explained by Philo in terms of this Hellenistic speculation. The writer of Hebrews, who shows many signs of Alexandrian influence, uses throughout his Epistle this Philonic form of thought to show the superiority of Christianity over Judaism. Judaism is but a 'shadow,' Christianity is the very 'image' embodying and expressing God's eternal purpose concerning mankind.

M. SCOTT FLETCHER.

SHAMBLES.—See ARTS.

SHAME ((1) *αἰσχύνη*, vbs. *αἰσχύνεσθαι*, *ἐπαισχύνεσθαι*, *καταισχύνεσθαι*; (2) *ἐντροπή*, *ἐντρέπειν*; (3) *αἰδώς*).—(1) The dread of outward shame, *αἰσχύνη*, as opposed to *δόξα*, 'glory,' not only restrains men from base actions, but sometimes deters them from the noblest and best deeds. In the Apostolic Age it was scarcely possible to be a Christian without facing ignominy. As Christ could not save the world without despising the shame of the Cross (He 12^{2}), so every Christian had to bear a cross of shame. He needed fortitude not to be ashamed of the gospel (Ro 1^{16}), of his hope (5^{5}), of his faith (9^{33} 10^{11}), of his trials (Ph 1^{20}), of his suffering as a Christian (1 P 4^{16}). Timothy was exhorted not to be ashamed of the testimony of the Lord, or of St. Paul his prisoner (2 Ti 1^{8}), and Onesiphorus was praised for not being ashamed of St. Paul's chain (1^{16}). Those who were not ashamed of Christ had their reward in the assurance that He was not ashamed to call them His brethren (He 2^{11}), that God was not ashamed to be called their God (11^{16}), and that they would not be ashamed before Christ at His second coming (1 Jn 2^{28}). True Christians renounced the hidden things of shame (*τὰ κρυπτὰ τῆς αἰσχύνης*, 2 Co 4^{2}), and inconsistent Christians were warned that the shame of their nakedness would be exposed (Rev 3^{18}), while hypocrites continued to foam out their own shameful deeds (*αἱ αἰσχύναι*, Jude ^{13}).

(2) *ἐντρέπειν τινα* is lit. 'to turn a man upon himself,' and so to shame him. In 1 Cor., which reflects the writer's quickly changing feelings and attitudes, St. Paul tells his readers that he does not write to shame them (*οὐκ ἐντρέπων ὑμᾶς*, 4^{14}), and again that he does write to move them to shame (*πρὸς ἐντροπήν*, 6^{5} 15^{34}). The Pastoral Letters teach that the disobedient Christian is to be avoided, that he may be ashamed (2 Th 3^{14}), and that the servant of Christ is to behave irreproachably, that his opponent may be ashamed (*ἐντραπῇ*, Tit 2^{8}).

(3) *Αἰδώς* (tr. 'shamefastness' in 1 Ti 2^{9}, 'reverence' in the inferior text of He 12^{28}) is a nobler word than *αἰσχύνη*, denoting a higher motive—a sensitive shrinking from what is either unworthy of oneself or dishonouring to God. It occurs twice in the *Iliad*—*αἰδῶ θέσθ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ* (xv. 561), and *ἴσχε γὰρ αἰδώς* (*ib.* 657): in the first case Pope renders it by 'honest shame,' and in the second by 'manly shame.' As to 'shamefastness,' which is read in the RV instead of 'shamefacedness' in the AV, see R. C. Trench, *Synonyms of the NT*^{8}, 1876, p. 67, and art. 'Shamefacedness' in *HDB*.

JAMES STRAHAN.

SHARON (*ὁ Σάρων*, הַשָּׁרוֹן, 'the level').—Sharon was the ancient name of the undulating Maritime Plain which extended from Mt. Carmel to some distance beyond Jaffa—perhaps to the Nahr Rūbīn and the low hills to the S. of Ramleh—where it merged in the Philistian Plain. It was admired by prophets and poets for the richness of its vegetation and the beauty of its wild flowers—'the excellency of Sharon' (Is 35^{2}), 'the rose of Sharon' (Ca 2^{1}). From the groves of oak which at one time covered a great part of its surface, especially in the north, it was also called *ὁ δρυμός* (LXX, Is 33^{9} 35^{2} 65^{10}; Jos. *BJ* I. xiii. 2) or *οἱ δρυμοί* (*Ant.* XIV. xiii. 3). Strabo (XVI. ii. 27) says that in his time there was next to Carmel 'a large forest' (*δρυμὸς μέγας τις*). The only part of Sharon which is alluded to in the NT is the southern end, lying around Lydda (now *Lydd*), where the fields and orchards were exceedingly well-watered and fertile and the population was dense. Here the presence of St. Peter in the early Apostolic Age—though his visit was only brief, as he was urgently summoned away to Joppa—is said to have given rise to a widespread spiritual movement: 'all that dwelt at Lydda and in Sharon turned to the Lord' (Ac 9^{35}). The AV renders 'at Lydda and Sharon,' apparently mistaking 'Sharon' for a town or village in the neighbourhood of Lydda. The use of the article with the Greek and the Hebrew noun proves that a whole district—'the level country' (from יָשַׁר)—is meant. The only known village of Sārōna is in the N.E. of Mt. Tabor, probably represented by the *Saronas* which Eusebius (*Onom.* 296. 6) says was the name given to the district between Tabor and Tiberias.

LITERATURE.—G. A. Smith, *HGHL*, 1900, p. 147 ff.; D. F. Buhl, *GAP*, 1896, p. 103 f.

JAMES STRAHAN.

SHAVING.—See HAIR, NAZIRITES.

SHECHEM.—In St. Stephen's address we read that Jacob and the fathers were carried over unto Shechem and laid in the sepulchre that Abraham bought of the sons of **Hamor** in Shechem (Ac 7^{16}). There is here a combining of two separate traditions. Jacob was buried at Machpelah (Gn 50^{13}), which Abraham bought from the sons of Heth (23). Jacob himself bought ground from the children of Hamor, and in it Joseph was buried (Jos 24^{32}). This ground was in Shechem. Here Jacob established his residence for some time, and his people entered into the closest relations with the natives. A well, said to have been dug by his orders, was in existence in Christ's day, and here at Jacob's well our Lord had His famous interview with the Samaritan woman (Jn 4). Shechem became famous as a Levite city, and a city of refuge, and still later as the capital of the ten tribes under Jeroboam. It became a city of the Samaritans. Its situation was between Mount Gerizim and Mount Ebal, and it lay on the Roman road from Jerusalem to Galilee.

LITERATURE.—C. W. Wilson, art. 'Shechem,' in *HDB*; G. A. Smith, *HGHL*, 1900, pp. 120, 332; R. J. Knowling, *EGT*, 'Acts,' 1900, *ad loc.*

J. W. DUNCAN.

SHEPHERD.—The name 'shepherd' is taken from the occupation of the Hebrews as a pastoral tribe (Gn 13^7 30^{36} 37^2 47^3, Ex 3^1, 1 S 17^{34}) and applied to God as the one who feeds and provides for His people (Gn 48^{15} 49^{24}, Is 40^{11}, Ps 23^1 95^7 100^3; cf. Ezk 34^{11-31}) and to the rulers of the nation (Nu 27^{17}, 2 S 7^7, 1 K 22^{17}, Jer 2^8 3^{15} 23^{1-4}, Ezk 34^{2-10}, Zec 10^3 $11^{3ff.}$ 13^5). The idea expressed in most of these passages is that the care of Israel, as 'the flock of His pasture,' is given by the Lord in charge of the rulers who are held to account for the welfare of every member of the same. Especially Ezk 34 rebukes these 'shepherds' for their neglect of their charge, and ends up (v.^{23b}) with the prophecy that in the end *one* shepherd, like unto *David* the servant of the Lord, will tend them as prince. To this Messianic passage reference is made in Jn 10^{11-16}, where Jesus is represented as saying: 'I am the good shepherd; . . . and I lay down my life for the sheep. And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: . . . and they shall become one flock, one shepherd'; cf. He 13^{20}, 1 P 2^{25} 5^4. To His office as Shepherd Jesus refers in Mt 15^{24}; cf. Jer 50^6. Moses also is represented in *Ex. R.* 2^{2-3} as the good shepherd to whom the Lord said: 'Since thou takest such care of the lambs of thy flock, be thou the shepherd of My flocks.' The same is said there also of David when chosen by the Lord to be king. Concerning the identification of Christ as the Good Shepherd with Orpheus on ancient Christian paintings see F. Piper, *Mythologie und Symbolik der christl. Kunst*, Weimar, 1847–51, i. 126; J. P. Lundy, *Monumental Christianity*, New York, 1876, pp. 187–196; also R. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, Leipzig, 1904, 11–13, 32 f., 113. But the title 'shepherd' or 'pastor' is given in the NT to all the heads of the Church, to the apostle Peter (Jn 21^{17}; cf. Mt $10^{6.16}$) and to the elders of the Church (Ac 20^{28}, 1 P 5^2) as having charge of the 'sheep of Christ,' 'the flock of God.' The name Ποίμην ('pastor' or 'shepherd') is used in the sense of 'overseer,' *episcopus* (Eph 4^1), wherefore Jesus is also called the 'arch-shepherd,' ἀρχιποίμην (1 P 5^4). This conception (cf. Philo, ed. Mangey, i. 196) of spiritual rulers as shepherds rests on the original Jewish *Didascalia* (preserved in the so-called *Apostolic Constitutions*, ii. 6, 10, 15. 4, 18. 7–18, 19. 1–3, 20. 3–5, 9, 11), where the above-quoted passages from Jeremiah and Ezekiel are interpreted in a spiritual sense as referring to the duties and responsibilities of the overseer of the Church, viz. that he has to look after the spiritual health of each member of the flock, keep them in a sound state of perfect faith, strengthen those weakened by doubt, bind up those bruised by the remorse of sin, and bring back those that have gone astray, while expelling those that may affect the moral or spiritual well-being of the flock by evil conduct or evil doctrine (see art. 'Didascalia' in *JE*). The name 'shepherd' or 'pastor' became henceforth the title of the bishop (Ignat. *ad Phil.* ii. 1, *ad Rom.* ix. 1; Iren. iv. 33; Cyprian, *Ep.* viii. [ii.], 'Cleri Romani ad clerum Carthaginensem'; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i. 26), and later on in Protestant Christianity of the minister of the Church in general. In *Enoch* lxxxix. 59, xc. 25, the name 'shepherd' is given to the 70 angels ruling the 70 nations of the earth (see R. H. Charles, *ad loc.*, and F. Spitta, *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristentums*, Göttingen, 1901, ii. 367 ff.), also to the angel in Hermas, *Mand.* iv. 22, *Sim.* vi. 3. 2. In ancient Babylonia the chief stars bore the name of 'Shepherds of Heaven.'

K. KOHLER.

SHEWBREAD.—In the holy place of the temple or tabernacle was the shewbread (He 9^2), lit. 'the setting forth of the loaves' (*ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων*; Vulg. *propositio panum*). In the LXX rendering of Ex 40^{23} the loaves are called *ἄρτοι τῆς προθέσεως*; other names were 'the continual bread,' 'the presence-bread,' 'holy bread.' Every Sabbath day the shewbread, unleavened (Josephus, *Ant.* III. vi. 6), and fresh from the oven, was placed, in two piles of six loaves each, on a table of cedar-wood, in front of the entrance to 'the most holy place,' and the stale bread was eaten within the sacred precincts. Instructions as to the composition, setting forth, and consumption of the bread are given in Lv 24^{5-9}. The ritual is attested from an early date (1 S 21^6), and was no doubt a survival from a primitive cultus in which the shewbread was regarded as the food of the deity, like the *lectisternia* of the Romans; but this idea was 'too crude to subsist without modification beyond the savage state of society' (W. R. Smith, *RS*^{2}, 1894, p. 229), and, when more spiritual thoughts of the Divine nature prevailed, the shewbread was retained merely *εἰς ἀνάμνησιν* (Lv 24^7)—*i.e.* as a reminder of man's dependence upon God for the gift of daily bread. Among the spoils displayed at the triumph of Vespasian and Titus, 'those that were taken in the temple of Jerusalem made the greatest figure of them all: that is, the golden table, of the weight of many talents; the golden candlestick also' (Josephus, *BJ* VII. v. 5), both of which are represented on the well-known Arch of Titus.

LITERATURE.—Grimm-Thayer, *s.v.* πρόθεσις; A. Edersheim, *The Temple, its Ministry and Services*, n.d., p. 181 ff.; A. R. S. Kennedy, art. 'Shewbread' in *HDB*.

JAMES STRAHAN.

SHIELD.—See ARMOUR.

SHIP (*ναῦς*, occurring in Ac 27^{41} only, 'a vessel of considerable size'; cf. *πλοῖον*, 'ship, boat, sailing vessel,' Ac $20^{13.38}$ $21^{2.3.6}$ $27^{2ff.}$ 28^{11}, Ja 3^4, Rev 8^9 $18^{17.19}$, and frequently in the Gospels; cf. also *πλοιάριον*, 'a little boat,' Mk 3^9 4^{36}, Jn 21^8, and *ἡ σκάφη*, 'a skiff,' used of the small life-boat which was towed astern the larger vessel on which St. Paul sailed from Palestine to Italy, Ac $27^{16.30.32}$).—The ancient Hebrews were not given to seafaring, Solomon (1 K 5^9 9^{26-28} 10^{22}) and Jehoshaphat (1 K $22^{48.49}$) being the only important exceptions. They preferred agricultural and pastoral life. Besides, Canaan had no good harbours, and almost the entire coast remained permanently in the possession of others, the Phœnicians holding all north of Mt. Carmel, and the Philistines most of that to the south. Simon the Hasmonæan (*c.* 145 B.C.) was the first to make a harbour. 'He took Joppa for a haven, and made it an entrance for the isles of the sea' (1 Mac 14^{5}). According to Josephus (*BJ* I. xxi. 5, *Ant.* XV. ix. 6), Herod the Great added a second harbour at Cæsarea. As early as 400 B.C. the Greeks demonstrated their ability to construct large ships. Dionysius I. of Syracuse built ships with four ranks of oarsmen (Pliny, *HN* vii. 57; Diod. Sic. xiv. 41, 42). In the days of St. Paul the Romans controlled the commerce of the Mediterranean.

It is to St. Luke that we owe the most vivid as well as the most accurate account of sea-voyaging which has come down to us from antiquity. Experts in naval science agree that it is without a parallel (cf. J. Smith, *The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*^{4}). Luke must have possessed a genuine Greek love for things nautical. The wealth of detail contained in Ac 27 and 28 regarding St. Paul's experiences from Cæsarea to Puteoli, which covered a period of six months (Sept. A.D. 58 to March 59), is invaluable. But long prior to this most eventful voyage, St. Paul had become experienced in nautical affairs. Writing to the Corinthians, he says, 'Thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day have I been in the deep' (2 Co 11^{25}), clinging perhaps to some floating plank or other timber of a wrecked vessel (cf. Ac 27^{44}).

In the voyage to Italy St. Paul and his fellow-prisoners were carried in three different vessels: (1) In a ship of Adramyttium (a town near Troas in Mysia), probably a coasting vessel which was returning home for the winter (27^{2}). The centurion's plan probably was, originally, to take the prisoners all the way to Mysia, and from there cross over and join the Egnatian Way, which ran overland from Byzantium through Philippi to Dyrrachium, thence crossing to Italy. As a matter of fact, they sailed by this vessel only from Cæsarea to Myra in Lycia. (2) In a corn-ship of Alexandria bound for Italy, from Myra to Melita, one of the great fleet of merchant ships which assisted in feeding Rome (27^{6}). This was the vessel which was wrecked. (3) In a second corn-ship of Alexandria, which brought them from Melita to Puteoli (28^{11}).

The following points in connexion with these ships are especially noteworthy:

1. Size of ships.—While we are not informed as to their exact dimensions, we do know that they were capable of carrying not only a considerable cargo of wheat but also 276 souls all told (though the Vatican MS reads but 76), and that when one was wrecked another took all these persons on board (27$^{37.38}$ 28^{11}). It has been estimated that the capacity of such vessels must have ranged from 500 to 1000 tons. This is corroborated by what we know in general about Roman merchant vessels. That, for example, on which Josephus was wrecked, he tells us, carried 'about six hundred' (*Vita*, 3). Lucian (*Πλοῖον ἢ Εὐχαί*) also describes a vessel which was driven by a storm into the port of Athens, which measured the equivalent of 180 ft. in length by 45 ft. in breadth, having an approximate tonnage of 1200. And, according to Athenæus (v. 37), the war galley of Ptolemy Philopator measured 420 by 57 ft. (cf. J. Smith, *Voyage and Shipwreck*^{4}, pp. 187 ff., 234 ff.).

2. The officers.—(*a*) The sailing-master, steersman, pilot (*κυβερνήτης*, 27^{11}; cf. Rev 18^{17}; in the AV of Ja 3^{4} called 'the governor,' *ὁ εὐθύνων*); and (*b*) the ship-owner, ship-master, captain (*ναύκληρος*); he it was who hired out his vessel, wholly or in part, for purposes of transportation, probably also receiving the fares.

3. The sailors, called *ναῦται*, seamen, shipmen, crew.—It was their keen ears that detected the sounds of the breakers when they were nearing land (Ac 27$^{27.30}$).

4. The sails (*σκεῦος*, translated 'gear,' 27^{17}; the same word is used in 10^{11} of the great sheet which Peter saw in a vision; cf. *ἀρτέμωνα*, translated 'foresail,' 27^{40}).—Roman ships usually bore but one large square sail, on which for the most part they depended to propel the vessel. Pliny says there was also a sail at the stern, but this J. Smith regards as exceptional (Pliny, *Procem.* xix.; Smith, *Voyage and Shipwreck*^{4}, p. 192). This large mainsail was fastened to a long yard. It was furled by being drawn up to the yard. It was reefed in time of storm (cf. 27^{15}). From a drawing, preserved at Pompeii, of a vessel dating from the time of the apostles, it is evident that Roman sails were sewn across both vertically and horizontally by bands of rope to check any rent from extending beyond the square in which it occurred. They were made of costly material—byssus, or *shesh*—and sometimes bore designs, which were woven into them. The ships of Antony and Cleopatra carried purple sails. Tyrian sails were richly embroidered. As St. Paul was a tent-maker, he probably understood sail-making also, and may have more than once crossed the Mediterranean, earning his passage by plying his trade. In times of storm a vessel could not safely carry the large mainsail, or even the yard-arm; hence these were lowered on the deck, and a small storm-sail or 'foresail' (*ἀρτέμων*) was hoisted to take their place. This was what was actually done on St. Paul's ship just before running aground (27^{40}). Some, however, following Breusing, interpret the 'gear' which was 'lowered' (27^{17}) to mean that cables with weights attached were lowered into the sea to retard the vessel in its progress to inevitable destruction (so Blass, Goerne, Knabenbauer, and, to a modified extent, also Wendt).

5. The masts.—Nothing is said of masts in the account except by implication. There must have been a large mainmast, and probably a foremast also at the bow. They were made of strong wood, possibly of cedar (cf. Ezk 27^{5}). There is no proof that these Roman corn-ships bore a mizzenmast or aftermost mast, though doubtless the Romans at this time possessed three-masted vessels.

6. The anchor (*ἄγκυρα*, 27$^{29.30.40}$).—Four are specially mentioned in 27^{29}, but others were doubtless carried, for use at both bow and stern. Originally, the ancients used large stones, but in Roman times they made anchors of iron. They consisted of a main stock with two teeth-like extremities, not always 'without flukes' (cf. Roschach in Daremberg-Saglio's *Dictionnaire des Antiquités*, 1873–75, p. 267). Anchors were needed to prevent a vessel from being cast on the rocks. Those on the ill-fated vessel with St. Paul were finally cast off into the sea and abandoned (27^{40}). A singularly beautiful figurative use is made of the expression in He 6^{19}, in which the Apostle speaks of hope as 'an anchor of the soul' (see ANCHOR).

7. The rudder (*πηδάλιον*, 27^{40}; cf. Ja 3^{4}).—The Greek word comes from a root meaning 'the blade of an oar'; hence a rudder was primarily a broad float oar or paddle. It was probably hung by straps or ropes from the after part of the ship, and was managed by the steersman or master of the vessel (*κυβερνήτης*). When not in use, as for example in harbour, it was made fast either to the side of the ship or on deck. When a vessel was on the verge of running aground, the rudder was loosed to carry the ship up the beach (27^{40}). Of the rudder, also, a striking figurative use is made by the apostle James in speaking of the tongue; he says that, as a little rudder can turn about a great ship, so the tongue can control the whole nature of man (3$^{4.5}$).

8. Helps (27^{17}, 'They used helps, undergirding the ship,' *βοηθείαις ἐχρῶντο, ὑποζωννύντες τὸ πλοῖον*).—

These were cables for undergirding and strengthening the hull especially in bad weather, in order to prevent the ship's timbers from yielding under strain. The vessels of the Romans were so loosely built that they had to be frapped. This was done either lengthwise round the ship from stem to stern above the water-line (as Breusing and Torr are disposed to think) or transversely, amidship under the keel, encircling the vessel (as Balmer, J. Smith, and others). The verb 'undergirding' favours the latter view, though both processes may have been in vogue.

9. Tackling (σκευή, 27^{19}).—A comprehensive term including all the ship's necessary furniture, its fittings and equipment, everything movable lying on deck or anywhere about, not in actual use—these were cast overboard the third day.

10. The little boat (ἡ σκάφη, $27^{16.\ 30.\ 32}$).—Every large merchant ship probably had one or more such skiffs to serve as life-boats. They were usually towed behind. That attached to St. Paul's ship was dragging water-logged astern, until, under the lee of Cauda, it was taken up for greater security (27^{16}). When the sailors felt that danger was imminent, they began to lower it in order to escape to land (27^{30}), but St. Paul promptly detected their scheme and reported them to the centurion, whereupon it was cut loose and dropped overboard (27^{32}).

11. Ropes (σχοινία, 27^{32}).—These held the little life-boat, but, being cut, the boat was allowed to fall off into the sea. No incident in the voyage shows so well the faith which the soldiers had in St. Paul.

12. Sign (παράσημον, 28^{11}).—Roman ships bore individual ensigns. That on which St. Paul left Melita bore the sign 'Dioscuri,' the Twin Brothers, referring to the heroes Castor and Pollux, the twin sons of Zeus, who were generally regarded as protectors of voyagers. In Greek mythology they were the heroes of many adventures, and were worshipped as divinities, particularly by Dorians and at Rome. To them, as the patron deities of the seamen, this third ship was dedicated. Why the ensign of this particular vessel should be given is not clear, but perhaps it was because of the captain's courage in starting in winter (February ?) on so perilous a voyage—Melita to Puteoli. Sometimes eyes also were painted or sculptured on the prows of vessels (cf. 27^{15}, ἀντοφθαλμεῖν, lit. 'to look at the wind eye to eye'). The hull, too, was often painted and decorated, the ornament on the stern-post being commonly a swan or a goose-head. From the hull (πρύμνα, 27^{29}) rose the flagstaff which carried the pennant.

13. Speed, winds, currents, direction, etc.—A vessel's rate of sailing depended much upon the wind. The voyage from Troas to Philippi St. Paul made on one occasion apparently in two days ($16^{11.\ 12}$), whereas on another it required five (20^{6}). With a fair wind, Roman ships ordinarily averaged, it is reckoned, seven knots an hour. Being rigged like modern Chinese junks, they were peculiarly well fitted to make good speed before the wind. When the winds were unfavourable, ships could be made to sail 'within seven points of the wind'; for example, St. Paul's vessel maintained a N.W.W. course from Cauda to Melita in spite of an E.N.E. Euraquilo, or north-easter (27^{14}). Roman sailors knew also how to make use of the currents of the Mediterranean. Thus, the ship of Adramyttium sailed northward from Sidon under the lee of Cyprus against winds that were contrary (27^{4}), probably helped somewhat by a coast current which flows in that direction. In a very severe storm, sailors made their ships 'lie to,' the object being, not to make progress, but to ride out the gale, as under the lee of Cauda (27^{14-17}). But with vessels of only moderate size, rigged with sails unequally distributed over the deck, and having at best very imperfect charts, and with no compass, shipwrecks were of common occurrence. Sailing was avoided as much as possible in the winter season because the heavens were then frequently clouded and it was impossible to take observations (27^{20} 28^{11}). Plumb-lines were carried for purposes of sounding (27^{28}), and possibly other instruments, such as windlasses; but the science of navigation in apostolic times was still in its infancy.

Most remarkable is the fact that before setting out to sea it was customary even among the Greeks and Romans to supplicate the protecting deities for a prosperous voyage (cf. Wis 14^{1}, Jon 1^{5}).

LITERATURE.—J. Smith, *The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*^{4}, 1880; A. Breusing, *Die Nautik der Alten*, 1886; J. Vars, *L'Art nautique dans l'antiquité et spécialement en Grèce, d'après A. Breusing*, 1887; H. Balmer, *Die Romfahrt des Apostels Paulus und die Seefahrtskunde im röm. Kaiserzeitalter*, 1905; Cecil Torr, *Ancient Ships*, 1894; A. Böckh, *Urkunden über das Seewesen des attischen Staates*, 1840; H. Guthe, art. 'Ships and Navigation' in *Standard Bible Dictionary*, 1909; M. A. Canney, art. 'Ship' in *EBi* iv.; F. H. Woods, art. 'Ships and Boats' in *SDB*; art. 'Ship' in Piercy's *Illustrated Bible Dictionary*, 1908; P. Watts, art. 'Ship' in *EBr*^{11} xxiv.; R. M. Blomfield, art. 'Ships and Boats' in *HDB* v.

GEORGE L. ROBINSON.

SHOE, SANDAL.—With one exception the references to shoes or sandals are all found in the Book of Acts. Two of these are quotations, one from Ex 3^{5} (Ac 7^{33}), and the other from the Gospels, Mt 3^{11}, Mk 1^{7}, Lk 3^{16}, and Jn 1^{27} (Ac 13^{25}). The latter gives scope for comparison, and raises a certain problem, which is discussed in *EBi*, *s.v.* 'Shoes.' Verbal differences are not sufficient to throw any light upon the kind of foot-covering worn. The two words found, ὑποδήματα and σανδάλια, do not appear to be distinctive, the one of 'shoes' and the other of 'sandals.' The former is found in all the passages cited above, while the latter appears only in Ac 12^{8}, conjoined with the verb from which ὑποδήματα is derived.

Although linguistic aids fail us, we may safely infer that both sandals and shoes were in common use during apostolic times. For the most part they were made by craftsmen, working with leather chiefly, although wood, cork, etc., were also employed. Simple and ornate forms were forthcoming. Sandals of the plain kind were mere coverings for the soles of the feet to save them from injury, especially during a journey. They were attached by thongs arranged in a variety of ways. In the more ornate forms sandals had an attachment at the toes, at the heels, and along the sides, not necessarily all found together. So long as the toes were in any measure visible the foot-covering might be said to be a pair of sandals. When the various attachments to the sole were closed in above, the transition to shoes was complete. The thong or latchet would appear to have been as necessary to shoes as to sandals. An exception to this would be the 'slipper,' best suited for indoor wear, being easy to put on and off. Another distinctive feature of shoes, as opposed to slippers, was the heel-covering. Boots in various forms were also known, but the descriptions are not very definite.

On the ground of Eph 6^{15} we are perhaps justified in referring to the Roman *caliga*, the foot-equipment of the common soldier at this time. It is usually taken to be a sandal of the strong order, with nails to prevent slipping, but, according to another view, it was really a shoe fitting closely to the foot above. Such foot-gear is supposed to be referred to in Josephus, *BJ* VI. i. 8, in which instance the nails failed in their purpose.

The practice of walking barefoot seems to have been restricted to slaves and the poorer classes; with others it was the custom only on certain occasions (*e.g.* mourning). Indoors it was usual to lay aside the shoes or sandals that had been worn abroad, and to go barefoot, and so when reclining at meals (cf. Jn $13^{4.5}$). In the Temple ceremonial also shoes were discarded. As appears from Ac 12^8, sandals were laid aside during sleep.

From 13^{51} we may infer that St. Paul and Barnabas had foot-wear of some sort, the symbolical action pointing to the dust which had collected underfoot. By detachment of the shoes this could be shaken out, and, assuming that the action is to be literally taken, it accords with the wearing of shoes rather than of sandals. W. CRUICKSHANK.

SHRINES.—See DIANA.

SIBYLLINE ORACLES.—At the close of the 5th (6th ?) cent. Gospel (cf. vol. i. p. 489) which is entitled *The History of Joseph the Carpenter*, the Saviour predicts that Antichrist will murder four persons and shed their blood like water, in revenge for their exposure of his evil policy. The apostles ask who these four persons are, and the Lord replies, 'They are Enoch, Elijah, Schila, and Tabitha.' 'Schila' has puzzled editors of this Arabic document. It is commonly taken as a man's name, and he has been identified with the NT 'Silas,' although there is no obvious reason either in the NT or in later tradition why Silas should be in such exalted company. E. Nestle (*ZNTW* xi. [1910] 240) suggests that he was the son of the widow of Nain; but this is pure conjecture, and Nestle's companion idea that 'Tabitha' represents the daughter of Jairus (Mk 5^{41}, *ταλειθά κούμ*) is a precarious support. Tabitha is certainly the woman of Joppa (Ac 9^{36-41}) whom St. Peter raised from the dead. In the Coptic Apocalypse of Elijah she encounters Antichrist, and in a fragment of some Sahidic apocalypse, quoted by Crum (*ZNTW* xii. [1911] 352), she is ranked with Enoch and Elijah as having entered heaven in the body. Crum further solves the problem of 'Schila' by noting that when the Arabic noun is pointed differently it becomes equivalent to 'Sibylla,' who is elsewhere associated with Enoch. This yields an excellent sense for the passage, two men being followed by two women.

But what is the Sibyl, a pagan figure, doing in this Christian connexion? How did she come to fill so strange a rôle? The answer to these questions is the subject of the present article.

The etymology of the word 'Sibyl' is a disputed point. (*a*) The oldest derivation is the attractive one given by Varro (quoted in Lact. *Div. Inst.* i. 6), that the term is a generic title for prophetesses, which comes from the Doric or Æolic *σιός*=*θεός*, and *βολλά* (*βούλλα*)=*βουλή*, *i.e.* 'the counsel of God.' (*b*) J. P. Postgate (*AJPh* iii. [1882] 333–334), unable to accept (*a*), since *σιός* is Laconian, not Æolic, and since the loss of an accented syllable is unlikely, prefers the roots *σιβ-υλο-γα* (the feminine suffix)='the wise (little) woman,' the suffix *-υλο* being used in a diminutive sense, and *σιβ-* being connected with *sap*, 'to be wise.' (*c*) The idea of wisdom is brought in by those philologists, like Max Müller (*Lectures on the Science of Language*, new ed., London, 1882, vol. i. p. 109), who connect *σιβ* with a primitive Italian *sabus* or *sabius*, 'wise'; but there is no trace of this Italian term as the origin of the diminutive, and 'Sibulla' does not seem to occur in any Italian dialect. (*d*) E. Hofmann (see below) accepts the first part of (*a*), but makes the word a composite from *σιός* and *ἵλλαος*=*ἵλαος* (*ἵλεως*), meaning 'God-appeasing,' or 'God-reconciling,' with reference to the aim of the primitive Sibylline oracles. Others find the thought of age dominant, and (*e*), like S. Krauss, derive it from *sib-il*, 'the ancient of God,' *sib* or *šib*='old,' and *-ιλ* as in *Βαβυλών*, for which the inscriptions furnish the form 'Bâb-il' (*Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, xi. [1902] 122), or (*f*), like H. Lewy in *Philologus*, lvii. [1898] 350 f., connect *σίβυλλα* with the Semitic (Aramaic) root of *sābᵉtā*, 'grandmother,' although this leaves the reduplication of the *β* unexplained. None of these, or of the other ancient and modern etymologies which have been proposed, is satisfactory. *Σίβιλλα* occurs as a woman's name in an Attic inscription from the 4th cent. B.C., but, while this suggests that Sibyl may have been a proper name to begin with, it is insufficient to prove that Sibyl was a Greek term, not an Oriental. Eventually the name was applied to any woman of prophetic gifts, according to Servius (on *Æn.* iii. 445: 'Sibylla . . . dicitur omnis puella cuius pectus numen recipit') and Suidas (*ἐνὶ ὀνόματι αἱ θηλεῖαι μάντιδες ὠνομάσθησαν Σιβύλλαι*). But originally it was restricted to a small class of prophetesses, whom we may call:

1. The classical Sibyl(s).—Towards the end of the 6th, or about the beginning of the 5th, cent. B.C., the foundation of the Capitoline temple in Rome was associated with the influence of Sibylline utterances and the infusion of Greek rites (*Græcus ritus*) into Roman religion. The origin of these was Eastern. During the 6th cent. 'Greece was not only full of Orphism and Pythagoreanism, but of floating oracular dicta believed to emanate from a mystic female figure, a weird figure of whom it is hard to say how far she was human or divine; and of whose origin we know nothing, except that her original home was, as we might expect, Asia Minor' (W. Warde Fowler, *The Religious Experience of the Roman People*, London, 1911, p. 257). This was the Sibyl. Like the Pythia, she was a woman, considered to be inspired by Apollo. Subsequently, she was supposed to be extremely old, on the principle, probably, that long experience added to her prophetic capacities. As time went on, her personality multiplied; in the 4th cent. B.C. Heraclides Ponticus, the historian, knew of three, and Varro reckoned as many as ten* Sibyls. Primitive tradition located the original Sibyl at Erythræ, but the most famous Sibyl resided at Cumæ, the old Greek settlement in Campania, though it is probable that the Sibylline oracles which came to Rome from Cumæ had reached the latter city from Erythræ.† The Roman collection, which legend linked to the reign of Tarquinius Superbus, perished in the Capitol fire of 83 B.C. But they had become too important for the purposes of religion to be lost, and a commission of three State officials replaced them by a fresh collection of a thousand verses, gathered from Erythræ, Samos, Ilium, Africa, Sicily, and elsewhere. Instructions were given that only genuine productions were to be admitted to this new edition of the *libri Sibyllini* or *libri fatales*.‡ But such precautions as were taken do not seem to have been more than partially successful. Oracles of this kind absorbed forgeries of a more or less political aim, and the authorized collection had to be purged from time to time. In 13 B.C. Augustus included this among his religious reforms, and Tiberius had to prevent an anonymous Sibylline book from being added to the list; the Emperor showed himself more sceptical than the *quindecimuiri sacris faciundis*,§ who were officially responsible for the interpretation of the oracles and for the application of their mysterious commands to the national life. In times of disaster and misfortune, or when prodigies occurred, the Romans turned to this sacred collection. Whatever measures it dictated—fasts, feasts, expiations, or the like—were carried out with trembling, anxious care, as during the panic roused by Hannibal's campaign in Northern Italy. The Sibylline collection met, or was skilfully manipulated to meet, the popular appetite for appeasing the supernatural, which prodigies and defeats created from time to time. These Roman oracles originally were not so much predictions of woes to come, like apocalyptic tracts, as explanations of what was required to avert the anger of the gods and ward off evil to the State on earth. They were not 'vaticinia' but 'remedia Sibyllina,' as Pliny puts it (*HN* xi. 35). They were also esoteric literature; the consent of the Senate was required before a line of their contents could be divulged to the general public. This put considerable power into the hands of the officials who had charge of them, especially as the obscurity of their contents made the sense of certain passages conveniently ambiguous, and it is not surprising to find that, as time went on, their reputation suffered in the same way as the Greek oracles; the Roman, like the Greek, *Sibyllina* might 'philippize'; genuine lines might be interpreted for private ends, if a political leader could influence the expositors, and forged lines could be surreptitiously introduced. Still, for two centuries at least, these oracles had a singular power over the religious hopes and fears of the people. An odd story like that preserved by Petronius[*] in the 1st cent. A.D. must not be allowed to count unduly against the esteem which was still felt for the oracles. But their influence was upon the wane. Thus, in A.D. 270, when the Alemanni invaded Italy, the Senate hesitated to consult the *Sibyllina*, and Aurelian had to incite them (Vopiscus, *Vita Aureliani*, 20); the Emperor taunted them with behaving as if they were in a Christian church—a significant indication of the changed attitude towards these oracles! Their use lingered down to the age of Julian. Then the Christian reaction proved fatal to them, and Stilicho is said to have burned the entire official collection at the beginning of the 5th century. His action was bitterly resented, as we can see from the indignant verses of Rutilius Numantianus, but the protest did not affect the fact; Stilicho's action had made it impossible for the authorities to appeal in future to this ancient relic of pagan divination.[†]

---

* The variant tradition of nine reached Shakespeare. The Bastard in *King Henry VI.* (pt. i. act i. scene ii. lines 55–57), describing Joan of Arc, says:

> 'The spirit of deep prophecy she hath,
> Exceeding the nine sibyls of old Rome:
> What's past and what's to come she can descry.'

† Cf. Emmanuel Hofmann's paper on 'Die tarquinischen Sibyllen-bücher' in *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, new ser., l. [1895] 90–113.

‡ According to some recent critics, *e.g.* F. Kampers (in *Histor. Zeitschrift*, 1908, p. 252 f.), the new harvest of *Sibyllina* included some Jewish Alexandrian productions, which influenced Vergil. See, further, J. B. Mayor's paper in the *Exp.* 7th ser. iii. [1907] 289 ff.

§ When his patron's son was elected to this board of officials, Tibullus (ii. 5) wrote a poem for the occasion, in which he invokes Phœbus Apollo, under whose guidance 'the Sibyl has never played the Romans false, singing Fate's secrets in hexameters' (15 f.).

Besides the official collection, however, Sibylline oracles passed current in large numbers among the people. Lactantius, who has preserved several important data on the subject, declares that only the Cumæan Sibyl's oracles, amounting to three books, were kept secret,[‡] while the writings of the other Sibyls for the most part circulated freely. It is true, as we have seen, that the very diffusion of such verses led to the partial discrediting of the entire literature as a religious authority of impartial value, but long before this shadow fell upon the *Sibyllina* at Rome the Hellenistic Jews of Alexandria had taken advantage of the current Sibylline verse as a literary *genre* and started a new, ingenious development of the method.

2. The Jewish Sibylline oracles.—We come upon Jewish Sibylline oracles before we hear of a Jewish Sibyl. The latter is first mentioned by Alexander Polyhistor, the Greek author of Χαλδαϊκά, in the 1st cent. B.C., who quotes what is apparently an oracle still extant in *Sib. Orac.* iii. 97 ff. It is necessary to say 'apparently,' for serious doubts have been thrown recently upon Alexander's indebtedness to a Jewish source; both Geffcken[*] and Bousset[†] prefer to find traces of a Babylonian (Greek) Sibylline oracle, and Schürer's criticism of this theory does not succeed in ruling it out of court. The exact relations between the Jewish Sibyl and the Chaldæan have not yet been cleared up. Pausanias vouches for four Sibyls, the Erythræan Herophile, the Cumæan Demo, a Libyan prophetess, and 'subsequent to Demo, an oracular woman among the Hebrews, named Sabbe; Berosus is said to have been the father, Erymanthes the mother, of Sabbe. Some call her the Babylonian, others the Egyptian Sibyl' (x. 12). A later variant for 'Sabbe' is 'Sambethe,' which is variously explained. But among these uncertainties the fact shines clear, that by the 2nd cent. B.C. the literary method of the Sibylline oracles had been exploited by one or more Jewish authors at Alexandria, in the interests of religious apologetic and propaganda. Like the older Philo, Theodotus, and possibly the author of the pseudo-Phocylidæan verses, the Jews who composed these Sibylline oracles of their own could write Greek hexameters.[‡] They chose this pagan form in order not only to convey threats of doom against persecuting powers like Assyria and Rome, but also to win a hearing among outside circles for their own monotheism and moralism. Why should not the Sibyl, this recognized exponent of Divine things, voice the true inspiration of Israel as well as the secondary revelation of the nations? Why should not this authoritative channel convey the living water of Jewish truth, or rather of truth as only the Jews knew it? And so this form of pseudonymous literature came into vogue.[§]

But the vogue did not last very long. The same fate befell the Sibylline oracles of Judaism that befell the apocalypses; their popularity with the early Christian Church appears to have thrown them out of favour with the officials of Rabbinic Judaism.[‖] The Church appropriated them, appealed to them, edited them in her own interests, composed fresh ones, and, in general, treated the Jewish Sibylline oracles much as the Alexandrian Jews had treated the pagan ones. It is true that the composition of Jewish Sibyllines continued sporadically till the reign of Marcus Aurelius at any rate, and even later. But the extant collection is due to Christians, and one of the intricate problems of this literature is to determine how far Christians have edited sources which were originally Jewish. As in the case of the apocalypses, the criteria are far from being satisfactory. The Sibylline oracles are a conglomerate of documents, ranging from the 2nd cent. B.C. to the middle of the 7th cent. A.D. Some sections (*e.g.* the earliest, in bk. iii.) are evidently Jewish, others as evidently Christian; but large passages seem to show no distinct soil in one or the other religion. Some of them are not definitely pre-Christian, and even those that are to be dated in the Christian era may be Jewish compositions worked over by a Christian hand.

---

[*] His drunken hero, Trimalchio (*Satyricon*, 48), alleges, 'I once saw with my own eyes the Sibyl hanging in a cage at Cumæ, and when the boys called to her, "Sibyl, what do you want?" she replied, "I want to die."'

[†] On the whole subject, see G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, Munich, 1902, pp. 462–475, and W. Buchholz's article in Roscher, pp. 790–813, with the penetrating discussion in A. Bouché-Leclercq's *Histoire de la divination dans l'antiquité*, 4 vols., Paris, 1879–81, ii. 199 f.

[‡] Justin (*Apol.* i. 44) denounces this as a device of evil demons, to prevent men from reading evidence for the truth of God!

[*] In his 'Komposition und Entstehungszeit der Oracula Sibyllina' (*TU* xxiii. 1 [1902] 2 f.).

[†] In an essay in E. Preuschen's *ZNTW* iii. [1902] 23–49.

[‡] 'The language of prophecy naturally assumes a metrical or rhythmical form, partly as an aid to the memory, partly, perhaps, as a means of giving to the words uttered the effect of a more solemn intonation' (W. Y. Sellar, *Roman Poets of the Republic*, Oxford, 1905, p. 34); cf. *ERE* iv. 798^{a}.

[§] Cf. A. Hilgenfeld's *Jüdische Apokalyptik*, Jena, 1857, p. 51 f.; Ewald's *Abhandlung über Entstehung, Inhalt, und Werth der sibyllinischen Bücher*, Göttingen, 1858; B. W. Badt's essay *De oraculis sibyllinis a Judæis compositis*, Breslau, 1869; and J. Lieger's *Die jüdische Sibylle, griechisch und deutsch mit erklärenden Anmerkungen*, Vienna, 1908; in addition to the prefaces of critical editors like Alexandre and Friedlieb. The bulk of bk. iii. goes back to the 2nd cent. B.C.; nuclei seem to gather round 170 B.C. and 140 B.C.

[‖] Even Josephus only once refers to the *Sibyllina*, to the oracle of iii. 97 f. about the tower of Babel (*Ant.* i. 4).

An instance of the difficulty of deciding whether a passage of the *Sibyllina* was written by a Jew or by a Christian is afforded by the first of the fragments which Theophilus of Antioch has preserved (*ad Autol.* ii. 36):

'O mortal men of flesh, mere things of nought,
How quick your pride, regardless of life's end!
Have ye no fear of God, who knows each thought,
Who sees all, rules all,[*] who doth all transcend,
Nourishing all he made, and in all men
Sets the sweet[†] Spirit to direct their ways?
One God there is, Lord above mortal ken,
Unborn, alone in power, from mortal gaze
Hidden himself, who yet beholdeth all.
The immortal God no eye of flesh can view,
Who dwells above, the heavenly God, the true;
For mortal nerves will weakly flinch and fall
Even before the sun's refulgent ball.[‡]
Ah, worship him who o'er the world holds sway,
Unborn, eternal, self-created Being,
Sustaining Lord, who in our common day[§]
Assigns to mortals each the power of seeing.[‖]
Bitterly for ill error shall ye pay,
For all forsaking of his altars true,
For hecatombs and offerings ye lay
On altars of dead idols as their due.
Besotted, proud, ye left the straight highway
To wander blindly among thorns: ah, cease,
Cease, oh ye foolish men, to roam astray,
From darkness and black night seek ye release,
Lay hold upon the Light,[¶] unerring, clear,
For all to mark his presence now and here.
Turn not for ever to the murky night:
When lo the sun's sweet rays are shining bright!
Be wise of heart, be wise and understand:
There is one God, who sends upon the land
The rain, the wind, the lightning and the might
Of earthquake, famine, pestilence, and woe,
Sad woe that weighs the heart, the hail, the snow,—
All,[**] all are his, who reigns over his own,
Sovereign of heaven and earth himself alone.'

A passage like this breathes so much of the monotheistic moralism which was common to Orphism, Judaism, and Christianity that we have no definite criteria for assigning it to either a Jewish or a Christian Sibyllinist; either might have written it, subordinating his dogmatic idiosyncrasies to the need of preserving the dramatic probabilities of the situation. The spirit of the piece is deliberately neutral. On the other hand, there can be no doubt with regard to a passage like this from bk. iii. 263 ff., which describes the fortunes of the twelve tribes:

'To them alone a hundred fold the field
Bears harvest, and God's measures ample yield.
Yet even they shall fare amiss, even they
Shall suffer pestilence. Thou,[††] far away
From thy fair shrine shalt flee, for 'tis thy fate
To leave thy sacred soil all desolate;
Borne to Assyria, thou shalt there behold
Thy wives and children into slavery sold,
And greedy hands despoiling all thy gold.
Thou shalt fill every country, every sea,
And at thy customs all shall angry be.[‡‡]
But thy land shall be empty, down shall fall
The great God's shrine and altar, the long wall,
Since God immortal thou would'st not obey,
But from his holy law didst swerve and stray,
Since wretched idols were thy heart's desire,
Careless in reverence for the immortal Sire
Of gods and men, who worship doth require.
Wherefore thy wondrous shrine, ~~thy~~ fruitful land
For seventy years[*] untouched by thee shall stand.
Yet at the end shall bliss and glory great
Be thine, as God has ordered: only wait . . .'

We have thus three strata in the medley of the extant *Sibyllina*: (1) the pagan (Greek or Babylonian) oracles, which came into the hands of Jews and eventually of Christians. It is one of the many services rendered to the criticism of the oracles by Geffcken, their latest editor, that he has distinguished more fully than any of his predecessors the presence of such outside sources throughout the collection; even although the evidence is occasionally unsatisfactory, there can be little doubt that the later Jewish and Christian Sibyllinists made more use of these surviving fragments than scholars formerly were disposed to admit;[†] (2) the Jewish Sibyllines, rising in Alexandria not long after the invasion of Egypt by Antiochus Epiphanes in 171–169 B.C. The literary method was to imitate[‡] the pagan oracles, for the purpose of persuading or threatening the Gentiles, but occasionally fragments of them were incorporated as the nucleus of a fresh composition, and more or less edited for their new setting; (3) the Christian Sibyllines, which followed the same path in dealing with their predecessors. Fresh oracles were composed, old ones were recast and Christianized. It was the Jewish composers who gave the lead to Christian in this literary method, as in the apocalyptic department of pseudepigrapha, and the production of occasional Jewish oracles went on side by side with the Christian activity, even after the Pharisaic reaction and re-organization of Judaism had eschewed the Sibyllines. But we must now turn to the third of the strata. It is the most important for our present purpose, not simply because it is Christian, but because the final editing of the oracles, as we have them, was the work of Christians.[§]

3. The Christian Sibyl.—In the early Christian literature we hear of the Sibyl before we hear of Sibylline oracles. The so-called allusions in Clement of Rome are dubious, but Hermas (*Vis.* II. iv.) mentions her. Justin (*Apol.* i. 20) quotes her, along with Hystaspes, to prove that the world would be destroyed by fire, and the author of pseudo-Justin's *Cohortatio ad Græcos* (16), not earlier than the end of the 2nd or the beginning of the 3rd cent., not only quotes her as a primeval witness to monotheism, but (37) describes her shrine at Cumæ: 'You will also be able easily to learn the right religion, to some extent, from the ancient Sibyl, who, under a powerful inspiration, teaches you by her oracles what seems closely akin to the doctrine of the prophets. She is said to have come from Babylon, her father being Berosus, who wrote the history of Chaldæa; after crossing over, somehow, to Campania, she uttered her oracles in a town called Cumæ, six miles from Baiæ, the site of the hot springs of Campania.

---

[*] τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ὑμῶν, almost in the sense of Wis 1^6 (=*scrutator*) or 1 P 2^{25} ('overseer').

[†] As below (p. 485) in bk. vi. Blass prefers to render, 'who set the sweet breath of life in everything, and made man director of all things.'

[‡] This ancient argument is applied in the *Epistle of Barnabas* (v. 9 f.) to the Incarnation specifically: 'He manifested Himself as God's Son. For, had He not come in the flesh, how could men ever have been saved by beholding Him, since they are unable to gaze directly at the rays of the sun, which is destined to perish and is the work of His hands?'

[§] ἐν φαῒ κοινῷ, a frequent phrase in the *Sibyllina*.

[‖] *i.e.*, apparently, of recognizing Himself. But κριτήριον is difficult in this sense. To take it as meaning that God constantly judges men in the present, not simply in the future, is a possible, though less probable, alternative.

[¶] If this alludes to Christ, the authorship is plain. To take it as a reference to the sun is possible, but less likely. The same difficulty emerges in the interpretation of iii. 95 f.

[**] Literally, 'why detail each one by one?'—a common phrase of the Sibyl, in breaking off a list.

[††] Suddenly apostrophizing the Jewish people.

[‡‡] The well-known anti-Semitic prejudice which echoes through Latin literature. See H. Strong's paragraphs in *HJ* xiii. [1915] 306 f.; he points out how, *e.g.*, the Jewish objection to pork must have irritated Romans, as pork was their favourite animal food.

[*] From Jer 25^{12}.

[†] See below, p. 486. In viii. 361, 373, two lines are quoted from a Delphic oracle which happens to be preserved by Herodotus (i. 47). Hermas (see below) hears terrible news from his Sibyl, followed by gentle, gracious promises, and Rendel Harris (*The Homeric Centones*, London, 1898, p. 15 f.) conjectures that the former were 'an intimation of the impending ruin of Rome, something like what we find in the eighth book of the *Sibylline Oracles*.' But this would be Jewish. The couplet in iv. 97–98 is indubitably pagan; Strabo quotes it as such.

[‡] 'The pseudo-oracular,' as F. W. H. Myers puts it, 'is a style which has in all ages been cultivated with success' (*Hellenica*^{2}, London, 1898, p. 411).

[§] A good statement of the problem is to be found in Harnack's *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur*, I. i. [Leipzig, 1893] 861 ff., II. i. [do., 1897] 581 f., ii. [do., 1904] 184 f.

When I was in that town, I saw a spot where I was shown a huge basilica cut out of a single block—an extraordinary and most marvellous object. According to those who had the local tradition from their fathers, it was there that she used to put forth her oracles. In the middle of the basilica I was shown three openings cut out of the same block, in which, when filled with water, she was said to have bathed; after which she would resume her robe, retire to the inner shrine of the basilica (still cut out of the same block), and in the middle of the chamber, seated on a high platform and throne, put forth her oracles.' He then argues that Plato must have had this Sibyl in his mind when he described in the *Phædrus* (244B) and the *Meno* (99C) the phenomena of prophetic frenzy or rapture, since the Sibyl did not recollect afterwards what she had said during her unconscious ecstasies.* This Christian author also shares the view of Pausanias (see above) about the parentage of the Sibyl; but for our immediate purpose it is more relevant to note his appeal to her teaching on morality and monotheism. The appeal is by no means characteristic of him alone. It represents a widespread attitude, and from it there developed a Christian Sibylline literature. Christians, especially Christian apologists of the 2nd cent. like Theophilus of Antioch and Clement of Alexandria, were content to upbraid the degenerate and immoral paganism of the age by holding up the purer conceptions of the ancient Sibyl, but others were attracted to the predictions and threats of the Sibylline prophecies, which seemed so analogous to the apocalyptic tracts of the Church. It was the latter interest that first started the independent composition of Sibylline verses by Christians, probably on quite a small scale. Celsus, *e.g.*, taunts Christians on two grounds, in this connexion; they were 'Sibyllists,' he urged, with their belief in the existence of a prophetic Sibyl and their appeal to her oracular authority (Orig. *c. Cels.* v. 61), and they dared to interpolate these ancient sources with impious lines of their own (vii. 53: *νῦν δὲ παρεγγράφειν μὲν εἰς τὰ ἐκείνης πολλὰ καὶ βλάσφημα εἰκῇ δύνασθε*). It was not difficult to slip in a Christian line or alter a phrase, any more than in the case of the apocalypses of Judaism. Then came the full-blown production of such oracles by writers of the Church, partly to justify the ways of Providence, partly to enforce Christian predictions and threats, partly even to disseminate Christian doctrines. Once the fabrication of *Sibyllina* started, it went on from modest interpretations of a line or two to fresh pieces. The sustaining force in the composition of such oracles was drawn from the popular passion, in several Christian circles, for their pagan and Jewish prototypes. The ingenuity of Sibylline composers and the credulity of many simple Christians combined to produce our present collection.

One remarkable proof of the prestige gained by the Sibylline oracles of paganism in certain corners of the Church during the 2nd cent. is afforded by an incidental allusion in Clement of Alexandria, which proves that some Pauline apocryphon claimed the authority of the Apostle for the Divine testimony of these primeval predictions. In the sixth book of the *Stromata* (ch. 5), arguing that the Greeks had some knowledge of the true God, Clement declares:

> 'From the Hellenic discipline and also from the legal [*i.e.* the Jewish] discipline, those who accept faith are gathered into the one race of the saved People—not that the three peoples are separated chronologically, but that they are disciplined in different covenants of the one Lord [and instructed?] by the word of the one Lord. As it was God's will to save the Jews by giving them prophets, so he raised up the most notable of the Greeks themselves to be prophets in their own tongue, as they were able to receive the divine bounty, and thus separated them from the vulgar crowd. This will be clear from *The Preaching of Peter* and also from the words of the Apostle Paul: "Take the Greek books, read the Sibyl, see how the unity of God and the course of the future are shown there. Take and read Hystaspes, and you will find the Son of God far more luminously and plainly described, and how many kings will array themselves against the Christ, hating him and those who bear his name, his faithful ones, his patience and his coming."'

Unfortunately Clement does not name this Pauline document, and nothing corresponding to his quotation has turned up yet in any surviving fragments of the *Acta Pauli*. But the Alexandrian apologist's attitude brings out one distinctive feature in the Christian *Sibyllina*. For all their common appeal to the pagan Sibyl or Sibyls, there was one difference between the procedure of the Jewish Sibyllinists and the Christian. The former often took pains to construct a Sibyl of their own; she spoke Greek, and spoke to Greeks, but she was of Hebrew birth. She repudiates her sisters of Erythræ and Cumæ. 'Mortals throughout Hellas will call me foreign, sprung from Erythræ, and shameless; some will say I am the Sibyl whose mother was Circe and whose father was Gnostos, a raving maniac. But when all these things come to pass, then you will remember me, and none will then call me mad, but the prophetess of mighty God' (iii. 813–818; cf. iv. 1–23). The Sibyl, like Cassandra, has to prophesy to an incredulous generation. But she is of Hebrew origin, or at any rate of Babylonian. Traditions vary on her birth; in some quarters she appears to have been connected with Noah (iii. 827, 'I was his daughter-in-law'), but it was at any rate essential to safeguard the origin of one who not only denounced idolatry but glorified the Jewish people, and there was a tendency to identify her, in one or other of her Oriental forms, with Hebrew story. The Christian Sibyllinists, on the other hand, took over the pagan Sibyl or Sibyls. Their theory of Divine inspiration working in the past outside Israel—an outcome of the finer conception of the Logos, as held by the apologists—enabled them to dispense with the construction of a new figure. It would have been much more difficult for them, in any case, to produce a Sibyl for themselves than it had been for the Hellenistic Jews of an earlier age.* The Christian Sibyl is therefore a voice rather than a figure; she is rarely so dramatic and definite as the Jewish Sibyl, except when she is made to repent of her pagan vices (see below).

The only exception to this may be found in the pages of that second-rate Bunyan of the 2nd cent., Hermas. He makes his hero receive a book of revelations from an old woman, whom he takes to be the Sibyl. But he is told in a vision that it is the Church; the Church is old, because she was created first of all things (*Vis.* i.–ii.). This would be all the more dramatic if the setting of the vision were Cumæ.† Whether Hermas added this graphic touch or not, he certainly took over the figure of the aged Sibyl and re-shaped it as the Church, in order to suggest a medium for moral precepts and eschatological predictions. It is one of the daring touches in this religious romance, but later writers of the Church went on another line when they appropriated the Sibyl. They preferred to leave her in the far mists of Greek antiquity as an incontrovertible witness to God's presence and purpose among the nations of pre-Christian paganism. From that coign of vantage she pours out reproof and threatening. She has little or no dramatic rôle of an independent kind, till we turn aside to some corners of Egyptian Christianity,[*] where, as we saw at the beginning of this article, apocalyptic fantasy set her among the final opponents of Antichrist, among the four witnesses to Christ who herald His overthrow of death and evil. A conception of this kind could arise only in a popular Christianity which was face to face with sterner exigencies than those of the age of Hermas; but it represented the normal Christian attitude to the Sibyl as little as did Hermas. What the Church valued primarily in the Sibyl was her rhapsodies, not any actions or sufferings. She was a voice in the wilderness, and it was to the oracles which she was supposed to have voiced that Christians turned for confirmation of their hopes and beliefs.

---

* In the Sibylline oracles, the Sibyl is passive or reluctant under the influence of inspiration. This tallied with some Jewish and Christian conceptions of prophetic inspiration.

* The traits remained the same: (*a*) the Sibyl was a woman; (*b*) her inspiration was ecstatic and frenzied; (*c*) she spoke in hexameters, the ordinary metrical mould for religious oracles (Plutarch, *De Pyth. Orac.* 9, says she was nourished by the Muses on Helicon); and (*d*) she was very old. The last point was sharpened for Jews and Christians. If the Sibyl was already in the far past, when Heracleitus heard of her towards the end of the 6th cent. B.C., how much more remote she would be to Hellenistic Judaism and early Christianity!

† 'I was on my way,' says Hermas, *εἰς κώμας* (MSS); most editors alter this to *εἰς Κούμας*.

A number of prominent early Christian Fathers ignore the Sibyl, but none of those who mention or quote her feel any need of defending this procedure. The ordinary assumption is that she is a reliable prophetess of the truth, and that her predictions of Christ and Christianity are as authentic in their own way as the prophecies of the OT. Tertullian[†] voices the general opinion when he calls her 'ueri uera uates.' The first indication of any real[‡] scepticism on the part of Christians occurs in the 4th cent. oration of Constantine, *ad Sanct. coetum* (18 f.). Though the speaker quotes the Sibylline oracles as a telling proof, from paganism, of the Divine origin and nature of Christ, he feels obliged to give reasons for the faith that is in him: the reasons are weaker than the faith, but the significant thing is that evidently he could not count upon an unquestioning acceptance of the oracles as inspired by God in pre-Christian Greece. He argues in this way:

> 'The Erythræan Sibyl, who declares that she lived in the sixth generation after the flood,[§] was a priestess of Apollo; she wore the sacred fillet in imitation of him whom she served, and guarded the tripod round which the serpent coiled; she answered those who consulted her, as her parents in their folly had devoted her to this service—a service which produced not solemn results but unseemly passions, such as are told of Daphne. However, she once swept into the shrine of that obnoxious superstition and, really filled this time with the Divine inspiration, foretold in words the Divine plan for the future, plainly disclosing the story of the descent of Jesus by the initial letters of the lines—which form an acrostic.' He proceeds to quote the acrostic (see below), adding: 'Obviously a divine impulse inspired the maiden to foretell this. For my part, I consider her blessed who was thus chosen by the Saviour to be a prophetess of his gracious thought for us. But many people are sceptical; they allow that the Erythræan Sibyl was a seer, but they suspect that it was someone belonging to our religion, not unacquainted with the art of poetry, who composed these lines; they think they are a forgery and that they are alleged to be oracles of the Sibyl because they contain salutary moral precepts which curb sensuous indulgence and promote a sober, orderly life. It is impossible, however, to mistake the real facts of the case, for our own members have been at pains to calculate the time with care, so that no one need suspect this poem was written after the arrival and the condemnation (*κάθοδον καὶ κρίσιν*) of Christ or that the current view of their previous composition by the Sibyl is inaccurate.'

He then appeals to the evidence of Cicero in the *de Divin.* ii. 54—a singularly maladroit appeal, for Cicero did not translate this acrostic[*] into Latin, and in fact used the acrostic form of the Sibylline verses to disprove the assertion that the Sibyl spoke in ecstatic frenzy; acrostics, as he observed, are not the product of a frenzied intellect, pouring out impromptu inspiration. Eusebius, or whoever wrote this speech for the Emperor, felt, however, that the *Sibyllina* afforded too telling a proof of Christianity to be surrendered. The uncritical spirit prevailed over the doubts of more intelligent Christians and the ridicule poured by pagans on this manufactured product. The *Sibyllina* were read, and they continued to be written.

From what has been said, it will be gathered that no Sibylline oracles of Christian origin are contemporary with the Apostolic Age. We do not possess any definite evidence as to the period when such compositions began to appear in Christian circles, apart from the insertion of lines here and there in extant Jewish oracles, which preceded independent Sibylline composition. But it can hardly have been much, if at all, earlier than the end of the 2nd cent. that the Church's interest in the Sibyl became creative. All the sections which are specifically Christian, in the present collection, are quite post-apostolic; some may be earlier than the 3rd cent., but none has a sure claim to be reckoned as belonging to the 2nd century. The result is that we are left with the paradox that those Sibylline oracles which, strictly speaking, are relevant to this Dictionary are all of Jewish origin, *i.e.* the familiar oracles embedded in books iii.–v. especially, illustrating the apocalyptic and eschatological traditions[†] which operated in some circles of contemporary piety. These Jewish oracles the present writer does not propose to discuss. They are accessible, and for the most part intelligible, thanks to the research which for over a century has been devoted to this branch of our subject.[‡] It is the rest of the Sibyllines which are unfamiliar to the ordinary student, even of Church history; they are not easily accessible, and they are by no means clear, but they represent so curious and baffling a phase of early Christian literature and popular feeling, on its romantic side, that it will be of some service even to call attention to the problems which they still contain, and to the phenomena of their origin. In surveying these *Sibyllina* we enter a by-way of early Christian literature, but it is a by-way which, like that of the uncanonical gospels, though never to the same extent, was once thronged and popular.

In Geffcken's standard edition of the text (see Literature), apart from a prose prologue and some brief, scattered fragments, the extant collection contains fourteen books. Nothing from the ninth and tenth has been preserved, but the other twelve amount to 4146 lines (400, 347, 829, 192, 531, 28, 162, 500, 324, 299, 173, 361), and there are some obvious lacunæ in the text. The present form of the collection probably goes back in the main to the anonymous Byzantine Greek who wrote the

---

[*] Vergil, of course, had already begun to set the Cumæan Sibyl in motion. She is more to him than a seer who is consulted. She conducts Æneas to the world of the dead, just as she does in Ovid.

[†] *Ad Nationes*, ii. 12: 'Ante enim Sibylla quam omnis litteratura exstitit. Illa scilicet Sibylla, ueri uera uates, et cuius uocabula dæmoniorum uatibus induistis. Ea senario uersu in hunc sensum de Saturni prosapia et rebus eius exponit.' The description recurs in the passage inserted by Codex Fuldensis in *Apol.* 19, but the authenticity of the addition is doubtful (cf. R. Heinze's *Tertullians Apologeticum*, Leipzig, 1910, p. 385 f.).

[‡] Origen's answer to Celsus is weak, and he never uses the Sibyl in his proofs of revelation. But he does not pronounce against the *Sibyllina*. Lactantius (*Div. Inst.* iv. 15. 26) takes much the same line of defence as Constantine.

[§] In bk. i. 283 f. the Sibyl distinctly says she belonged to the sixth generation after Adam!

[*] The Sibylline oracle he mentions advised the Romans 'eum quem re vera regem habebamus, appellandum quoque esse regem, si salui esse vellemus.' The Parthians could be conquered only by a 'king.' Therefore, as this adroit partisan of Cæsar put it in his oracle, let that title be given to Cæsar.

[†] *E.g.* the belief in *Nero redivivus* or at any rate *redux*, which echoes through bks. iv., v., and viii., and which sounds behind the Apocalypse of John.

[‡] Besides the translations mentioned in the Literature (below), the English reader will find critical discussions in S. Krauss's article (*JE* xi. 319–323), W. J. Deane's *Pseudepigrapha*, London, 1891, pp. 276–344, Bousset's article in the Eng. tr. of Herzog (vol. x. pp. 396–400), J. H. Lupton's art. in Smith's *DCB* iv. 644–649, a paper by S. A. Hirsch in the *JQR* ii. [1890] 406–429, and —for the religious ideas—James Drummond's *Philo Judæus*, 2 vols., London, 1888, i. 167 ff., and R. H. Charles, in *EBi* i. 245–250.

prologue some time in the course of the 6th century. This prologue is a rough piece of work. It repeats some current legends about the Sibyl and Sibylline oracles, but its structure is loose. This may be due to later interpolations, or the text may have suffered at the hands of scribes. Even so, however, it shows more goodwill than critical ability in the writer. He is a simple, credulous Christian, who undertakes the literary task of collecting and arranging the *Sibyllina* because he desires to aid Christian piety. The contents of the prologue are as follows:

> ‘If toil spent on reading Greek books yields rich profit to those who labour at it, inasmuch as it has the power of making scholars of those who toil thus, it is far more fitting for the rightminded to devote themselves at all times to the divine scriptures, inasmuch as they treat of God and of what issues in spiritual profit; this yields a twofold gain, for people can thereby profit themselves and also those whom they come across. Hence it was that I myself resolved to take the oracles which are called Sibylline, and which are to be found here and there, read in confusion and indistinctly understood, and to publish them in connected and orderly form, so that they may be readily grasped by the reader and yield him their profit (for they contain no small amount of what is essential and useful), thus rendering the study of them at once more rich and varied. For they impart clear information about the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, the divine and life-imparting trinity, as well as about the incarnation of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ, about his birth from a pure virgin, about the cures performed by him, likewise about his life-giving Passion and his resurrection from the dead on the third day, about the judgment to come and the recompense for what we all have done in this life. Besides, they treat clearly of what is disclosed in the writings of Moses and the books of the prophets about the creation of the world, the formation of man, the expulsion from paradise, and the re-forming;[*] they foretell what has taken place, and perhaps what is to take place, in various ways. In a word, they can be of no small service to those who come across them.
>
> “Sibyl” is a Roman term, meaning prophetess or seer; hence female seers were called by this single name. There were Sibyls, as many writers tell us, in different ages and localities, to the number of ten; first, the Chaldæan or Persian, whose proper name was Sambethe, belonging to the race of the most blessed Noah, and said to have foretold the events connected with Alexander the Macedonian; she is mentioned by Nicanor the biographer of Alexander. Second, the Libyan sibyl, mentioned by Euripides in the prologue to the *Lamia*. Third, the Delphic, born at Delphi, of whom Chrysippus speaks in his book upon the deity (divination?). Fourth, the Italian sibyl of Cimmeria in Italy, the mother of Evander, who founded the shrine of Pan in Rome called the Lupercal. Fifth, the Erythræan sibyl, who predicted the Trojan war; Apollodorus the Erythræan vouches for her. Sixth, the Samian sibyl, whose proper name was Phyto; Eratosthenes has written of her. Seventh, the Cumæan sibyl called Amalthea and also Herophile, by some Taraxandra; Vergil [*Æn.* vi. 36] calls the Cumæan sibyl Deiphobe, the daughter of Glaucus. Eighth, the Hellespontine sibyl, born at the village of Marpessus near the town of Gergition, in the district of the Troad, during the days of Solon and Cyrus, as Heraclides Ponticus writes. Ninth, the Phrygian, and tenth, the Tiburtine sibyl, called Albunea.[†]
>
> The story goes that the Cumæan sibyl brought nine books of her own oracles to Tarquinius Priscus, who was then king of the Roman State, asking three hundred pounds for them. As she was treated with contempt and not even asked what their contents were, she committed three of them to the flames. On her next visit to the king, she brought the six books and demanded the same price for them, but was treated with disdain, and burned other three. Following this up with a third visit, she brought the remaining three and asked the same price for them, declaring that if she did not get it she would burn them also. Then the king—so the story goes—read them, and in astonishment gave her a hundred pounds for them and demanded the rest of the books; she reported that she had none equivalent to what had been burnt and that no such oracles were attainable apart from ecstasy, but that certain persons in various towns and localities had received oracles which they judged essential and profitable, and that a collection of these should be made. This was done speedily. What God had given in secret did not escape notice. The books of all the sibyls were deposited in the Capitol in ancient Rome, those of the sibyl of Cumæ being kept secret and not communicated to the people, as they announced rather specifically and distinctly what was to happen in Italy; the other books were made known to all. The predictions of the Erythræan sibyl have the local name prefixed to them, whereas the others have no indication of their origin, but lie mixed up together.
>
> Now Firmianus,[‡] a philosopher of no small repute and a priest of the aforesaid Capitol, opened his eyes to Christ, our eternal light, and in his writings set forth what had been said by the sibyls about the unspeakable Glory, and thereby refuted with effect the folly of the Greek error. His powerful explanation was in the Ausonian tongue, whereas the Sibylline verses were in the Greek language. Lest this should be deemed incredible, I shall bring forward the following evidence from the man who has just been mentioned.[*] (Since the Sibyllines current among us are despised as common by those who understand Greek topics—what is uncommon being only counted of any value—and since people are the slower to believe in them as the lines do not all observe the accurate laws of metre, this latter is not the fault of the prophetess but of those who took them down, either because they could not keep up with the rush of what was said, or because they were uneducated;[†] as for the prophetess, her memory of what she had said ceased with the period of ecstasy. This was what Plato[‡] had in mind when he wrote that many important things were accomplished by those who did not know what they were saying.) “So I shall quote as much as possible from the oracles brought to Rome by the envoys. The following was written of the supreme God:
>
> One God, who rules alone, almighty, uncreated . . .
> One God there is alone, high over all, who made
> the heaven, the sun and stars and moon,
> the fruitful earth, the swellings of the sea;
> he only is Creator God, all-strong,
> he fixed our mould of being, and ’twas he
> blended the nature of each human life.”
>
> Which means either that when human beings come together, they become one flesh with the Father, or that he fashioned man and the world under heaven out of the four elements which are opposed to one another.’

There is a close affinity between this prologue and a ‘theosophy’ of the 5th cent. (474–491), which originally contained seven books ‘on the orthodox faith,’ employing the Sibylline oracles amongst other pagan sources to illustrate Christian doctrine. In a fragment recently discovered by Karl Mras (‘Eine neuentdeckte Sibyllen-Theosophie,’ *Wiener Studien*, xxviii. [1906] 43–83), the author appears to have drawn his quotation from Lactantius in part, but he had not our extant Sibylline collection before him, and Mras conjectures that the author of our prologue borrowed from this ‘theosophy.’ There is nothing in the prologue to contradict this view; it is a dishevelled piece of writing, and neither original nor reliable. However the compiler made up his collection, its condition does not increase our respect for his literary capacities. What his ideas of connexion and order may have been, we have no means of telling. The arrangement of the following oracles is not chronological—possibly we have no right to expect that—but it is not even topical. The least unsatisfactory method of dealing with the materials will be to survey rapidly each book in the sequence of the collection.

Bks. i. and ii. form a unity, but they are not by any means the earliest part of the collection, and it is almost certain that they represent a Jewish basis overlaid by Christian additions at several points. They appear to have been unknown to early Christian writers; the first echo occurs in the *Oratio ad sanct. coetum* (18 = *Sib.* i. 283 f.), which is attributed to Constantine. This does not militate against H. Dechent’s view[§] that the Jewish piece which he disentangles from i. 1–323, ii. 6–33, 154–178, 185–189, 193–241, 253–311, 314–325 (327) was composed before the fall of Jerusalem, but it does tell against any early date [*] for the Christian editing. In bk. i. the Sibyl describes the Creation and the Flood, and then, in genuinely prophetic style, carries the story down to the rebellion of the Titans (1–323), when suddenly the birth, ministry, death, and resurrection of Christ, and the punishment of the disobedient Hebrews, are described; the book ends with a prediction of the capture of the Temple at Jerusalem and the dispersion of the Jews under the wrath of God for having maltreated His Son. Several passages in this Christian section are almost verbally identical with lines of the eighth book, and it is still a vexed question which book borrowed from the other.

---

[*] *ἀναπλάσεως*, the ‘new’ creation in contrast to *πλάσεως*, which has just been used.

[†] This paragraph is practically a reproduction of Varro’s account, which Lactantius (*Div. Inst.* i. 6) had preserved.

[‡] He means, of course, the great Christian apologist, L. Cælius Firmianus Lactantius. Some idea of our author’s historical knowledge may be inferred from his remark that Lactantius had been a pagan priest of the Capitoline temple!

[*] The loose quotation from Lactantius (*Div. Inst.* i. 6) does not begin till after the passage in brackets, which our author seems to have reproduced freely by an error of memory from the *Cohortatio ad Græcos*.

[†] This is the Christian’s attempt to answer the educated Roman’s objection to the obscurity and irregularity of the Christian *Sibyllina*. So far from being a mark of weakness, this really proves their authenticity and inspired origin!

[‡] See above, p. 480. Both passages expound the validity of rapture as a means of divination and insight, but the Sibyl is only mentioned in the *Phædrus*, where Socrates contends that ‘the greatest blessings come to us by way of madness (*μανίας*) if only it is bestowed by heaven. Why, the prophetess at Delphi and the priestesses at Dodona have done many a noble service to Hellas, both to individuals and to the public, by their madness, whereas they have done little or nothing in their sober senses. And further, we should only be elaborating what is known to everybody, if we were to speak of the Sibyl and all the rest, who by the exercise of inspired divination have set many people right for what lay before them, by disclosing to them much of the future.’

[§] In his monograph, *Ueber das erste, zweite und elfte Buch der sibyllinischen Weissagungen*, Frankfort, 1873.

In the Jewish oracle, which, like nearly all the *Sibyllina*, is a mine of odd lore about contemporary traditions and legends, the most interesting feature is the detailed description of Noah as a 'preacher of righteousness' (2 P 2^{5}) to his scornful generation (147 ff.). He preaches a short, good sermon. God reveals to him the impending fate of mankind, if they persist in their evil ways, and bids him appeal to them for the last time. Noah does so, but is scoffed at. He renews his warning, and, instead of being couched in any threatening tones,[†] it is charged with a singular pathos. He tells them, *e.g.*, how he will lament and weep in the ark, if things come to the worst and God has to destroy them and the world. As is usual in the *Sibyllina*, the biblical thread is strung with variegated chips of legend and romantic mythology, but it is not so thickly strung as to become invisible. There is a simplicity and directness in this popular poetry on the biblical narrative which is superior to the prosaic paraphrase of Josephus. The Christian section is of less merit, either from a religious or from a literary point of view. It is a florid cento from the NT, with a vehement animus against the Jews. A fair specimen of the author's outlook may be found in the description of Christ, 'the son of the immortal God,' in 332 f.:

> 'He shall fulfil, he shall not destroy, God's law,
> bringing the original pattern, and shall teach all things.
> To him shall the priests [‡] bring offerings of gold, myrrh and incense. . . .
> But when a voice sounds through the desert,
> bidding all mortals loudly
> to make straight paths and cast evils from their heart
> and be enlightened by baptism in the waters,[§] every one,
> that being born from above they no more
> may swerve from the right in the least— . . .
> then mortals shall have a sign suddenly,
> when the Fair Stone comes guarded from Egypt's land, [‖]
> whereat the people of the Hebrews will stumble,
> but the nations will muster under his guidance.'

Then follows a note of His miracles similar to that of bk. viii. (see below).

The second book is predominantly eschatological, as might be expected, since the Sibyl now comes to the closing generations of mankind. One of the characteristics of this literature is its stress upon a purpose in history; sin is to be punished by God, amid sore suffering, and the punishment implies not only the overthrow of impious States on earth, but a final judgment of God, to which all leads up. The second book starts with a brief, gloomy description of the woes that vex earth in the tenth generation, when Rome is shattered by a visitation from heaven. Then earth is peaceful and fruitful for the pious, free from the curse of private property and Imperial tyranny. At this point, the Sibyllinist dramatically describes the contest for the virtuous rewards of immortality, over which Christ presides (34 f.)—a section which is further marked by the incorporation of a long moralistic [*] passage (56–148) from pseudo-Phocylides. The oracle then returns to the woeful last days, the misfortunes of the Jews, and the Last Judgment. The Christian accretions are probably from various hands, but none of them necessarily implies an early date. Lines 163 f. may be a quotation from the *Gospel of the Egyptians* (cf. vol. i. p. 495), but what Clement (*Strom.* iii. 6. 45) cites from the latter is only a parallel to the Sibylline allusion. The reference to the intercession of the Virgin Mary (312) is not so primitive as the remarks of Irenæus (v. 19), and the earliest parallel to the divine lists of struggle for the prizes of bliss occurs in Tertullian's treatise *Ad Mart.* 3. Whatever may have been the period of the fragments that constitute the nucleus of the book, the Christian touches need not be assigned to a date much, if at all, earlier than the end of the 2nd cent., and they may well be later. No early Father quotes from them. They are marked by a weird, grim power, if we can speak of 'power' in connexion with the Christian *Sibyllina* at all, either in edification or in literary quality. The apocalyptic element is strong, coloured by tinges familiar (*e.g.* 165 f. = Mt $24^{24f.}$) to us from current apocalyptic treatises, but often with an individuality of its own.

It is in this book (15 f.) that we first meet the famous Sibylline doctrine of the ten ages of the world (cf. *ERE* i. 200, and A. Rzach's paper in *Wiener Studien*, xxxiv. [1912] 114–122), which had been current in the pagan *Sibyllina* already (cf. Servius on Verg. *Eclog.* iv. 4). It recurs in iii. 108 f., in a separate form, the tenth generation being the generation of the Titans which is reckoned as the tenth from the Flood (the passage quoted by Tertullian, see above, p. 481). But here and in viii. 199 f. it is eschatological, the tenth generation being the last. In iv. 47–87 the tenth generation seems to mark the downfall of the Persian Empire at the hands of Alexander, and the generations are reckoned from the Flood, whereas in i. 1–198, which appears to be the prelude to ii. 15 f., the generations are reckoned from Adam, the fifth generation being that of the Giants.

One of the most characteristic passages is the eschatological delineation in 238 f.:

> 'When Sabaoth, Adonai, thundering on high
> raises the dead, setting a term to their fates,
> and seats himself on the heavenly throne and places the great pillars,[†]
> then Christ the immortal shall come in a cloud
> to the Immortal, with mighty angelic retinue,
> seating himself at the right hand of the Great, and judging from the throne
> the life of the pious and the ways of the impious.

---

[*] According to Bousset, the Christian editor of bk. viii., the author of iii. 63–92, and the editor of i.–ii. all wrote in the 3rd cent., under Odenathus. This would follow necessarily, if the widow of iii. 77 f. were Zenobia, not Cleopatra, and if the Assyrian whom the twelve tribes return from the East to punish (ii. 167 f.) were Odenathus. Bleek relegated i.–ii. to the 5th cent. (middle), Ewald to the 4th, Alexandre to the 3rd, and Friedlieb to the 2nd.

[†] Such as, *e.g.*, we hear in the oracle of iii. 55 f., where the bitter irony of denunciation overpowers the speaker. 'Woe is me, alas! when shall that Day arrive, the judgment of the immortal God, the great King? Meantime, o ye cities, get founded, get all adorned with temples, race-courses, market-places, statues of gold and silver, and stone, so that ye may come to the bitter Day! For come it will, whenever the smell of brimstone pervades all men.'

[‡] Mt 2^{11}.

[§] ὕδασι Φωτίζεσθαι; cf. below (p. 487).

[‖] Cf. Mt 2^{15}, 1 P $2^{7f.}$

[*] Note, *e.g.*, the denunciation (111–118) of the love of money, as elsewhere in iii. 235 f., viii. 18 f. Rapacity is one of the cardinal sins with which these Eastern provincials charge the Roman Empire (iii. 350 f., viii. 18 f., 96 f.); the Sibyl reflects the resentment felt by the popular mind at the taxes levied by Rome, as well as the ordinary ethical protest against avarice and luxury. The general ethics are discussed with reference to the *Didache* by Rendel Harris in *The Teaching of the Apostles*, London, 1887, p. 40 f., and by A. Dieterich in his *Nekyia*, Leipzig, 1893, p. 193 f.

[†] Taking κίονα as generic. But this feature is unexampled and unintelligible. Did the Sibyllinist mean 'the whipping-post' of a Roman place of trial?

Moses, the great friend of the Most High, shall also come,
clothed in flesh, and Abraham the great,
Isaac and Jacob, Joshua, Daniel and Elijah,
Habakkuk, Jonah, and those whom the Hebrews slew.
All the Hebrews after Jeremiah who come for judgment before the throne shall he slay,
that they may receive due recompense and punishment
for what each did in this mortal life.
Then shall all pass through the fiery stream,
through the unquenchable fire: the just
shall all be saved, but the impious shall perish to all eternity,
as many as have formerly wrought evil,
committed murder or been accomplices therein,
all liars, thieves, deceivers, foul adulterers,
parasites, intriguers, sowers of slander,
wicked, violent, lawless, and idolatrous persons,
all who have forsaken the great immortal God,
who have turned blasphemers, persecutors of the pious,
destroyers of the faithful, scorners of just men,
all who with crafty and shameless double-face
as presbyters and honoured deacons [*] look on . . .'

There is a lacuna in the text at this point, after which the grim list of crimes is continued, with their fitting punishment. In 313 f., the bliss of heaven is portrayed as follows:

'But as for those others who cared for justice and good deeds,
for piety and righteous thoughts,
angels shall bear them up through the fiery stream
to light and life without a care,
where is the immortal path of the great God,
where are the three fountains of wine, honey and milk.
There shall earth be alike for all, undivided
by walls and barriers, then of its own accord
it will bear richer fruits, possessions shall be in common
and wealth no monopoly.[†]
No poor shall be there, no rich man, no tyrant,
no slave, neither great nor small any more,
no kings, no rulers, all shall be alike in fellowship.
None shall ever say again, "Night has come" or "Morning,"
or "Yesterday," none worries over length of days,
over spring, over summer, over winter, over autumn,
over marriage, over death, over buying, over selling,
over sunset, over sunrise: it shall be one long day.'

The last words literally run, 'and He shall make one long day.' But, in order to avoid the appearance of describing a selfish bliss, the Sibyllinist proceeds to the following remarkable doctrine:

'And another thing will the almighty, immortal God bestow on them:[‡]
when the pious ask immortal God, he will grant them to save men
from the fierce fire and eternal torment: this also he will do (for them)
He will take the men again from the tireless fire
and for the sake of his own people will transport them
to another life, immortal, undying,
in the Elysian plain, where he has the great waters
of the deep-bosomed lake, perennial Acherusia.'

At the thought of this the Sibyl breaks into a pathetic prayer for herself:

'Alas, woe is me for that day,
when I am punished for all my ill deeds,
I who cared nought for marriage [§] or sound reason,
but in the house of my wealthy man
shut out the needy, and deliberately
wrought unlawful deeds aforetime! Saviour, do thou save me from my tormentors,
a shameless woman, who has done immodestly.
Lo, I beseech thee, let me cease a little from my song,
O holy giver of manna, king of a great kingdom.'

The long third book, on the other hand, is almost entirely a Jewish compilation, with oracles dating from the 2nd and the 1st centuries B.C. Originally it had 1034 verses instead of the extant 829. No book of our collection is so important for the study of this Jewish propaganda in its eschatological aspects, and none presents such difficulties to the literary analyst. It is plain that a Christian has threaded in lines here and there, *e.g.* 776 (if *υἱὸν* is read for *ναὸν* or *οἶκον—υἱὸν γὰρ καλέουσι βροτοὶ μεγάλοιο θεοῖο*); it is by no means so plain that longer sections like 46–62 and 63–92 are of Christian origin, although the latter, with its striking description of Beliar (Simon Magus?) who comes from Sebaste (Samaria?) and of the catastrophes at the end of the world, does not have a Jewish ring about it. Apart from the possible exception of these passages, the motley oracles of the book are all pre-Christian; this is almost the sole result which stands out clearly amid the various literary analyses. The fourth book is distinctly Jewish, and is commonly dated *c.* A.D. 80, since the eruption of Vesuvius in A.D. 79 (130–136) is regarded as a punishment for the Roman treatment of Judæa, and is to be followed by an Eastern attack on Rome, headed by Nero, from beyond the Euphrates. It is a short, heterogeneous book, and is quoted by Justin and Clement of Alexandria, as well as by Lactantius. Its antipathy (27 ff.) to any visible temple and to material sacrifices has been taken by some critics to mark a type of Judaism different from that of bks. iii. and v.—either Essenism or some 'allied though independent' phase (cf. Lightfoot's *Colossians and Philemon*, new ed., London, 1879, p. 96 f.); but these allusions may be to pagan cults, and even the stress laid on grace before food (24 f.) does not stamp the oracle as Essenic. The fifth book is larger and stretches further down, though the contents are still predominantly Jewish, and even Egyptian, to judge from the curious reference of approval to the temple of Onias (501–511). It is a medley of denunciations, woes, and predictions, the latest of which are not earlier than Hadrian's reign (46 ff.) and possibly [*] as late as that of Marcus Aurelius. But these Jewish oracles of the first two Christian centuries owe their present form to some Christian editor of the latter century. The first Christian to quote from them is Clement of Alexandria. Here and there, but not often, we can detect a Christian patch, as at 256–259:

'But then shall a unique Man come from heaven,
who spreads out his hands on the Wood [†] of rich fruit,
the best of the Hebrews, who one day shall stay [‡] the sun,
with fair words issuing from pure lips.'

Another touch, which possibly is late, is the abrupt (293 ff.) prediction of ruin for the temple of Artemis at Ephesus, which is to be overwhelmed by an earthquake and to sink into the sea, to the bitter grief of the Ephesians.

Substantially, however, these three books are Jewish in texture. At their best, they voice the highest propaganda of Hellenistic Judaism between the 2nd cent. B.C. and the 2nd cent. A.D., when many, in Egypt especially, were conscious of their vocation (cf., *e.g.*, iii. 195, *οἱ πάντεσσι βροτοῖσι βίου καθοδηγοὶ ἔσονται*=Ro 2^{19}, *ὁδηγὸν τυφλῶν*) to be a source of light and leading to the Gentiles. These primitive *Sibyllina* of Judaism are neither cosmopolitan nor proselytizing; this is one of their distinctive features. They are 'national and nomistic,' as Krauss observes, 'in so far as they are Jewish. Even the Messianic time is inconceivable without the Temple, sacrificial worship, and the Law. Despite this, the pagan Greeks are nowhere urged to observe the Law; they are asked merely to lead moral lives and to recognize the one God. Although the Sibyl addresses all peoples, the Syrians, Britons, Gauls, and the nations of the Isles, she especially exhorts the people of Hellas, knowing that it will be well with all the human race if this people with its grand culture will combine its own virtues with the pure religion of Judaism' (*JE* xi. 320^b). The latter conviction underlay the Hellenistic propaganda. It was Greece which had been primarily responsible for the development of idolatry in the great Roman world, and Greece must regain her lost monotheism if the mass of men were to abandon polytheism and return to the original worship of the one God. The conversion of Greece (cf. iii. 545 ff.) was the hope of these Sibyllinists. Hence the aptness of their appeal through the stammering, inspired lips of a Sibyl who spoke from the far mists of pre-Homeric antiquity. The appeal, it must be remembered, was not to the 'intellectuals.' The *Sibyllina* were popular literature, not esoteric essays. They were couched in the language of impressive, popular address, midway between the hymn and the apocalypse,[*] and like the latter aimed their shafts at the common heart of men. Naturally, the shafts were winged with threats as well as with promises and argument. And denunciations of idolatry and polytheism as naturally led to eschatological predictions. If the average apocalypse could be called a tract for bad times, the Sibylline oracle was usually a tract for bad people, for nations who had deliberately devoted themselves to idolatry and vice, or outraged the Jewish people. The last words of bk. v. are: 'the heaven remained starless.' And that is characteristic of the oracles. These Sibyllinists wrote on the sound principle that some people really need not argument but suffering, if they are ever to be brought to their senses. A starless sky hangs over them. In the Jewish *Sibyllina* (cf. P. Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie*, Tübingen, 1903, pp. 46–50, etc.) particularly, though by no means exclusively, impatient threats of doom abound; sometimes it is final, though sometimes it is intended to act as a salutary historical reminder of the pains and penalties which are incurred by all who defy the laws of Israel's God.[†] The Sibyl will reason with Hellas, *e.g.*, but she will also shower threats of calamity on her. Her oracles are charged with lightning as well as with light. It is this preoccupation with a moralistic view of history which repeatedly tends to make the interest of the *Sibyllina* eschatological even when they are more hopeful about the heathen; for in contrast to the misery of pagans the Messianic bliss of Israel is depicted, partly to encourage the disconsolate Jews of the period, but partly also to act as a tempting promise to outsiders (*e.g.* v. 492 f.). It is to the God who can bestow such happiness, not to vain idols, that worship ought to be paid. Thus, in iii. 624 f., after depicting the prosperity of Israel on the new earth—*i.e.* the new order of things under the later Maccabees—the oracle proceeds to bid the deceitful man turn and make intercession to God, offering him sacrifices and honouring him with good behaviour: 'it may be that the immortal God will have mercy on thee.' But in most cases the oracles are oppressed by the sense that things have gone too far. Their environment was dark. What the Sibyl generally has in mind, it must be repeated, is not so much the philosophers of Hellas as the practical propaganda which followed in the wake of the Seleucid kings (*e.g.* iii. 732 f.), with its contemptuous indifference to all that a Jew valued in monotheism and even in morals. This is one of the main threads running through the woof of these three Jewish books of *Sibyllina*, the desire to warn at any rate and win if possible contemporary Hellenism. As the latter hope waned, the Sibyl's testimony hardened into denunciation and doom.

---

[*] Even Christian officials are among the condemned, as in the Dantesque vision of the 4th cent. *Apocalypse of Paul* (ed. Tischendorf, Leipzig, 1866, p. 34 f.), where the Apostle sees a presbyter, a bishop, and a deacon successively tormented for their ecclesiastical misdeeds.

[†] A point reiterated by the *Sibyllina* (*e.g.* iii. 247, 'Heaven fashioned the earth to be common to all')—one of several drawn from Stoic ethics.

[‡] The denial that the punishment of hell is eternal tallies with Origen's doctrine, and an indignant scribe or editor has appended a protest, which has been preserved in some MSS. 'Obviously a lie,' he remarks, 'for the fire of punishment will never leave the condemned, though personally I could wish it were so, scarred as I am with such sore wounds of sin, that need all the greater Mercy. Origen ought to be ashamed of chattering as though there were any limit to punishment.'

[§] The traditional Sibyl is unmarried, though there is one strange exception in the Sibyl whom Pausanias mentions (x. 12); she was called Herophile or Artemis, she sang at Delphi about the rape of Helen and the Trojan war, and 'she was the wedded wife of Apollo, and his daughter, and his sister.' Perhaps here as in vii. 153 (see below, p. 486) she confesses to having sinned sexually instead of marrying. Only, she seems to be married here, unless 'in the house of my wealthy man' means residence in the shrine of Apollo. The two versions of her past life differ slightly.

[*] If line 51, which speaks of Hadrian's three successors, belongs to the previous oracle (1–50), and is not an interpolation.

[†] *I.e.* the Cross (see below, on bk. vi.); Ignatius (*ad Smyrn.* i. 2) had already called Christians 'the fruit' of the Cross.

[‡] The meaning is obscure, partly because the reading varies. K. Buresch and Geffcken read *στήσει* for the *στῆσε(ν)* of the MSS; either the miracle of Joshua is to be repeated in the last days (cf. Lact. *Div. Inst.* vii. 26. 2: 'et statuet deus solem') or Jesus is in some way identified with Joshua (owing to the Greek equivalent Ἰησοῦς; cf. He 4^{8}). Hirsch, however, recalls the Midrash Tanḥumah on Ex 17^{18}, according to which Moses stopped the sun and moon when he stretched out his hands at the battle with the Amalekites. This would tally with the Sibylline point of view in viii. 251 (see below).

In the sixth book we are back on Christian ground, more thoroughly Christian than any we have yet crossed. At the same time, there is not a single allusion to the Sibyl. The book is simply a short hymn, which has been taken to represent a theology akin to some of the uncanonical gospels and to have originated in more or less heretical circles of the 2nd cent. Church. 'Heretical,' in this connexion, is a question-begging epithet, however, as Harnack points out; 'eccentric' would suit the contents better. The piece need not be earlier than the 3rd cent., though 2nd cent. parallels are not awanting. The only help in determining its relative date is furnished by the fact that it is quoted by Lactantius, but there are no historical references to enable us to say how much earlier than the beginning of the 4th cent. its composition is to be placed. It is the briefest of the extant Sibylline books, and may therefore be translated in full. The present writer appends a fairly literal version, in order to bring out the peculiar theology of the piece:

'I hail from the heart the Immortal's great Son, renowned in song,
who was granted the throne to possess, by the Father most High,
ere yet he was born; whereupon in the flesh granted him
he appeared and bathed in the streams of the river of Jordan
that moves with grey tread on as it rolls its waters.
Avoiding the fire,[*] he first shall behold the sweet Spirit
of God, borne on the white shining wings of the Dove.
A Blossom pure shall bloom, and springs shall gush;
to men shall he show the Ways, shall show the paths of heaven,
and give to all instruction in tales of wisdom.
He shall come for judgment and smite the disobedient People,
extolling the praiseworthy race of the Father in heaven.
He shall tread on the waves, shall free mankind from diseases,
shall cause the dead to arise, shall banish many a sorrow:
from a single wallet[†] shall bread in abundance issue for men,
when David's house puts forth its Plant; and in his hand
the whole world lies, the earth, the sky, the sea.
He shall flash upon the earth, as when at his first appearance
they two saw him,[‡] who had been born each from the side of the other.
And this shall be when earth rejoices in hope of the Child.
But for thee alone, O land of Sodom,[§] evil woes are in store;
for thou, thou didst not know thy God, insensate one,
when he came to be seen of men; nay, with thorns for a crown
thou crownedst him, and for his drink despitefully
didst mix the dreadful gall—hence come thine evil woes.

---

[*] M. Friedländer exaggerates the significance of the *Sibyllina* for apocalyptic prophecy, but there was a distinct affinity between both forms of Jewish propaganda (*Die religiösen Bewegungen innerhalb des Judentums im Zeitalter Jesu*, Berlin, 1905, p. 289 f.).

[†] *E.g.* in v. 276 f., and especially in iv. 152 f., when impiety, bloodshed, and vice are rampant, men know 'that God is no longer gentle and gracious, but gnashing his teeth in anger and destroying the whole race of men together with a huge conflagration. O wretched mortals, do not drive God to all sorts of wrath, but give up swords, shrieks, murder, and violence, wash your whole body in ever-running streams, stretch your hands to heaven, ask pardon for your past deeds; God will grant repentance.'

[*] The tradition which appears in some of the uncanonical gospels (see vol. i. p. 494).

[†] Mt 14^{19}. Lactantius seems to have read *πήρης*, but the MSS reading *ῥίζης* ('root') would connect with the following line and yield a good, though slightly different, sense.

[‡] Adam and Eve.

[§] Cf. Rev 11^8

O cross,[*] most blessed wood, on which God was stretched out,
earth shall no longer hold thee, thou shalt see heaven thy home,
when God's bright Light flashes forth afresh.'

The text of bk. vii. is broken at several places, and the contents are miscellaneous, but the bulk seems to be of Jewish Christian origin ; there are Gnostic touches (*e.g.* in 139 ff.), which indicate a soil in the 2nd or 3rd cent. similar to that of bk. vi. The book, however, is such a conglomerate of fragments that it defies any general estimate. A brief woe on Rhodes, Delos, Cyprus, and Sicily is abruptly followed by a reference to Noah, and a prediction of the final deluge, as follows (9–23) :[†]

'The earth shall float, the hills shall float, the very air (heaven) shall float,
all things shall be water, and by water shall all things be destroyed ;
the winds shall be stayed, and a second age shall begin.
O Phrygia, thou shalt first emerge from the top of the water,
thou first shalt impiously deny thy God,
delighting thyself in idols dumb, in idols that shall be thy ruin,
O wretched one, when many years have run their course.
The luckless Ethiopians, who suffer piteous pangs,
shall be struck down by the sword, as they stoop and bend.
Fair Egypt, ever blessed with corn,
watered by the seven flowing streams of the Nile,
shall be ruined by strife and faction ; whereupon, in despair,
men shall drive out Apis—no god for men !
Woe to thee, Laodicea,[‡] who never hast God beheld,
thou shalt be beguiled, thou proud one ; the Lycus will flood thee over.'

The following fragments are Messianic (24 f.), historical denunciations [§] (40 f.), and woes on Troy, Colophon, Corinth, and Tyre, as well as on Cœle-Syria (64 f.) for its indifference to the Logos-Messiah (line 84 echoing the thought of the fire at Christ's baptism, in vi. 6). Then comes a group of oracles, apparently taken from some older collection, against Sardinia, Celtiberia, Mygdonia, Rome, Syria, and Thebes (96–117). The terrors which precede the Messianic Age are described (118–149), with a brief picture of the new order of things on lines familiar to us from apocalyptic traditions preserved in Papias, and Irenæus, and elsewhere. Lactantius quotes (*Div. Inst.* vii. 16. 13) from this fragment (123). It may be conjectured with some certainty that here as elsewhere the short, pithy oracles of doom and warning addressed to places in which neither a Jewish nor a Christian Sibyllinist would feel any direct interest originally belonged to some collection of pagan prophecies. Often they stand in an extremely loose connexion with each other, or with their general context. We may suppose that they were retained, partly to lend *vraisemblance* to the new composition, partly for the sake of some local importance which is lost to us.[‖]

The close of the book is singular (150 f.), for, after describing the bliss of men upon the new earth, the Sibyl utters an *apologia* and plea for herself as a pagan, which goes beyond the similar cry in bk. ii. (see above, p. 484). She confesses that she has sinned both wilfully and carelessly, and has despised marriage (*i.e.* as the context here seems to imply, 'indulged in sexual vice'). For all this, she is to die, and burn in hell-fire, when men on earth have stoned and buried her. But apparently—for the text is mangled and dim—she hopes for deliverance, when God instructs her and raises her to life in heaven. We have here the Christian Sibyllinist conscious of the drawbacks attaching to his pagan mouthpiece, and endeavouring to adjust her character to the new setting. It is not enough to put predictions and statements of Christian doctrine in the mouth of a pagan Sibyl of the far past ; she must be made to repent of her errors and be Christianized at the end.

The miscellaneous contents of bk. viii., from which Lactantius has quoted largely, are distinguished by an unusual antipathy to the tyranny and avarice[*] of the Roman Empire. The ordinary view is that 1–216 are in the main Jewish, the rest Christian. A general blend of woes, Messianic prophecies, incongruous separate oracles, and historical allusions characterizes the former. The denunciation of Rome in 1–138 and the prediction of her downfall must be dated not earlier than the burial of Hadrian (52–64) in A.D. 139. The bitterness of the allusions to Hadrian, which contrasts so remarkably with the tone of bks. v. and xii. to that Emperor, points to a Jew rather than to a Christian as the author of the piece ; and if the piece is homogeneous, in spite of some lacunæ in the extant text, it must have originally been the work of a provincial[†] Jew, exasperated by Hadrian's suppression of the Palestinian rebellion, and by the 'Judaicus fiscus,' as that unpopular tax was levied and collected. Lines 139–216 are heterogeneous, partly taken from earlier books (*e.g.* 169 f. from iii. 49 f.), but never betraying any decisive trace of Christian authorship.[‡]

The case is altered when we pass from line 216 to 217 ; then and thenceforth we are on Christian soil of the 3rd century. Indeed four MSS print 217–500 as part of a 'ninth' book ; they have no relation to the fragments of the preceding oracle, and it is owing to a blunder of the first editor, in all likelihood, or of some scribe, that these two disparate sections have been yoked together.[§] The outstanding feature of this part of the book is the famous opening acrostic on the name of ΙΗϹΟΥϹ ΧΡΕΙϹΤΟϹ ΘΕΟΥ ΥΙΟϹ ϹΩΤΗΡ, which, in a Latin translation, is actually cited by Augustine (in the *Civ. Dei*, xviii. 23) as a genuine prophecy of Christ which had fallen from the lips of the Erythræan Sibyl. In Constantine's *Orat. ad sanctorum coetum* (18) the acrostic is quoted with the addition[‖] of ϹΤΑΥΡΟϹ, and this is the form in the Sibylline oracles. It is next to impossible to reproduce, without extreme awkwardness, in a translation the artificial structure of the lines, but the following version is an attempt to preserve the acrostic feature which is the outstanding characteristic of the Greek original. The present writer has rhymed the translation, in order to make it less prosaic :

---

[*] One of the first allusions to the cult of the Cross, in its legendary development (cf. *ERE* iv. 328). Sozomen remembers to quote this line in his 5th cent. history (ii. 1), when telling the romantic story of how Queen Helena found the genuine Cross of Jesus at Jerusalem. He protests against any sceptical surprise, on the ground that 'even among the Greeks this Sibylline view was admitted : "O most blessed wood, on which God was stretched out." Our most ardent opponents would not deny this, so that the wood of the Cross and the reverence paid to it are clearly proved to have been foreshadowed.'

[†] 9–13 are almost verbally equivalent to i. 193–196.

[‡] Laodicea is frequently doomed in the *Sibyllina*—usually to destruction by an earthquake (*e.g.* iii. 471–472, iv. 107–108, v. 290–291, xii. 280–281), however.

[§] The habit of threatening and denouncing grew as the *Sibyllina* went on. The severe tone had been characteristic of the pagan Sibyl, and, as Bouché-Leclercq observes (*op. cit.*, p. 202), it sounded still more loudly in the Jewish oracles. 'La Sibylle . . . ne sait guère menacer sans maudire.'

[‖] Zosimus, the Greek historian of the 5th cent., preserves a fragment of 37 lines (ii. 5) which give directions for the proper celebration of the 'ludi seculares.' This was a pagan oracle which Christians would naturally ignore, and it is therefore absent from our collection. It is possibly the sort of 'Sibyllini versus' mentioned by Horace in his *Carmen Seculare* (pt. iv. line 5).

[*] As in iv. 145 f. ('to Asia there shall come the great wealth which Rome once stole and placed in her rich treasury ; twice as much, aye and more, shall she restore to Asia') and even in iii. 350 f. ('For all the money received by Rome from tributary Asia, Asia shall receive three times as much from Rome, and pay back to her the horrid insolence'). We may overhear the same note in Commodian's *Carmen Apologeticum*, 889 f. ('tollatur imperium, quod fuit inique repletum, quod per tributa mala diu macerabat omnes').

[†] Yet the (Cumæan ?) Sibyl seems to be prophesying in Rome (κατὰ πτόλιν, 3).

[‡] The end of Rome is predicted (189 f.) for A.D. 195, in connexion with the return of Nero from the East.

[§] Alexandre assigned viii. 217 f. and the introductory Theophilus fragments to a Christian who wrote in the first quarter of the 2nd century.

[‖] The addition is superfluous when a double acrostic is made out of the initial letters of each word, *i.e.* ΙΧΘΥϹ, 'Fish,' the favourite early Christian symbol.

> ‘Judgment is come, the earth shall sweat in fear ;
> Eternal, the King leaves the heavenly sphere,
> Sentence to pass on all the world of men.
> On God the just and unjust shall look then,
> Uplifted ’mid his saints, when time is done ;
> Souls, mortal souls, he judges from his throne,
> Changing to dry land and to thorns the wide
> Round earth, till men their idols[*] fling aside.
> Earth, sky and sea the flame shall burn, and dash
> Into the gates of Hell with shattering crash ;
> Saints in the flesh shall shine in liberty,
> The lawless fire devours eternally.
> Of secret deeds the tale shall then be told,
> Since God the heart’s dim corners shall unfold.
> Then shall all wail and gnash their teeth, at strange
> Eclipse of sun, dropping of stars, and change
> Of heaven, the moonlight lost, while here below
> Up rise the valleys, down the mountains go ;
> Under the sky no lofty peak shall soar
> Inhuman, hill and plain shall be no more,
> Or sea to fare upon ; the scorched land,
> Springs, rippling rivers, perish by the brand.
> Sounding from heaven, the trumpet peals a blast
> Of wrath and woe upon the evil cast,
> The earth is opened and hell’s pit laid bare.
> Each and all stand before God’s royal chair.
> Rivers of fiery sulphur[†] flood the air.
> Sign of all this, a vivid seal, shall be
> The cross among the faithful joyfully,
> A hindrance to the world, but life and light
> Unending[‡] to elect souls washed aright ;
> Rod of the shepherd, shall it rule in iron might.
> Our God is shown in the acrostic thus,
> Saviour, immortal King, who died for us.

This acrostic was composed partly to lend an air of authenticity to the Christian *Sibyllina*. The pagan tradition[§] was that the Sybil had spoken her oracle in acrostic form. When sceptics doubted the genuineness of the Christian oracles, it was useful to be able to point to a specimen of the acrostic which told in favour of Christian doctrine. But its inherent popularity led to translations into Latin, even before Augustine’s day.

The remainder of the oracle is a chaos of queer fragments. The acrostic is immediately followed by the remark that the Crucified Christ was typified by the outstretched arms of Moses at the victory over Amalek (251 f.), an idea which had been propounded by the author of *Barnabas* (xii. 2) and by Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 90). The advent of Christ (256 f.) shades off into a comparison between the creation and the end, but in 270 ff. the life and Passion of Christ are described afresh. One of the romantic touches in the picture of the Risen Lord is the symbolism of the four wounds in His hands and feet (318 f.), which He shows to the faithful (cf. Jn $20^{20\text{f.}}$) ; these are explained to mean the four quarters of the earth—north, south, east, and west having to bear witness against the cruelty of man. The next fragment depicts the entry of Christ into Jerusalem (323 ff.). Then a break occurs, ushering in a dramatic sketch of the Last Day, the burning of the world, and the horrible woes of men (337–358). Through the lips of the Sibyl (359 ff.) God now teaches His true nature, the vanity of idols, and the superfluousness of sacrifice (390), the two ways set before men (399 f.), and the pains and rewards which they may expect. This long homiletic section is almost unique in the Christian *Sibyllina*. It ends abruptly, and the next paragraph (429 f.) treats of the Divine providence and man’s relation to his Creator and Judge. The text is badly preserved, but we can trace a form of Logos theology behind the doctrine. In 456 f., the oracle becomes clearer ; the Virgin-birth at Bethlehem is described. Suddenly, however, the scene changes, and the closing verses (480 ff.) are a moralistic homily to Christians upon humility, love to God and man, reverence, worship, and the like—wholesome doctrine, but quite out of keeping with any Sibylline setting. The preacher has overpowered the poet, and the passion for edifying has proved too strong for the writer’s sense of dramatic fitness.

The passage on Christ’s advent (256 f.) deserves to be quoted. It was a favourite of Lactantius :

> ‘For he shall not enter the world[*] in glory, but as a mortal man,
> pitiable, without honour and comeliness, to give hope to the pitiable,
> to give comeliness to mortal flesh and heavenly faith to the unbelieving,
> to fashion man who in the beginning had been formed by God’s holy hands,
> but whom the serpent had craftily seduced to the doom of death,
> to gain the knowledge of good and evil,
> till he deserted God and worshipped mortal beings.
> The Almighty at the beginning took him as his counsellor,
> saying, “Let us both, my son, mould mortal race after our likeness ;
> I shall devote my hands, and thou the Word, to our form,
> that together we may make the product.”
> Mindful, then, of this design he shall enter the world,
> bringing the original pattern into the holy virgin,
> baptizing with water by the hands of presbyters,
> doing all things by his Word, healing every disease.
> With his word he shall check the winds, smooth the raging sea,
> walking on it with the feet of peace and in faith.’

It is from this eighth book (337 f.), as Augustine[†] used it to show that the Sibyl was a pre-Christian witness to the truth of Christian prophecy, that the famous mediæval hymn drew its inspiration for the lines :

> ‘Dies iræ, dies illa,
> Soluet sæclum in fauilla,
> Teste Dauid cum Sibylla.’

The final destruction of the world by fire is proved not only by the psalter but by the Sibylline oracles ;[‡] they were enlisted in the service of Christian eschatology. The God who had spoken of this crisis by David had spoken of it also by this pagan prophetess. Another echo of the oracle is to be heard in the 5th (6th ?) cent. composition, *Quæstiones et responsa ad orthodoxos* (74 . . . ‘if the end of the present order of things is the judgment of the impious by fire, as the scriptures of prophets and apostles declare, as well as those of the Sibyl’), which was erroneously attributed to Justin Martyr. We can understand, from this widespread feeling in a later age, how Michael Angelo neither felt nor excited any sense of incongruity in painting Sibyls along with OT prophets on the roof of the Sixtine Chapel. Giotto had already done this in the Campanile at Florence. Here as elsewhere art naively expressed the popular theology of the age.

The following books are political rather than religious ; this distinguishes them from most of the other Sibylline oracles, whether Jewish or Christian, but it is a return to the primitive function and temper of the classical Sibyl. The eleventh book is a rambling, fanciful series of oracles, in which the Sibyl, as in bk. v., is concerned mainly with the fortunes of Egypt down to the period of Cleopatra ;[§] Egypt’s subjugation by the Romans is God's punishment for her treatment of Israel (307 ff.). She starts from the Flood and the Tower of Babel, surveys the ancient monarchies, and ends, as she begins, with Egypt. The standpoint is Jewish, but this does not necessarily imply that the author was a Jew, although it must be admitted that there are no distinctively Christian touches in the oracles. They are practically devoid of religious interest. The Sibyl takes occasion to repeat (163 f.; see bk. iii. 419–426) [*] her charge against Homer, after telling the fate of Troy:

---

[*] Literally ‘their idols and all their wealth.’

[†] A cataract of fire and brimstone pours through the *Sibyllina* from iii. 54 f. onwards (cf. *ERE* v. 390).

[‡] Literally, ‘enlightening of the elect with water from twelve springs’ (*i.e.* the twelve apostles?). Orthodox baptism (cf. above, p. 483).

[§] Dion. Hal. iv. 62 quotes Varro to this effect.

[*] Mendelssohn happily conjectures *κτίσιν* for the irrelevant *κρίσιν* of the MSS, here and in 269.

[†] According to Augustine, the Sibyl and Job are the two pre-Christian personalities who can be reckoned as classical examples of membership in God’s City (xviii. 23 and 47).

[‡] The earlier Sibylline proofs (*e.g.* in iv. 193 f.) were in the mind of Justin when he wrote (*Apol.* i. 20) that ‘the Sibyl and Hystaspes certify that corruptible things are to be dissolved by fire’ (cf. Mayor’s note on 2 P 3^7).

[§] The ‘monstrous regiment of women’ is for the Sibyllines an invariable prelude of disaster ; the idea is historically applied to

'And again there shall be a wise old man of song,
whom all dub wisest among men.
Plainly shall he set down things quite unspeakable,
having gained possession of my words, my measures, and my verses;
he first shall unfold my books
and then hide them, and show them to men no more.'

The pre-Homeric Sibyl thus claims to have furnished Homer with the materials for his epic, which he took over without acknowledgment and then suppressed. This is intended, of course, to account for two features in the Sibylline oracles, the fact of their late publication and the hexameter metre. The former fact was explained on the same lines as the late publication of apocalypses which professed to have been written by men of the far past; they remained unknown for long, because they had been hidden purposely either by the author or by others, for various reasons. The Sibyllinist does not hesitate to blacken Homer's character, in order to establish the good faith of the Sibyl herself. Otherwise, the only feature of interest in the book is the repeated use made of the third book. The very asseveration of her veracity as an interpreter of the Divine counsel, with which she closes as she opens the oracle, echoes the opening lines of the third book. Only, she feels [†] that her predictions are to be ridiculed and her warnings ignored (314 f.). So she will retire [‡] to the shrine of Apollo, where she is regarded as a true, ecstatic prophetess. The time will come when the hearers of this present oracle will have to admit that she was no deceiver.

The data for calculating the date of the piece are exceptionally few and vague. There is an apparent reference to the extent of the Roman Empire in lines 160–161; but the reading varies, and, while one critic deduces from the language [§] that the author wrote between A.D. 115 and 118, another is equally confident that the Sibyllinist must have survived the overthrow of the Parthian kingdom in A.D. 226. All that is certain is that the *terminus a quo* for the composition of the main part of the book is the overthrow of Cleopatra by the Romans.

Since Lightfoot wrote (*Apostolic Fathers*, pt. ii.^{2} [London, 1889]: 'Ignatius and Polycarp,' vol. i. p. 542 f.), it has been customary to accept bks. xi.–xiv. as a continuous prophecy, which summarizes the history of the world from the Flood down to the end of the 3rd cent. A.D. at the earliest. But even so, it is not a unity. The contents have been increased and altered from time to time by successive hands, and data of style and language place bks. xii. and xiii. by themselves as superior to the other two. Unfortunately, even in the case of the latter, the text is extremely corrupt, and the historical allusions [*] are often ambiguous.

While the eleventh book kept the fortunes of the Egyptian Empire in the foreground, the twelfth book chronicles 'the woeful time of the sons of Latium' (like v. 1–11, from which xii. 1–11 is verbally taken). Our Sibyl sketches rapidly and incoherently the course of the Roman Empire, with repeated indifference to the facts of history. The date of the book is fixed by the death of Alexander Severus, with which the oracles end. It must have been written during the first half of the 3rd century. Otherwise there is little definite information about the author. Geffcken, who has devoted special attention to this book, finds Christian additions in 28–34 (the prophecy of Christ's birth) and 232, which have a Jewish source, written not so much by an ardent Jew [†] as by one who was above all things an Eastern provincial, with ill-concealed admiration for the Imperial system.[‡] But it is a dull book. The Sibyl at the close begs for relief from the strain of rhapsody, on the ground that 'her soul within is weary of the divine measures, prophesying of royal reigns.' The reader is also weary, long before the Sibyl. Short chronicles of long historical periods are apt to be dull, even in prose. When they are written in verse by a third-rate poet who covers three centuries in less than three hundred lines, they are even less relevant to poetry and religion than to history.

The thirteenth book covers an exceptionally short period, only a quarter of a century, from A.D. 241 to 265. It is the wail of a Christian who has a passionate abhorrence of the persecuting Emperor, Decius,[§] and a brooding sense of pity for the calamities of the Empire. The book illustrates what Gibbon (*Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, i.^{4} [London, 1906]) describes as a period which was 'one uninterrupted series of confusion and calamity,' and one of the few redeeming points, in the mind of the Sibyllinist, seems to be the appearance of Odenathus (147 f.), the powerful senator of Palmyra, whose services in the field compelled the thanks and recognition of the Romans. Otherwise, the survey of the Sibyl embraces little except disgrace and defeat for the Empire. For once, the woes are not open to the suspicion of professional colouring. The historian is obliged to write that 'during that calamitous period, every instant of time was marked, every

---

Berenice III. in 81 B.C. (xi. 245 f.), and then to Cleopatra (cf. viii. 199 f., iii. 75 f.). Bousset (*Antichrist Legend*, London, 1896, p. 99 f.) sees behind this a conception of the marine anti-divine monster as feminine.

[*] In a private communication, Professor Walter Scott points out that these passages from bks. iii. and xi. probably imply that this author knew the pagan oracles of the Trojan War to which Pausanias alludes (see above, p. 478). The complaint of the Sibyl against Homer belonged to pagan tradition; it was not invented by Jews or Christians. Varro (as reported by Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* i. 6. 9) tells that the Erythræan Sibyl 'Graiis Ilium petentibus vaticinatam et perituram esse Troiam et Homerum mendacia scripturum.'

[†] This Cassandra-like touch goes back to the pagan tradition.

[‡] Sibyls were not always stationary. Some would wander abroad, like the Babylonian (iii. 809 f.) or the Erythræan. This reflects either a primitive tradition that the Sibyls roamed on their mission to the discerning on earth or an ætiological explanation of the widespread traces of Sibylline oracles.

[§] The Sibyl's trick of punning continues, *e.g.*, in 236 (*καὶ τότε μεμφέσθω Μέμφις*). She had caught it from the pagan oracles of her tribe, *e.g.* the famous (iii. 363–364)

ἔσται καὶ Σάμος ἄμμος, ἐσεῖται ἄδηλος,
καὶ Ῥώμη ῥύμη.

But the OT instances paved the way for its usage among Hellenistic Judaists.

[*] It is almost refreshing to come across (in xii. 196 f.) a reference to the legend of the thundering legion, in the survey of the campaigns of Marcus Aurelius. The divine miracle is attributed to the pious deserts of the Emperor.

[†] The favourable opinion of Hadrian (163–176) tells against this. How could any Jew, writing after Bar Cochba's revolt, describe the Emperor thus? (The similar praise in v. 46 f. was written originally before that, since line 51, which implies a later period, must be an interpolated addition to the oracle.) Yet, even so, it is difficult to understand how either a Jew or a Christian of any definite belief could commend the Emperor's interest in the pagan mysteries (169–170). A similar difficulty is raised by the curiously negative description of the dead in viii. 107 f.; but the mood of Ecclesiastes cannot be supposed to have died out among thinkers of Jewish birth.

[‡] Even in the Christian passage (33–34), it is pointed out that 'the strength of Rome is to increase with him' (*i.e.* Christ). The author will not hear of the charge that his religion was either a foe or a source of weakness to the Empire.

[§] That is, if Wilamowitz is right in his attractive conjecture *δ' αὖ πιστῶν* (87).

province of the Roman world was afflicted, by barbarous invaders and military tyrants, and the ruined empire seemed to approach the last and fatal moment of its dissolution' (p. 237). The Sibyllinist reflects this period. If the lights are low in his oracle, it is because they were burning low when it was written.[*]

The book is short and heterogeneous. The Sibyl is moved (1–6) to narrate the tumultuous wars of the East, in which Rome was involved (8 f.). Suddenly she interpolates (64–73) a stern word to Bostra, which echoes the oracle in iii. 57 f.; the Arabian capital is denounced especially on the score of its passion for astrological pursuits. Other prophecies follow, against Alexandria and Cappadocia particularly, but the Sibyl presently comes back to the disastrous fortunes of Rome (103 f.) and her downfall at the hands of the Easterns; it will be a time when the living will envy the dead, when they say 'death is good, yet death will fly from them' (118–119; cf. Rev 9^{6}). Then we hear of the dismal plight of Syria (119 f.), and a series of woes on various Eastern cities and provinces follows. Persia and Rome are the protagonists. So much is plain amid the symbolic expressions and the grandiloquent language of the oracle, but the habit of describing kings and rulers as wild beasts or of referring to them by a numerical equivalent for the first letter of their names[†] does not promote lucidity, and even when we know the period which is under review it is far from easy to make sense of several details in the Sibyl's predictions. Obscurity may be impressive in pseudo-oracular literature, but the impression made is slight. The leading interest of the book's oracles is for students of Roman history at this dark period in the Empire's course; the book has no religious significance, and there is nothing in its paragraphs which is worth quoting.

It is a question, says Geffcken, whether bk. xi. or bk. xiv. is the worst of the Sibylline oracles. The latter is at any rate later, written by a Jew who probably lived in Egypt. It opens with a lament and warning on the passion for power and tyranny (1–11), and then passes into an enigmatic, confused series of Eastern chronicles, under the disguise of prophecy, of Roman generals and Emperors who are hardly to be identified, closing (280–283) with a prediction that the race of Latin Emperors is to be replaced by a permanent (*ἀσάλευτος*; cf. He 12^{27}) generation whose reign is the reign of God. The rest of the book is an oracle on Egypt (284–361), which is almost unintelligible. It is not possible here to do more than call attention to two attempts to bring order out of chaos in this conglomerate of oracles. The first is by A. Wirth (*Wiener Studien*, xiv. 35 f.), who ingeniously traces the Roman Emperors from Cæsar to the close of the 3rd century. One of the chief difficulties in identifying them is that the Sibyllinist as usual never names them; he gives each a number, which is intended to mark the initial letter of his name, each letter of the Greek alphabet being valued numerically as on the well-known principles of the cryptic Gematria which apocalyptic had found so useful.[*] Thus, according to Wirth, the man of 'eighty' (in 227) is Probus. Wirth rightly sees that the book cannot be earlier than the 3rd cent. A.D., but this hypothesis requires several data to be forced, and it involves some fanciful reconstruction alike of the text and of the history. Ewald, long ago, had felt that the oracle reflected a much later period, in the 7th cent., and this position has been worked out afresh by W. Scott in an elaborate, ingenious series of papers in *The Classical Quarterly*, ix. [1915] 144–166, 207–228. He attempts skilfully to illustrate the details of the oracle from the struggle between Rome and Persia for Egypt during the first half of the 7th century. According to this interpretation, the Sibyl sympathizes strongly with the opponents of Rome; the two campaigns of the Persians in A.D. 614–617 and of the Arabs in 639–641, especially the latter, lie behind the Egyptian oracle of this book, which regards the Roman re-occupation between the two conquests from the East as an unwelcome and oppressive epoch. Every defeat of the Romans, in the struggle that swayed over the possession of Alexandria, is hailed as Divine vengeance on the Empire for what the Jews of Egypt had suffered. This interpretation[†] resets Ewald's general view in the light of recent research upon the Arab conquest of Egypt, and, so far as sense can be made out of an oracle which is often little better than gibberish, it clears up more obscurities than the rival theories, which do not go further down than the 3rd or 4th century. On this hypothesis, of course, the fourteenth book must have been added to the collection after the prologue was written. This is not improbable, in the nature of the case, and it is not even out of keeping with the extant condition of the text, for the fourteenth book ends abruptly, whereas the thirteenth closes with the refrain of the eleventh, the Sibyl pleading exhaustion and begging for a cessation of her poetic and prophetic rhapsody.

Our gratitude to the unknown Byzantine Christian who put the *Sibyllina* together in this collection is tempered by the impression of carelessness, ignorance, and caprice which mark his editorial efforts. It is true that he did his work for the purpose of edifying pious Christians, and not for the benefit of critical students. It is also true that the roughnesses and obscurities of the text may be partly set down to later scribes. But it was the editor who must have cut up oracles ruthlessly in order to make them fit; he must have omitted sections and thus broken the continuity of many passages, and evidently he knew little or nothing about the origin and sense of several of the oracles which he collected. The result is chaos frequently. The materials are often obscure in themselves, and their setting rarely makes them more intelligible. Oracles lie side by side which differ utterly in aim and date. Fragments from various centuries are scattered over the entire collection, and even the so-called 'books' are hardly ever homogeneous. At the same time, under this incongruity and confusion of the *Sibyllina* there is a certain unity not only of form but of spirit. (*a*) The formal unity is more than the adherence to the hexameter. As Rzach's appendix to his edition of the *Sibyllina* (pp. 240–314) shows, every Sibyllinist made a more or less serious attempt to echo Homer. The Homeric phrases and tags are not confined to the earliest books. They appear in oracles from the 3rd and 6th Christian centuries. To some extent, they are probably indirect, but the use of Homeric phraseology as well as metre was evidently a convention.[*] The history of literature shows that true poetry need not be stifled by the conventional forms of its age; but whenever the genuine breath of inspiration begins to ebb conventions are borne less lightly, and it is only in one or two books of the *Sibyllina* that the Homeric conventions are almost forgotten by the reader in the sheer interest of the oracles. It should be recollected, however, that their interest would be greater for their original public, just because they were circulated as separate pieces. A modern reader has the collected mass before him, and the juxtaposition of good, poor, and indifferent prevents him from appreciating the occasional flashes of genuine pathos and stern power which lighten up the surrounding mists.

---

[*] In 46–49 the Sibyl predicts that Alexandria will supply Rome with corn for as many years as her name stands for (*i.e.* Romē=948). Professor Scott (see Literature below) points out a remarkable coincidence in connexion with this. Chosroes the Persian leader conquered in Egypt in A.D. 617. Now 948 years reckoned back from this date brings us to 332 B.C., the year in which Alexandria was founded. If this was in the Sibyllinist's mind, he must have written this fragment after 617 (Scott thinks he was the man who also wrote xiv. 284 f., which describes the conquest of Egypt by the Persians), and the fragment was inserted in bk. viii. at this point, because in the preceding lines (38–45) it is prophesied that, so long as Alexandria exported corn to Rome, the Persians never would conquer that city. The original Sibyllinist of the 7th cent., of course, expected, on the strength of this prophecy, that the Persians would succeed in conquering Rome.

[†] An even more exasperating trick is to hint at the first letter(s), by way of assurance. *E.g.* the Sibyllinist in xi. 23–24, wishing to describe Pharaoh, reminds the reader of 'Phasgana'!

[*] This goes back to the Sibyllinist of bk. v., where (12 f.) Augustus is the man 'who has the first of letters' (A), Nero the man whose initial letter is fifty (N=50), and so forth.

[†] The difficulty raised by the abrupt allusion in 312 to an army of Sicilians is solved, according to Scott, by reading δ' ἐκ Κιλικῶν for δὴ Σικελῶν, and assuming that Heraclius started his expedition against Egypt in 626–627 from Cilicia, where he had won a footing in 625. Wirth prefers to think of the slave-wars in Sicily towards the end of the reign of Gallienus, and Alexandre conjectured Σκυθῶν.

(*b*) To a certain extent, also, there is a general point of view, which survives in spite of the different historical and religious situations. The cosmology is fairly uniform in outline if not in details, and even the theology, apart from the definitely Christian touches,[†] has a character of its own. This is particularly true of the eschatology, for, although one oracle will be more Messianic (in the personal sense of the term) than another, although the Jewish sections tend to view the consummation as a prolonged reign of the holy nation on earth, while the Christian Sibyllinists lay more stress on the catastrophe of the Last Judgment, yet these and other variations do not obliterate the large common features which the *Sibyllina* shared with apocalyptic—calculations about the near end, the conditions of the Judgment, the expectation of Nero's return, and so forth. Here, as in the theology, there must have been a tradition, partly akin to Orphism and Stoicism, to which every Sibyllinist felt bound to conform in the main, however well-marked his idiosyncrasies might be. It is the same in the political aspect. One oracle will favour Hadrian, for example, more than another, but it is impossible as a rule to mistake the unswerving antipathy to Rome in the later *Sibyllina*, where it succeeds to the rôle of Syria in the earlier. Jew and Christian were generally at one on this point, when they composed *Sibyllina*. Their reasons might vary, and there might be differences in the degree of their bitterness, but the Roman Empire stood out as the last enemy to be conquered by, or rather for, the just. The rivalry of East and West, which characterized ancient history, was to be decided in favour of the East. This again was a feature which the *Sibyllina* shared with their allied literary product, the apocalypses. Upon the whole, we may contend that, while those who endeavour to identify the historical situations of the various Sibylline oracles are right in feeling that the *ars nesciendi* forms an unusually important part of the investigator's equipment, nevertheless, standing back from the details, we are able to gain a fairly broad and accurate impression of their general spirit and characteristics.[‡]

The amazing developments of the Sibylline myth in Byzantine and mediæval literature do not concern us here, as they were practically independent of our Sibylline collection and subsequent to it. It was the 9th cent. Byzantine chronicler, Georgios Monachos (Hamartolos), for example, who apparently started the idea that the biblical queen of Sheba could be converted into a Sibyl (see the essay by S. Krauss in the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, xi. 120–131), a notion which proved the germ of some curious growths in mediæval legend. The companion tradition of the Tiburtine Sibyl (cf. *ERE* i. 580^a) does appear to run back to the 4th century. Like the exploitation of Vergil's eclogue as a Messianic prophecy,[*] it was one of several streams which flowed from almost the same soil as our Sibylline oracles, but the latter went their own way, and, if we are able to follow that way, even dimly, it is thanks to the Byzantine Christian who, in the 6th cent., cut the rough channel along which they have flowed down to us through the ramifications of early and mediæval oracular literature.

LITERATURE.—An ample bibliography will be found in **Schürer's** *GJV* iii.^{4} [Leipzig, 1909] 555–592, though he does not mention some of the English contributions, like **W. Whiston's** *A Vindication of Sibylline Oracles* (London, 1715) and **J. Floyer's** similar volume, *The Sibylline Oracles, translated from the best Greek Copies* (London, 1713). The authenticity of the oracles formed a topic of discussion among the English Deists of the 18th cent., in connexion with prophecy, but the debate led to no critical advance, owing principally to the defective spirit of historical criticism and to the corrupt state of the text. The latter difficulty was eased by Angelo Mai's discoveries of fresh material and MSS at Milan and Rome (1817, 1828), on the basis of which the first modern edition was published by a French scholar, **C. Alexandre**, *Oracula Sibyllina*, Paris, 1841–1856; the second edition of this standard work (1869) is not quite so full as the first. Almost simultaneously **J. H. Friedlieb** issued a short edition (*Die sibyllinischen Weissagungen*, Leipzig, 1852), with a German metrical version. Alexandre's version had been in Latin. **A. Rzach's** edition of the text (*Oracula Sibyllina*, Vienna, 1891) is only one of a long series of contributions which he has made to the historical and textual criticism of this literature. Lastly, **J. Geffcken** edited the oracles critically for *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*, Leipzig, 1902. Geffcken's edition is not final, but it forms an indispensable basis for study. The Jewish oracles in bks. iii.–v., together with the fragments, are translated into German by **F. Blass** in **E. Kautzsch's** *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des AT*, Tübingen, 1900, ii. 177–217, and translated into English by **H. C. O. Lanchester** in Charles's *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, Oxford, 1913, ii. 368–406. A German version of Christian oracles in bks. i.–v. and vi.–viii., etc., is published by **Geffcken** in E. Hennecke's *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, Tübingen, 1904, but there is no modern English version of them, even of selected passages. The blank verse translation by **M. S. Terry**, New York, 1890, the present writer has not been able to see. In addition to the authorities cited throughout the course of the article, he is specially indebted to the courtesy of Professor Walter Scott, formerly of Merton College, Oxford, and Toronto University, who has placed at his disposal unpublished materials relating to bks. iv. and viii.

JAMES MOFFATT.

SICARII.—See ASSASSINS.

SICKLE (δρέπανον).—In the NT the sickle is referred to only in St. Mark's Gospel (Mk 4^{29}) and in the Apocalypse (Rev 14^{14-19}). In the latter passage the victorious Christ comes with a sharp sickle in His hand to gather in the fruits of His triumph. For the simile cf. Jl 3^{13}, Jer 51^{33}. In the earliest times sickles were made of flint. They had only one cutting edge, which was generally slightly concave and serrated. As a rule the back edge was quite thick. The bone or wooden handle in which they were set followed approximately the curve of the flint edges. The flints projected from the hafts about half an inch or less. Flint sickles continued to be used throughout the Bronze Age. The reason probably was that they were on the one hand comparatively inexpensive, and on the other hand quite as efficacious as sickles made of bronze. It was not until iron came into general use in the

---

[*] It was an instance of what Rendel Harris (*The Homeric Centones*, p. 3) calls 'the multiform witchcraft of Homer over the human race.' He shows (p. 13 f.) how the *Sibyllina* took Homer more seriously than the Centones.

[†] Which are moulded, as a rule, on a type of their own.

[‡] The Swedish scholar, E. Fehr, has published an excellent monograph on these characteristics (*Studia in Oracula Sibyllina*, Upsala, 1893).

[*] This lies side by side with the proof from the Sibylline oracles, in Constantine's *Orat. ad sanct. coetum* (19). Rendel Harris (*HDB* v. 67 f.) thinks that the Vergilian element in bk. xi., to which Dechent had already called attention, the references to Æneas and the claim of priority to Homer, must mark the period of Constantine as the date when the problem of the Christian Sibyl's relation to Homer became acute.

Fourth Semitic period that flint sickles were entirely superseded. Iron sickles are confined to the Fourth Semitic and the Hellenistic periods. The breadth of the blade varies from ¾ to 2½ ins., the commonest breadth being from about 1 to 1¼ in. The handle sometimes consisted of two hafting plates secured by thongs or metal pins; occasionally, however, the butt-end of the sickle was tanged, while socketed sickles also sometimes occur. See, further, HARVEST.

LITERATURE.—R. A. S. Macalister, *The Excavation of Gezer*, 3 vols., London, 1912, i. 335, 342, ii. 32–34, 124, 127; F. J. Bliss, *A Mound of Many Cities*, do., 1894, pp. 105, 107 (with fig. 210), 108, 123; H. Vincent, *Canaan, d'après l'exploration récente*, Paris, 1907, p. 388 f.; C. Steuernagel, *Tell el-mutesellim*, Leipzig, 1908, plate xxvii.; H. B. Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*^{2}, London, 1907, pp. 188–191; *SDB*, pp. 852–853; P. S. P. Handcock, *The Archæology of the Holy Land*, London, 1916, pp. 148–149, 188, 208.

P. S. P. HANDCOCK.

SICKNESS.—Outside of the Gospels little attention is paid to sickness in the apostolic writings. This is very noticeable if one compares these writings with the OT or even the Gospels. Only five particular kinds of disease are specified: palsy (Ac 8^{7} 9^{33}); impotence (Ac 3^{2}); a digestive trouble (*πυκναὶ ἀσθένειαι*, 1 Ti 5^{23}); dysentery (Ac 28^{8}); abdominal disease associated with worms (Ac 12$^{21ff.}$). In addition we have those suffering from nervous disorders (Ac 5^{16}; cf. also 16$^{16-18}$ 19^{12}). Individuals are, in general terms, 'sick' (Dorcas [Ac 9^{37}], Epaphroditus [Ph 2$^{26-27}$], and Trophimus [2 Ti 4^{20}]), yet no symptoms are mentioned by which the nature of the illness may be defined.

The terms in which other references to sickness appear are extremely indefinite: *ἀσθενής* (cf. Ac 4^{9}), *ἀσθένεια* (Ac 28^{9}), *ἀσθενέω* (Ja 5^{14}), *ἀδύνατος* (Ac 14^{8}), *κάμνω* (Ja 5^{15}), *ἄρρωστος* (1 Co 11^{30}). The meaning here may be only lack of strength, or it may be an infirmity caused by sickness. In all these cases of specific diseases the trouble is described popularly by its leading symptoms, with the exception possibly of the ailment of Publius' father.

The only attempt to account for the cause of any sickness alluded to is by St. Paul in his advice to the Corinthians concerning the Lord's Supper. He there intimates that sickness and even death are a Divine judgment on their flagrant abuse of the Eucharist. One may compare this with the theory of the supernatural cause of disease in Hebrew and Greek circles. A connexion between sickness and disease is suggested by Jesus in Jn 5^{14}. Two other implications as to the cause of abnormal conditions are contained in the Acts, both associated with nervous derangement, yet without any conscious diagnosis or effort to account for the fact. In accord with the notions of the time, evil spirits are reported as going out from those whom they had possessed (Ac 19^{12}), a particular instance of which is in 16$^{16-18}$. Because the spirit Python possessed the damsel she became a ventriloquist-soothsayer. The demon was cast out by a word from St. Paul and the maid restored to mental equilibrium.

The treatment of sickness in the Apostolic Church, so far as suggested by the NT, is medicinal, therapeutic, psychotherapeutic, and miraculous. The practice of anointing with oil (Ja 5^{14}; cf Mk 6^{13}) is not indeed without a magical association—'in the name of the Lord'—but its long history connects it with a healing virtue; wine also possesses medicinal properties (1 Ti 5^{23}). The medicines used on the island of Malta are not specified, nor are the results of their use stated. The therapeutic treatment of disease certainly underlies St. Paul's advice to the Corinthians. Psychotherapy is to be appealed to with reference to the healing of nervous disorders (cf. 1 Co 12$^{28.30}$, 'gifts of healing'). The cases of cure which are not otherwise accounted for are regarded by the apostles as miraculous (cf. Ac 4^{16} 9^{40}).

LITERATURE.—J. R. Bennett, *The Diseases of the Bible*^{3}, 1896; T. H. Wright, art. 'Disease,' in *DCG*; A. Macalister, art. 'Medicine,' in *HDB*; see also Literature under PHYSICIAN.

C. A. BECKWITH.

SIDON (Σιδών, ethnic Σιδώνιοι).—Sidon, called 'Great Zidon' (Jos 11^{8}), was one of the maritime cities of Phœnicia, about 25 miles N. of Tyre, its 'rival in magnitude, fame, and antiquity' (Strabo, XVI. ii. 22). After the coming of Alexander the Great, whom Sidon rapturously welcomed and Tyre frantically opposed, the two cities shared the same political fortunes, being for two centuries bones of contention between the Greek kings of Syria in the north and Egypt in the south. So long, however, as their civic autonomy was secure, their factories busy, their overseas traffic prosperous, the quarrels of their alternate overlords did not greatly trouble them. And, while their wealth was apparently almost as great as ever, they added a new interest to life by learning the language and assimilating the culture of Greece. They were not now a mere race of merchant princes or pedlars, wholly absorbed in getting and spending. Strabo says that in his time—the beginning of our era—the Sidonians not only 'cultivate science and study astronomy and arithmetic, to which they are led by the application of numbers and night sailing, each of which concerns the merchant and seaman,' but there are 'distinguished philosophers, natives of Sidon, as Boethus, with whom I studied the philosophy of Aristotle, and Diodotus his brother' (XVI. ii. 24).

The two sister cities now consistently advocated a policy of peace with all their neighbours. Not possessing a fraction of the army and navy with which they once defied empires, they could no longer assert themselves even when they were in the right. When Herod Agrippa was 'highly displeased with the Tyrians and Sidonians' (Ac 12^{20}), they indulged in no useless heroics. Raising no question as to whether the king's displeasure was just or not, and facing the plain fact that 'their country was fed from the king's country,' they looked about for a friend at Court and humbly asked for peace. If there was any thought of peace with honour, it was suppressed. Dependents could not afford to be angry, and the king could do no wrong. To this had great Sidon and proud Tyre now come.

No details are given of our Lord's visit to Sidon, though it is definitely stated that He came through it, or at least its surrounding territory (reading *διά* not *καί* in Mk 7^{31}, with the best MSS), on His way to Decapolis, which He probably reached by the highway over the Lebanon to Damascus (see H. J. Holtzmann, *Die Synoptiker*^{3}, 1901 [*Handkommentar zum NT*], and A. B. Bruce, *EGT*, 'Mark,' 1897, *in loc.*). Nothing is known of the actual introduction of Christianity into Sidon. One of its bishops attended the Council of Nicæa in A.D. 325.

'Sidonian' was originally an ethnic name like 'Hittite,' Sidon and Heth being named together as sons of Canaan in Gn 10^{15}. In Homer 'Sidonia' is equivalent to *Phœnicia* and 'Sidonian' to *Phœnician.* In the Latin poets, too, when the adjective qualifies such words as 'Dido' (Virg. *Æn.* xi. 74), 'nautæ,' 'rates,' 'murex,' 'vestis,' 'chlamys,' it means *Phœnician.* The modern town, called by the Arabs Ṣaida, has about 15,000 inhabitants. Some very remarkable sarcophagi have been found in the necropolis to the S.E. of the town.

LITERATURE.—E. Robinson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine*^{2}, 3 vols., 1856, ii. 478 ff.; O. Hamdy-Bey and T. Reinach, *La Nécropole royale de Sidon*, 1892–96; C. Baedeker, *Palestine and Syria*^{2}, 1894.

JAMES STRAHAN.

SIGN.—The word σημεῖον ('sign') is used (1) of the autographic part of a letter, the mark of authenticity—2 Th 3^{17} (EV 'token'); (2) as meaning a 'symbol'—Ro 4^{11} (the 'sign of circumcision,' *i.e.* circumcision as a sign of the covenant); (3) as an 'indication'—Mt 26^{48} (Judas' kiss), Lk 2^{12} (to the Shepherds) 2^{34} (the child Jesus set for a sign); (4) hence for some wonderful indication—Mt 24$^{3.30}$, Mk 13^{4} (of Christ's Coming), Mt 16$^{1.4}$, Mk 8^{11}, 'Mk' 16$^{17.20}$, Lk 11$^{16.29}$ (to show Christ's power), Mt 16^{3} (signs of the times) 16^{4} (sign of Jonah), 1 Co 14^{22} (tongues and prophesying as a sign of the power of Christianity); and therefore for a 'miracle' or wonderful deed which has instruction as its object. The 'signs in heaven' of Rev 12$^{1.3}$ 15^{1} are a connecting link between these two shades of meaning. The usual sense of σημεῖον in the NT is a 'miracle,' especially in the plural (see art. MIRACLE).

In the EV the word 'sign' is used in two places where σημεῖον does not occur. In Lk 1^{62} 'they made signs' renders ἐνένευον, a verb used in Pr 6^{13} 10^{10} (LXX) of winking with the eye. In Ac 28^{11} 'a ship whose sign was the Dioscuri' renders πλοίῳ παρασήμῳ Διοσκούροις, where παρασήμῳ is either an adjective (='marked') or else, less probably, a substantive with Διοσκούροις in apposition (but in that case it means a ship's *flag* in classical Greek; see Liddell and Scott, *s.v.*). A. J. MACLEAN.

SILAS or SILVANUS.—The companion of Paul on his second missionary journey. The shorter (Greek) form of the name is peculiar to Acts, the longer (Latin) form appears four times in the Epistles. Its derivation is uncertain, but may be either of two Hebrew roots, שלח or שאל, which would give respectively the meanings of 'sent' and 'asked for.' The fact that Josephus mentions four Jews of the name of Silas points to its Semitic origin.

The first appearance of Silas in Acts is at the close of the Council of Jerusalem, when he and Judas surnamed Barsabbas, described as chief men among the brethren, are chosen to accompany Paul and Barnabas to Antioch, with a letter notifying the decision. Being prophets, they not only deliver the letter but remain for a time at Antioch, exhorting and confirming the brethren, and then return to Jerusalem. Shortly afterwards, the rupture between Paul and Barnabas takes place, and Silas is selected by Paul as his new associate, and starts with him on his second missionary journey (15$^{22-41}$). As this implies the presence of Silas again at Antioch, it may be supposed that Paul has sent for him to Jerusalem, or that he has returned of his own accord after reporting to the primitive Church the fulfilment of his original mission; 15^{34} (AV, 'it pleased Silas to abide there still'), which appears with variations in some ancient MSS, is generally regarded as a gloss. On the subsequent journey Silas is not mentioned till Philippi is reached, when his name becomes associated with that of Paul in all the circumstances of the imprisonment, the conversion of the jailer, and the official release. Incidentally, like Paul, he is credited with the possession of the Roman citizenship (16$^{19-40}$). Thereafter, he shares the work and troubles of the Apostle at Thessalonica, and proceeds thence with him to Berœa, where he and Timothy are left, when Paul retires before his Jewish opponents (17$^{1-14}$). From Athens a message is sent by Paul, instructing them to come to him with all speed (17^{15}), but he has left that city and arrived at Corinth before they rejoin him (18^{5}). At this point the name of Silas disappears from the story.

The references to Silvanus in the Epistles accord with the account of Paul's companion in Acts and confirm the theory of their identification. In both Epistles to the Thessalonians, probably written at Corinth, he appears as joint-author with Paul and Timothy, and unites in their friendly greetings (1 Th 1^{1}, 2 Th 1^{1}). In 2 Co 1^{19} he is again mentioned with them as a co-worker in the gospel at Corinth. The inference is that he was the same person as Silas, whom Acts represents as the companion of Paul and Timothy both at Thessalonica and at Corinth. The final reference—1 P 5^{12} ('by Silvanus, a faithful brother unto you, as I suppose, I have written briefly')—only shows that in later years he was associated with the author of that Epistle, and assisted him in its production. One passage, when compared with Acts, may be supposed to present a difficulty, if it is presumed that Silas and Timothy were inseparable from the time when they parted with Paul at Berœa till they rejoined him at Corinth. 1 Th 3$^{1-5}$ conveys the impression that Timothy had been with Paul in Athens, and had been sent thence to Thessalonica to comfort the Church there and bring news of its condition. It is possible that Timothy paid a visit to Athens which has not been recorded in Acts, but it is unnecessary to infer that Silas accompanied him, and that consequently there is a lacuna in Acts, so far as he is concerned.

Notwithstanding the corroboration of the notices in the Epistles, the identification of Silas with Silvanus has not passed without question. On the ground of an alleged tendency in Acts to connect Paul as closely as possible with the Church of Jerusalem, Weizsäcker suggests that, in the account of the second missionary journey, Silas has been substituted for Silvanus, the actual companion of Paul. As a member of the primitive Church and its agent in conveying the decree regarding circumcision to Antioch, Silas would be a pledge of relationship between Paul and Jerusalem on the second journey, as Barnabas had been on the first; and so he would be regarded by the author of Acts as a more appropriate associate for the Apostle. For this theory, however, the reasons adduced have not been found convincing, even by those who admit the supposed tendency in Acts. Scarcely more success has attended the various critical attempts to identify Silas or Silvanus with other friends and fellow-labourers of Paul, such as Luke (Van Vloten) and Titus (Märcker and Seufert). Of the theories advanced in this connexion perhaps the least probable is that which finds two Silases in Acts—one the messenger of the Jerusalem Church to Antioch (15$^{22-32}$), the other the companion of Paul on his second journey (15^{40}–18^{5})—and identifies the latter with both Silvanus and Titus (Zimmer).

To Silas has been attributed a share, more or less independent, in the writing of several Epistles. Thus it has been suggested that some passages of 1 Cor. (1^{16} 3$^{16f.}$ 15$^{20-34}$ 16$^{13-18}$) are interpolations by him, and that he wrote the apocalyptic portions of the Epistles to the Thessalonians (R. Scott). Even the whole of 1 and 2 Thess. has been supposed to be the work of the Silvanus mentioned in 1 P 5^{12}. Silas (Silvanus) is also one of the authors to whom Hebrews has been ascribed; but there is no traditional support for this view, and too little is known of him to furnish a compelling argument. As in the case of Barnabas, his connexion with the Jerusalem Church tells rather against his authorship of such an Epistle as Hebrews. There is good reason, however, for associating the name of Silas with 1 Peter, and the part borne by him in the production of that Epistle is obtaining increasing recognition. According to 5^{12}, he was at least the amanuensis by whose hand it was written; but, if the Petrine origin be accepted, various considerations, such as the Pauline cast of the Epistle and its correct Greek, suggest that both matter and style were largely influenced by him. Some scholars, indeed, suppose that Peter entrusted its composition entirely to Silas, and contented himself with revising and approving it. Others go further, and think that Silas may have written it independently, after the death of the Apostle.

LITERATURE.—Works on Paul and the Apostolic Age generally, esp. A. C. McGiffert, *History of the Apostolic Age*, Edinburgh, 1897, and C. v. Weizsäcker, *Das apostolische Zeitalter*, Freiburg i. B., 1886 (Eng. tr., 2 vols., London, 1894–95); Van Vloten, 'Lucas und Silas,' in *ZWT* x. [1867], xiv. [1871]; Märcker, 'Titus Silvanus,' in *Gymnasialprogramm*, 1864; Seufert, in *ZWT* xxviii. [1885]; Zimmer, in *ZKWL* ii. [1881]; R. Scott, *The Pauline Epistles*, Edinburgh, 1909; J. Weiss, *SK* lxv. [1892] 253; J. Moffatt, *LNT*, Edinburgh, 1911, pp. 80 f., 296, 331 f., 439.

D. FREW.

SILK.—Silk, the fibrous substance produced by the mulberry silk-moth of China, is mentioned (Rev 18^{12}) as part of the costly merchandise of 'Babylon' (Imperial Rome). The Chinese name of the silk-worm is *si*, Korean *soi*; to the Greeks it became known as σήρ, the people supplying it being the Σῆρες, and the fibre itself σηρικόν, whence Lat. *sericum*, Fr. *soie*, Ger. *Seide*, Eng. silk. The silk-worm is first mentioned in Western literature by Aristotle (*de Anim. Hist.* v. 19). The silken textures of the East began to be imported into Italy in the early days of the Empire. At first they fetched fabulous prices, and their use by men was deemed an unpardonable extravagance. At a meeting of the Senate, in the time of Tiberius, 'much was said against the luxury of the city by Quintus Haterius, a man of consular rank, and by Octavius Fronto, formerly prætor; and a law was passed "against using vessels of solid gold in serving up repasts, and against men disgracing themselves with silken garments"' (Tac. *Ann.* ii. 33). The trade, however, grew. Elagabalus was the first Emperor who wore robes of silk. Aurelian complained that a pound of it cost 12 ounces of gold. Under Justinian the Western world at last received from China a supply of silk-worms' eggs (E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, iv. [1902], ch. xl. § 3).

JAMES STRAHAN.

SILVANUS.—See SILAS.

SILVER (ἄργυρος, ἀργύριον, Lat. *argentum*; from ἀργός, 'shining').—Silver is one of the precious or 'noble' metals, used from the earliest times as a means of exchange and adornment. With the exception of gold, it is the most malleable and ductile of all substances. Gold was 'estimated at thirteen times the value of silver' (Herod. iii. 95), but the proportion varied considerably at different periods.

1. Articles of silver are mentioned among the costly wares sold in the market of the apocalyptic Babylon—Imperial Rome (Rev 18^{12}). As this metal has a perfect metallic lustre and takes a very high polish, it was often used for mirrors. The *aquila*, or standard of the Roman legion, was of silver (Cic. *in Cat.* I. ix. 24). 'Milites argentati' were soldiers whose shields were covered or plated with silver (Livy, ix. 40). In a great house there were many 'vasa argentea' (2 Ti 2^{20}, Vulg.; cf. Hor. *Sat.* ii. 7. 72 f.). Rome's principal supply of silver came from southern Spain. The Maccabees heard what the conquering race 'did in the land of Spain, that they might become masters of the mines of silver and gold which were there' (1 Mac 8^{3}). Strabo (III. ii. 10), quoting Polybius, says that 40,000 men were regularly employed in the silver mines of New Carthage (Carthagena), which yielded daily to the Roman people a revenue of 25,000 drachmæ.

2. As silver was the everyday medium of exchange in the ancient world, the Gr. ἀργύριον, like the Heb. כֶּסֶף, frequently denoted money (cf. Fr. *argent*). When Simon the Magian offered Peter money (χρήματα) for the power to work miracles by the Holy Spirit, the Apostle answered, in horror of this 'simony,' or trafficking in sacred things, 'Thy money (ἀργύριον, RV 'silver') perish with thee.' Xenophon (*Cyrop.* III. i. 33) has the phrase εἰς ἀργύριον λογισθέντα, 'calculated in our money,' and ἀργύριον καθαρόν (Theocritus, xv. 36) meant 'hard cash.'

3. The magical books which were publicly burned in Ephesus during St. Paul's great mission there were priced at 50,000 [pieces] of silver (ἀργυρίου μυριάδας πέντε, Ac 19^{19}). The coin understood is the drachma or denarius. When Rome became mistress of the Hellenic world, she allowed the Attic coinage to be continued along with her own monetary system. Since the δραχμή and the denarius were practically equal in value, they became convertible terms. As the denarius-drachma (translated 'shilling' in the American RV) was about 9½d., the books destroyed were worth nearly £2000. Many silver shrines, or miniatures of the temple of Diana, were made and sold in the same city. A gild of silversmiths (ἀργυροκόποι, cf. LXX Jg 17^{4}, Jer 6^{29}), of which Demetrius was probably the president during the last year of St. Paul's residence at Ephesus, made their living largely by this lucrative business.

4. In depicting the fate of rich men, James (5^{3}) says that their gold and silver are 'rusted' (κατίωται). This is not strictly accurate, as both of these metals have the property of resisting corrosion; but silver is readily blackened or tarnished in an atmosphere of sulphuretted hydrogen.

LITERATURE.—Art. 'Argentum' in W. Smith, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*, 1848; W. Jacob, *Inquiry into Production and Consumption of the Precious Metals*, 1831.

JAMES STRAHAN.

SIMEON.—See PETER, TRIBES.

SIMON (the tanner).—A dweller in the town of Joppa or Jaffa; in his house St. Peter lodged during his sojourn there after the raising of Dorcas (see art. DORCAS), and from it he was summoned to visit the Roman centurion Cornelius (Ac 9^{43} $10^{6.\ 17.\ 32}$). The fact that Simon's occupation was that of a tanner has given rise to several interesting suggestions with regard to the Apostle's state of mind at this period. The trade of Simon, owing to his constant contact with dead bodies, was regarded by the Jews as unclean (cf. Edersheim, *Jewish Social Life*, 1908, p. 158). The Apostle's scruples as to ceremonial uncleanness were not so pronounced as to prevent him from lodging with Simon, and perhaps his contact with the tanner, probably a Christian believer, may have helped to prepare his mind for receiving the message of Cornelius. We may admit that the reference to the tanner is meant to introduce the 'universalism' of the following chapter without in any way suggesting that the passage is unhistorical (cf. Knowling, *EGT*, 'Acts,' 1900, *in loco*).

W. F. BOYD.

SIMON MAGUS.—1. The NT account.—Ac 8^{9-24} gives the story of 'a certain man, Simon by name,' who 'used sorcery, and amazed the people of Samaria, giving out that himself was some great one (λέγων εἶναί τινα ἑαυτὸν μέγαν): to whom they all gave heed, from the least to the greatest, saying, This man is that power of God which is called Great (ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ καλουμένη μεγάλη). . . . But when they believed Philip preaching good tidings concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women. And Simon also himself believed: and being baptized, he continued with Philip; and beholding signs and great miracles wrought, he was amazed.' The news of the movement in Samaria brought Peter and John from Jerusalem, and through their prayers and the laying on of their hands, the believers received the Holy Spirit. Seeing this, Simon offered the apostles money, saying, 'Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay my hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost. But Peter said unto him, Thy silver perish with thee, because thou hast thought to obtain the gift of God with money. Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter: for thy heart is not right before God. Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray the Lord if perhaps the thought of thy heart shall be forgiven thee. For I see that thou art in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity. And Simon answered and said, Pray ye for me to the Lord, that none of the things which ye have spoken come upon me.'

These verses tell all that is known definitely about this particular Simon. But in subsequent Christian literature the name became very prominent. A Simon Magus was described as an archheretic who was the antagonist of Simon Peter. Accounts of his teaching are given in heresiological works. An elaborate legend became current about his conflict with the Apostle. In modern times fresh importance has attached to this legend because the Tübingen school have tried to show that the oldest accounts are those in which Simon Magus is represented as a caricature of the apostle Paul, and the opponent of the apostle Peter. This has been used as a basis for their reconstruction of early Church history from the point of view that Peter and Paul were in conflict, and that the Acts of the Apostles was a conciliatory compromise. The question of the identity of this legendary Simon Magus—the disguised Paul—with the Simon of Ac 8 can be discussed best after some inquiry into the legend and into the references to Simon in Patristic literature.

2. The Simonian legend.—There are two chief sources of this legend. (*a*) *The Clementine Homilies and Recognitions.* These are two forms of an early Christian romance, the *Homilies* in Greek, the *Recognitions* in Latin. They relate the story of Clement's search for truth until his reunion with the long-lost members of his family. According to the *Homilies*, in the course of his wanderings Clement met Peter at Cæsarea in Palestine. The Apostle was to dispute next day with Simon of Gitta. The story of Simon is then related by two of his pupils: that his father's name was Antonius, his mother's Rachel; that he was a Samaritan of the village of Gitta, six miles from Samaria; that he was educated at Alexandria, and was skilled in the wisdom of the Greeks and in magic. Peter disputed with him for three days, after which Simon fled by night to Tyre. Peter followed him to Tyre and to Sidon and to Tripolis, whence Simon escaped to Syria. They met again in Laodicea, where the disputes were renewed. Simon managed to escape by changing the face of Faustus, Clement's father, and making it like his own. This device, however, led to Faustus exposing Simon's impostures. Meanwhile Simon reached Judæa.

In the *Recognitions* only one dispute is described—in Cæsarea. But there is reference to a visit of Simon to Rome, where he is to be honoured with statues. It is probable that these versions are independent re-castings of a common original. The question in doubt is whether the original story told only of a conflict between Simon and Peter in Syria, or whether it related an earlier conflict in Syria and a later one in Rome.

(*b*) *The legendary Acts of Peter and Paul.* These tell the story of contests between Simon and Peter; but they place the scene in Rome. There are two forms of the story. (*a*) The Gnostic Acts (*Actus Petri cum Simone*) tell that after Paul left Rome, a stir arose in the city about a Simon who worked miracles and called himself the Great Power of God. He came to the city flying in smoke, and created a great sensation. Therefore Peter was bidden by Christ to go to Rome. The Apostle found Simon installed in the house of a Roman senator, and he attacked the Magian as a ravening wolf. When Simon refused him admittance, Peter sent a message by a dog, whose speech brought the traitor to the Apostle's feet. By the aid of further miracles Peter silenced Simon till a public controversy was arranged before all Rome. Peter raised the dead, and exposed Simon's attempts to work similar miracles. Simon then promised to fly to God. But in answer to Peter's prayers he fell, broke his thigh, and was taken to Terracina, where he died.

(*β*) The *Acta Petri et Pauli* gives another form of the story. Paul is the companion of Peter in Rome. The success of their preaching made the Jews stir up Simon against Peter. He convinced Nero of his claims, and Peter and Paul were summoned to appear before the Emperor. After long discussion, Simon undertook to fly from a high tower. Paul was distressed, and prayed. But Peter adjured the angels of Satan not to help Simon, who fell to the ground and died.

The *Apostolic Constitutions* contains the whole story of a conflict in Syria and a conflict in Rome. Probably this is a piecing together of two stories, originally independent. It does not settle the question whether the *Clementines* and the *Petrine Acts* depend upon independent documents, as G. Salmon thinks (*DCB*, art. 'Simon Magus'), or whether they severally elaborate two parts of one common history—an Ebionite *Acts of Peter*—which is Lipsius' theory.

The substance of the story as it concerns Simon is that he travelled in Syria and as far as Rome, deceiving people by his magic and winning widespread adherence for his claims to Divine power; that he was opposed by Simon Peter, who exposed his deceit and brought to naught his efforts to impose on the people.

3. The Simonian system.—In addition to these legendary accounts of the contest between Simon Magus and Simon Peter, there are references to Simon in Patristic literature which give more trustworthy accounts of his life and teaching. (*a*) The earliest reference is in Justin Martyr's *Apology* (i. 26, 56). He says: 'After Christ's ascension into heaven the devils put forward certain men who said that they themselves were gods; and they were not only not persecuted by you, but even deemed worthy of honours. There was a Samaritan, Simon, a native of the village called Gitta, who in the reign of Claudius Cæsar, and in your royal city of Rome, did mighty acts of magic, by virtue of the art of the devils operating in him. He was considered a god, and as a god was honoured by you with a statue, which statue was erected on the river Tiber, between the two bridges, and bore this inscription, in the language of Rome: "Simoni Deo Sancto," "To Simon the holy God." And almost all the Samaritans, and a few even of other nations, worship him, and acknowledge him as the first god; and a woman, Helena, who went about with him at that time, and had formerly been a prostitute, they say is the first idea generated by him. And a man, Menander, also a Samaritan, of the town Capparetæa, a disciple of Simon, and inspired by devils, we know to have deceived many while he was in Antioch by his magical art' (26). In 56 is another reference: 'But the evil spirits were not satisfied with saying, before Christ's appearance, that those who were said to be sons of Jupiter were born of him; but after He had appeared and been born among men, and when they learned how He had been foretold by the prophets, and knew that He should be believed on and looked for by every nation, they again, as was said before, put forward other men, the Samaritans Simon and Menander, who did many mighty works by magic, and deceived many, and still keep them deceived. For even among yourselves, as we said before, Simon was in the royal city Rome in the reign of Claudius Cæsar, and so greatly astonished the sacred senate and people of the Romans, that he was considered a god, and honoured, like the others whom you honour as gods, with a statue.' (*b*) Later Patristic literature seems to gather its accounts of Simon's teaching from some common ground—probably a lost treatise by Justin. Simon is said to have taught that he was the highest power—the Supreme God Himself, who descended to the lower world because its rulers ruled it all. He passed through its regions, appearing in every form necessary for the restoration of the lost harmony. Among Jews he manifested himself as the Son, in Samaria as the Father, and among other nations as the Holy Spirit. Helena (whom he had purchased in a brothel in Tyre) was his πρώτη ἔννοια, mother of all, by whom he had called the angels and archangels into being. She had been laid under bonds by her own children, but after many transmigrations had been rescued at last by the Supreme God—Simon—who came down to deliver her and to bring salvation to all men through the knowledge of himself. He liberated the world and those who were his from the rule of those who had made the world. Those who had hope in him and in Helena might freely do as they would, for men were saved according to his grace and not according to good works.

Such a system is obviously an amalgam of paganism and Christianity. It contains a good deal that is common to almost all the forms of Gnostic myths, and it borrows some of its ideas and not a little of its phraseology from Christianity.

4. The historical value of the story.—(*a*) One explanation of this tradition is that it is the legendary development of the story in Ac 8, under the influence of a continued conflict between Christianity and the Simonian Gnosis. The Tübingen school, however, explained it in a different way. According to Baur and his followers, the Ebionite Clementine literature contains a caricature of the apostle Paul. Instead of the Simon of the tradition being treated as a historical character, the name is to be interpreted as a term of reproach for Paul. Whenever Simon Magus is mentioned in ancient documents, Paul is meant. The contest between Simon Magus and Simon Peter really represents the conflict between Paul and Peter. So the Simon of Ac 8 was no real character but only a presentation of Paul. Thus, Peter's refusal to give Simon Magus the power of the Holy Spirit is a covert account of the refusal of the elder Apostle to admit Paul's claims to rank with them, backed though the claim was by a gift of money for the poor saints in Jerusalem. Starting from this standpoint, Baur's school reconstructed the story of early Christianity with the conflict between Paul and Peter as the key. The Acts of the Apostles was interpreted as a compromise, a book written in a conciliatory interest but resting upon Jewish Christian myths only partly understood. The journeys of Peter and his visit to Rome are merely an ecclesiastical tradition reflecting the journeys of Paul, and expressing the belief of the Church that the great Apostle, who had withstood the Simon-Paul everywhere else, must have followed up his victory in the capital. This theory, ingeniously applied to Patristic and Clementine literature, and worked out with much skill, won many adherents for a time, despite the fact that it proved the presence of biased and fabricated history within primitive Christianity. But a reaction soon set in. In *EBr*^{9} (xxii. 79) A. Harnack wrote, 'On no other point are the proofs of the Tübingen school weaker than in this.' In *EBr*^{11} (xxv. 126) St. George Stock's conclusion is, 'The idea that Simon Magus is merely a distortion of St. Paul is absurd.' It is not denied that the Clementine literature is marked by hostility to St. Paul. 'The Clementine writings were produced in Rome, early in the third century, by members of the Elkesaite sect. . . . One of the characteristics of these heretics was hostility to Paul, whom they refused to recognize as an apostle' (G. Salmon in Smith-Wace, *DCB*, London, 1877–87, iv. 687). But, though P. W. Schmiedel (in *EBi*, art. 'Simon Magus') defends a modified position of the Tübingen school, most modern scholars would probably accept St. George Stock's summing up in *EBr*^{11}: 'In conclusion, there are of course some grounds for the Tübingen view, but they are wholly inadequate to bear the structure that has been raised upon them. St. Paul was a hard hitter, and Jewish Christians, who still clung to James and Peter as the only true pillars of the Church, are not likely to have cherished any love for his memory. This is enough to account for the hostility displayed against St. Paul in the Clementines. But to push the equation of St. Paul with Simon Magus further than we are forced to by the facts of the case is to lose sight of the real character of the Clementines as the counter-blast of Jewish to Samaritan Gnosticism and to obscure the greatness of Simon of Gitta, who was really the father of all heresy.' As F. H. Chase puts it in discussing Lipsius' theory that the Simonian legend originated the story of Peter's visit to Rome: 'Lipsius' theory is really an offshoot of the Tübingen theory of the apostolic age. The main trunk is now seen to be lifeless. The branch cannot but share its decay' (*HDB* iii. 777^b).*

(*b*) If the Tübingen theory be recognized as 'lifeless,' there are three questions of importance bearing on the historical value of the Simonian legend.

(1) Is the Simon of the legends a historical person? Salmon's answer may be accepted at once: 'It cannot reasonably be doubted that Simon of Gitta is a historical personage. The heretical sect which claimed him for its founder was regarded by Justin Martyr as most formidable. . . . He speaks of it as predominant in Samaria, and not unknown elsewhere; that is to say, probably, he had met members of the sect at Rome. The existence of the sect is testified by Hegesippus and Clement of Alexandria' (*op. cit.*, p. 687 f.). There is nothing to throw doubt upon the definite statements of Justin Martyr about the Simon who is mentioned alongside of Menander and Marcion as the founder of a sect and the object of veneration.

There is less certainty about the details of his life. With regard to his birthplace—Gitta—Justin was a Samaritan and a good witness; and the statements of Hegesippus about his father and his mother, and his being trained at Alexandria, are quite possibly good tradition. Also the general ascription to him of magical powers probably reflects a claim he made. The persistent story of his journeys, coupled with the existence of Simonians outside Palestine, favours the view that he travelled, though considerable haziness hangs over the whole subject of his alleged visit to Rome.

(2) Is the Simon of Ac 8 a historical person? This question also may be answered unhesitatingly in the affirmative. 'The Simon of the Acts is also a real person' (Salmon, *op. cit.*, p. 688). With the

---

* Cf. *Exp*, 8th ser., v. [1913] 348 n.

break-down of the Tübingen theory, and the rehabilitation of Luke as a historian, all reasons for doubting the essential accuracy of the narrative in Acts have disappeared. That narrative relates to times of which Luke had no firsthand knowledge; therefore it may be coloured by later feeling. But Luke related it because it occurred, and because he had reasons for relating it. What those reasons were, and whether we know very much about Simon, can be discussed best when another question has been answered:

(3) Is Simon of Gitta the same as the Simon of Ac 8? This identity was generally assumed until Salmon questioned it in the article referred to above. He believes that Justin Martyr confused Simon of Gitta with Simon of Acts, and that the confusion has dominated all subsequent references to them. His chief argument is that the Simonian doctrine, being a variant of 2nd cent. Gnosticism, could not have been propounded by a Simon who lived in Samaria *c.* A.D. 40. In support of his theory he adds: 'If Simon had been really the inventor of the Gnostic myths, it is not credible that they should pass into so many systems which did not care to retain any memory of his name. On the other hand, if this mythology had been in Simon's time already current, it is intelligible that he might make use of it in order to justify to his disciples his relations with a fallen woman.' Salmon thinks that 'the Simon described by Justin was not, as he supposed, the father of Gnosticism, but had found at the time of his teaching a Gnostic system already developed. It follows, then, that Justin's Simon could not be identical with the contemporary of the Apostles; and the name Simon is so common a one, that the supposition of two Simons presents no difficulty.' His conclusion is that 'the Simon described by Justin was his elder only by a generation; that he was a Gnostic teacher who had gained some followers at Samaria; and that Justin rashly identified him with the magician told of in the Acts of the Apostles' (*ib.*, p. 683). This conclusion is supported generally by St. George Stock in *EBr*^{11} (xxv. 126), who says that 'Dr. George Salmon brought light into darkness by distinguishing between Simon of Gitta and the original Simon Magus.' His conclusions are: '(1) That all we know of the original Simon Magus is contained in Acts; (2) that from very early times he has been confused with another Simon'; and he adds: 'Before such an amalgam of paganism and Christianity could be propounded, it is evident that Christianity must have been for some little time before the world, and that the system cannot possibly be traced back to Simon Magus. Is it not this early struggle between Jewish and Samaritan universalism, involving as it did a struggle of religion against magic, that is really symbolized under the wild traditions of the contest between Peter and Simon?' (*ib.*, p. 127). 'Justin Martyr was decidedly weak in history, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that he may have confused the Simon of *Acts* with a heretical leader of the same name who lived much nearer to his own time, especially as this other Simon also had a great reputation for magic. A full century must have elapsed between the conversion of Simon Magus to Christianity and the earliest date possible . . . for the composition of Justin Martyr's *First Apology*' (*c.* A.D. 152) (*ib.*, p. 126). F. H. Chase also accepts this theory, saying, in reference to the Simonian legend, 'the most probable account of its genesis is that it grew out of a mistaken identity' (*HDB* iii. 778).

(*c*) Before this modification of the view held so long as to the identification of the two Simons can be accepted, regard must be had to the following points.

(1) Are the references of Justin Martyr historically explicable on the theory that Simon of Gitta was a 2nd cent. Gnostic? Even if Justin was decidedly 'weak in history' (Stock), he must have acted 'rashly,' as Salmon allows (*loc. cit.*), if he identified two men who lived nearly a century apart, in a public *Apology* in defence of Christianity. His reference to a statue to Simon in Rome is generally regarded as a mistake, because in 1574 the base of a statue was dug up in the island in the Tiber to which he refers, with the inscription 'Semoni Sanco Deo Fidio.' It is supposed, therefore, that Justin mistook a statue dedicated to a Sabine deity for one erected to Simon. There is considerable force, however, in the plea of the editors of the 'Ante-Nicene Christian Library' that this is 'very slight evidence on which to reject so precise a statement as Justin here makes; a statement which he would scarcely have hazarded in an apology addressed to Rome, where every person had the means of ascertaining its accuracy. If, as is supposed, he made a mistake, it must have been at once exposed, and other writers would not have so frequently repeated the story as they have done' (*Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, ii. [1892] 29 n.).

It has also to be considered whether Justin could repeat (chs. 26 and 56) such a flagrant error as bringing Simon to Rome in the reign of Claudius and ascribing public honours to him, if the man Simon was not a generation older than himself, as Salmon's theory suggests. Would such a tradition have grown up in the Roman community about a man who was almost their contemporary? And, if there was no tradition, was Justin likely to have made such a statement, even adding the plea, 'As for the statue, if you please destroy it' (56)? At any rate, would the story have been left unrefuted so that it could be accepted and repeated by later writers? If Simon of Gitta was a 2nd cent. Gnostic teacher, either he had not been in Rome, in which case it is difficult to understand why Justin's fallacious reference was not exposed, or he had been in Rome so recently as to make it difficult to understand why Justin pushed back the event for nearly a century.

(2) Further, it has to be noted that there is a real parallelism between the Simonian system and the slight account in Acts of the teaching of Simon Magus. The magical element is prominent in both. Simon in Samaria 'used sorcery, and amazed the people,' a trait very characteristic of the legendary Simon. Acts (8$^{10. 11}$) says Simon gave out 'that himself was some great one: to whom they all gave heed, from the least to the greatest, saying, This man is that power of God which is called Great (*ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ καλουμένη μεγάλη*).' And Simon is said to have been specially struck with the 'signs and great miracles' wrought by Philip (v.^{13}). Now, in the Simonian system, Simon is said to have taught that he was the highest God, *τὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα δύναμιν*. He called himself *ὁ ἑστώς, ὁ στάς, ὁ στησόμενος*, implying his pre-existence and his immortality.

It would seem, therefore, that if the two Simons are different, the 3rd cent. Simon taught doctrines whose elements were taught by the earlier Simon; also that both were distinguished for sorcery and for magical powers.

The amalgam of paganism and Christianity which was characteristic of Gnosticism, and which was specially obvious in the Simonian system, is readily explicable in the teaching of Simon Magus, who, according to the story in Acts, was brought into intimate contact with Christian teaching without becoming a genuine believer.

(3) Is it not possible to find a mediating theory? First of all, we must think of the Simon of Acts

as a convert whose conversion was sincere as far as it went, but was very superficial. He is not represented as resenting Peter's rebuke. It abashed him, and made him penitent to the extent of asking humbly for the Apostle's prayers. There is no contest between Simon and Peter in Acts. But is it not likely that, when Simon was brought face to face with the deeper meanings of Christianity, he failed to respond? Instead of advancing in Christian knowledge, he seceded from a community with which his connexion had been anomalous. This view is put forward also by W. M. Ramsay in *Exp*, 8th ser., v. 348. Discussing the term 'believe,' he writes, 'The example of Simon Magus seems conclusive. Simon believed (Acts viii. 13), and was baptized. Yet it is hard to suppose that he became in the final sense a Christian, although for the time he was a member of the Church. The language of Luke, on the whole, suggests the opposite. Simon, it is true, after baptism, "continued with Philip; and beholding signs and great wonders wrought, he was amazed" (*ἐξίστατο*). Yet no word is said to mitigate the final condemnation pronounced on him by Peter: "thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter; for thy heart is not right." He is described, not as repenting, but only as asking in fear of the future that Peter should pray for him.

It seems beyond question that Luke knew the reputation which Simon acquired, and that he regarded the subsequent history of Simon as the natural result of what occurred at the beginning of his connexion with the Christians.'

But it need not be supposed that when Simon broke with the Christians he renounced all he had learned. It is more probable that he carried some of the Christian ideas with him and that he wove these into a system of his own. This system did contain some of the germs of later Gnosticism. Thus he became the leader of a retrograde sect, perhaps nominally Christian and certainly using some of the Christian terminology, but in reality anti-Christian and exalting Simon himself to the central position which Christianity was giving to Jesus Christ. The separation between Simon and the Christians would probably be widened by the departure of Philip soon after the apostles left Samaria. Philip had been the agent of the Christian movement, and it is not unlikely that on his withdrawal many Samaritans might easily fall again under the spell of Simon, especially if he were offering himself as a Christian leader.

Now if Simon was a pervert who originated an apostate sect—an anti-Christian sect, though a sect claiming Christian connexion—is it not comprehensible that two results happened? (*a*) Simon became the arch-heretic in the eyes of the Christians, and tradition was sure to be busy with his name. (*b*) The sect he founded became absorbed in later Gnosticism, but also contributed something to it. Gnosticism did not enter the 2nd cent. fully grown. A. C. Headlam (art. 'Gnosticism' in *HDB* ii. 188) remarks that 'the developed Gnostic heresies of the 2nd cent. presuppose the NT,' and that 'the embryo Gnosticism of the NT takes its proper place in the history of religious development.'[*] May not Simon have been one of the forerunners of Gnosticism; not, perhaps, its father, as tradition has supposed, but one source of some of its ramifications? A. C. McGiffert refers to this: 'His effort to rival and surpass Jesus very likely began after his contact with the Christians which Luke records. His religious system was apparently a syncretism of Jewish and Oriental elements, and resembled very closely some forms of second century Gnosticism, if it did not indeed give rise to them' (*A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, pp. 99–100). Without ascribing to Simon such prominence as is demanded by tradition, it is permissible to believe that he gave his name to a sect which became Gnostic but which retained a historical connexion with him, though its doctrines were modified largely in process of time.

In such circumstances we may find a historical basis for much of the Simonian tradition, whilst recognizing that tradition had been busy embellishing the story of Simon even long before the time of Justin Martyr. It may be assumed that he was born in the Samaritan village of Gitta; that he was a man of unusual attainments; that he received some training in Alexandrian philosophy; that he startled Samaria with his powers; that he was, for a time, nominally a Christian, but that he broke away from the Christian Church; that his knowledge of Christian truth was very shallow, and that he carried some Christian ideas over with him, but in confusion; and that his subsequent teaching was an amalgam of this crude Christian precipitate with Alexandrian speculation and with magic. It is probable that he travelled, preaching his new doctrines, practising his magical arts, and winning for himself and for his teaching something of the devotion with which he was regarded in Samaria. Whether he ever exhibited his skill in Rome, we have no means of determining; but at all events he was brought to Rome by popular legend and was represented as winning an extraordinary success in the Imperial city. His disciples became a sect which bore his name and which persisted long after the death of the original members. Simon's teaching contained some of the germs of 2nd cent. Gnosticism, which it may have done something to evolve and with which the Simonian sect became impregnated, though it still retained many of its early magico-Christian elements. Beyond this it seems impossible to go. What was actually taught by Simon cannot now be distinguished from what was taught by his followers. The story of Helena may be a Simonian doctrine, rather than a fact. It cannot be said whether Simon Magus and Simon Peter ever met again after their encounter in Samaria; the record of their conflict is probably the romance which tradition has woven round the name of one who was known to have been a Christian once but was rebuked by Peter for his ignorance of Christian truth and who became subsequently an apostate.

(4) Coming back to the story in Ac 8, there seems no reason for doubting its essential accuracy (see 4 (*b*) (2)).

(i.) Luke's account looks like history. There is no embellishment from the point of view of the Christian romancer. The story does not dilate upon the remarkable conversion, and it leaves Simon directly the purpose of the reference to him is fulfilled. The plain record is not embroidered; moreover, there is an almost tantalizing brevity, as in several of Luke's stories, which belong to the history of the Christian Church and were not written to satisfy curiosity.

(ii.) This does not deny that the story may be coloured somewhat by being seen through the haze of a considerable interval. Luke was writing about events of which he knew nothing at first hand. Perhaps he had met the Simonian sect outside Palestine, and there may have been already some magnifying of Simon's success in Samaria or some depreciation of his motives in Christian circles. At the same time, this 'impressionist' account of the incident would not justify such a criticism, *e.g.*, as that of McGiffert: 'Luke's account of Simon's dealings with the apostles can hardly be accurate in all the details, for it rests upon the assumption that the Holy Spirit was given by the laying on of the apostles' hands' (*op. cit.*, p. 100 n.). All that the account suggests is that in this case the gift of the Holy Spirit was connected with the laying on of hands—a suggestion quite in harmony with the general tenor of Acts.

---

[*] Cf. Vernon Bartlet, in *Exp*, 8th ser., v. 32, 33.

(iii.) Why did Luke insert the story? Salmon's laconic comment is, 'we need not ascribe to Luke any more recondite motive for relating the incident, than that he believed that it had occurred' (*op. cit.*, p. 668). This answers the charge that the incident is unhistorical. But it fails to take into account the modern estimate of Luke's methods as a historian. Two motives may be suggested.

(*a*) Is not a sufficient reason Luke's well-known plan of describing the first meeting between Christianity and rival systems? In Ac 13^{6-12} there is a careful account of the meeting between Paul the Christian and Elymas the sorcerer; 16^{16-19} tells of the maid having the spirit of divination whom St. Paul delivered; 17^{16-31} relates Paul's first argument with the Stoic and Epicurean philosophers in Athens; 19^{13-20} describes Paul's success in conflict with the pagan dabblers in the black art. Does not Ac 8^{9-24} tell the story of the earliest meeting between Christianity and a rival system? Simon Magus represented the magic of that time. When the gospel was brought to Samaria, thus making its first essay on non-Jewish soil, it was discovered to be mightier than the magic which exercised such a powerful influence over the contemporary world. It was a notable triumph for the young Christian faith that, on the first trial of strength with the world's magic, the gospel not only lured the multitudes from the magician but even won the admiration of the magician himself, and at least his temporary adherence.

(*b*) If we may accept the existence in Luke's time of a Simonian sect owing anything to this Simon Magus, would not another motive urge Luke to tell the story? Evidently the Simonian heresy always had a Christian tinge. This made it more dangerous to Christians than a gnosis which did not affect any Christian influence. Luke therefore would be anxious to disclose the true circumstances that accounted for the origin of the sect—circumstances highly discreditable to Simon. If the story in Acts tells exactly what happened, it was natural for the Church historian to relate it in order to guard Christians against Simonian errors, and to warn members of the sect against the mistake they were making in following such a leader as Simon instead of accepting the orthodox Christian faith.

It only remains to add that the influence of Simon Magus lingers in two directions. (1) The practice of presenting any person to an ecclesiastical benefice for money, gift, or reward is an offence against the law of the Church, known as 'simony.' An example of the offence occurs as early as the 3rd century. It was prohibited by many Councils, but it became well rooted in the mediæval Church. Dante refers to it (*Inferno*, xix. 1).

(2) 'Doctor Faustus' of popular literature preserves several traits of the ancient magian. The story is reminiscent of the Simonian legend in several points. In Simon Magus himself there may be a suggestion of Mephistopheles.

LITERATURE.—The three most complete articles on Simon Magus in English are in *HDB* (A. C. Headlam), in *DCB* (G. Salmon), in *EBr*^{11} (St. George Stock). A. Harnack's art. in *EBr*^{9} should also be consulted. See also F. H. Chase, art. 'Peter (Simon)' in *HDB*, esp. pp. 773–775 for account of Gnostic Acts of the Clementine literature, and pp. 777–779 for discussion of Peter's visit to Rome and the Simonian legend. P. W. Schmiedel, art. 'Simon Magus' in *EBi*, gives the modern modified form of the Tübingen theory. There is a brief summing up of several of the questions involved in note on Ac 8^{9} by R. J. Knowling in *EGT*, 'Acts,' London, 1900. J. B. Lightfoot discusses the Ebionite and anti-Pauline spirit of the Clementine literature in his essay on 'St. Paul and the Three' appended to *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*^{9}, London, 1887, pp. 324–330; see also p. 61; W. M. Ramsay, *Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the NT*, London, 1915.

J. E. ROBERTS.

SIMON PETER.—See PETER.

SIMPLICITY (lit. 'one-foldedness').—(*a*) In Ro 16^{18} the term 'simple' is used in the AV to translate ἄκακος. False teachers by smooth and fair speech beguile the hearts of the 'simple.' These are inexperienced Christians, unfamiliar with the duplicity of guile. ἄκακος in He 7^{26} is used in the purely good sense of 'guileless,' and is applied to Jesus, but here the word seems to be used in a slightly derogatory sense—so ignorant of evil as to be easily deceived by evil.

(*b*) In Ro 16^{19} the word 'simple,' translating ἀκέραιος (lit. 'free from foreign admixture,' as, *e.g.*, wine unmingled with water, unalloyed metal), has no such derogatory significance. St. Paul would have his readers innocent without being ignorant; discerning the wiles of Satan, yet without sin-craft: in wisdom many-sided—in aim and affection *single-minded* (cf. 1 Co 14^{20}, 'Be not children in mind: howbeit in malice, be ye babes').

(*c*) In 1 P 2^{2} ἄδολος is used in the sense of 'simple,' 'unadulterated': 'Desire the sincere milk of the word' (AV: the word 'sincere' being used in its early English sense of 'unmixed'). See R. C. Trench, *Synonyms of the NT*^{8}, London, 1876, p. lvi.

(*d*) 'Simplicity' is given as the AV translation of ἁπλότης in Ro 12^{8}: 'He that giveth, let him do it with simplicity.' The Greek word indicates one-foldedness; in regard to giving, the term suggests that there is no two-sidedness in the act, that the impulse to help is not checked by a spirit of grudging selfishness. Thus the sense of 'liberality' became attached to the word, and so it is translated in the RV of this passage (cf. 2 Co 8^{2} [AV and RV] $9^{11.13}$, Ja 1^{5}).

In 2 Co 11^{3} St. Paul fears lest the church at Corinth, like tempted Eve, 'should be corrupted from the simplicity (both AV and RV) that is toward Christ.' The noun (ἁπλότης) would be better translated here 'singleness of heart,' as in AV and RV of Eph 6^{5} and Col 3^{22} ('Obey your masters in singleness of heart,' *i.e.* in contrast to the double-dealing of eye-service). In Ac 2^{46} ('They'—*i.e.* the members of the primitive Church—'did take their food with gladness and singleness of heart') the same idea is expressed by another phrase—ἀφελότητι καρδίας—the figure suggested being that of a field clear of stony ground (ἀ + φελλεύς). The AV tr. 'simplicity' of 2 Co 1^{12} rests on an inferior reading—ἁπλότητι for ἁγιότητι.

H. BULCOCK.

SIN.—'Sin' is a term which belongs to religion. Moral evil as an injury done by man to himself is vice, as an offence against human society crime, but as affecting his relation to God sin. But even here we may distinguish a more distinctively religious from the more general moral sense. It is distrust of the goodness and grace of God as well as disobedience to the law of God as the standard of moral obligation. To be forgetful of God in one's thoughts, to be neglectful of piety and worship towards God, is as much sin as to disregard and defy God's commandments. It is sometimes insisted in writings of to-day, such as Tennant's (see Literature), that sin must be conscious and voluntary distrust and disobedience; but it will appear that in the Scriptures the emphasis on the subjective consciousness is secondary. Sin includes departure from, or failure to reach, the standard of religious and moral obligation for man determined by the nature and purpose of God; the stress falls more on the objective reality—the difference between what man is and what he should be, God being what He is. While it might be convenient to restrict the term 'sin' to conscious, voluntary acts, yet the wider usage is too deeply rooted in religious thought to be easily displaced. It must be insisted, however, that moral accountability, personal blameworthiness, attaches to the conscious and voluntary acts alone, even although, as regards the consequences of evil, human solidarity is such that the innocent may suffer with the guilty.

The term 'guilt' is one that requires careful definition. It is not punishment; for punishment consists of all the evil consequences of sin, which the sinner in his sense of having sinned regards as resulting from a violated moral law, or more personally as the evidences of the Divine displeasure. This subjective consciousness is not, however, illusory, as it does correspond with and respond to a moral order and a personal will opposed to sin, which are an objective reality. Guilt is the liability to punishment, the sinner by his act placing himself in such a relation to the moral order and the personal will of God as to expose him to the evil consequences included in his punishment. Here again our modern thought with its refinements makes distinctions which the Scriptures for the most part ignore. Can we separate, or must we identify, guilt and sense of guilt? Is there an objective fact and a subjective feeling? If sin is confined strictly to conscious and voluntary acts, then guilt, it would seem, must be measured by the sense of guilt, the blameworthiness or evil desert that the conscience of the sinner assigns to him. If this were so, then the worse a man became, the less guilty he would be; for it is a sign of moral deterioration to lose the sense of shame in wrongdoing.

The Scripture approach—and surely this is the properly religious approach—to the question is from the side of God rather than of man. A man's guilt is measured, not by his shame or sorrow, but by God's judgment: his relation to God as affected by his sin is determined, not by his own opinion of himself, but by God's view of him. The Divine judgment will, we may confidently believe, take due account of all the facts; the departure from, or failure to reach, the Divine standard, the moral possibility of each man as determined by his heredity, environment, and individuality, and his own moral estimate of himself—all will be included in God's knowledge of him, and so his guilt will be determined, not by an unerring wisdom and an unfailing righteousness only, but also by an unexhausted love. Thus a man's sense of guilt is not the measure of his guilt: for the more callous he is morally, the worse must his moral condition appear in the sight of God; and the more sensitive he is, the better must he appear to God. In the measure in which a man judges himself in penitence will he not be judged guilty by God.

Further, in his subjective consciousness a man tends to separate himself, both in his merits and in his defects, from his fellow-men; but in objective reality men are so closely related to one another as to be involved in moral responsibility for one another. Saints as a whole must bear the blame for many of the conditions which make the criminal; and the saint will bear in his heart as a personal sorrow and shame the sins of his fellow-men. In God's view also the individual does not stand isolated; but the race is a unity, one in its guilt, yet also one for God's grace. While, when necessary, we must insist on individual liberty and personal responsibility, we must not ignore the complementary truth of racial solidarity. The Scripture point of view is predominantly, if not exclusively, universal objectivity and not individual subjectivity; and unless we recognize this we shall fail to understand the apostolic teaching.

1. St. Paul's teaching.—As the *DCG* deals with the teaching of Jesus, we are here strictly confined to the apostolic teaching; and we must obviously begin with St. Paul.

(*a*) *The universality of sin.*—St. Paul's view is the distinctively religious view. Men, dependent upon God, and capable of knowing God, 'glorified him not as God, neither gave thanks,' but dishonoured God in their conception of Him, and in their worship (Ro 1^{21}); their moral deterioration followed religious perversion (vv.$^{24. 25}$). Even in the Gentiles this involved guilt, for the sin was conscious and voluntary, as a disregard and defiance of a law written in their hearts (1^{28-32} 2^{14-16}). Not less guilty was the Jew who failed to keep the Law of the possession of which he made his boast (2^{23}). By such a historical induction St. Paul establishes his thesis of the universality of sin and consequent guilt, and confirms it from the Scriptures, the aim of which is to bring to all men the sense of guilt, 'that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may be brought under the judgement of God' (3^{19}); 'the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold down the truth in unrighteousness' (1^{18}). This thesis is advanced, not for its own sake, however, but to show the need of as universal a salvation offered to mankind in Christ.

The validity of St. Paul's conclusion here is not affected by the correctness or otherwise of the explanation which he offers of the origin of idolatry and the immorality consequent on it. First, we must recognize the Hebraic mode of speech, which represents as direct Divine judgment what we should regard as inevitable moral consequence; and, secondly, we must to-day regard polytheism and the accompanying idolatry as seemingly inevitable stages in the development of the religious consciousness of the Divine. We may admit, however, that idolatry as St. Paul knew it in the Roman Empire was closely associated with immorality; and that Greek and Roman mythology was likely to have an adverse moral influence, as Plato in the *Republic* recognized.

In affirming that sin involves guilt, exposes man to the Divine judgment, St. Paul was echoing the teaching not only of the OT and of Jesus Himself (Mt 11^{22} $23^{37. 39}$) but of the universal human conscience, confirmed by the course of human history. There is a moral order in man and the world condemning and executing sentence on sin; and, if God be personally immanent in the world, we cannot distinguish that moral order from the mind and will of God. And, if God be personal, He feels as well as thinks and wills; and so we cannot altogether exclude an emotional reaction of God against sin. St. Paul's term 'the wrath of God' may be allowed its full significance so long as we exclude any passion inconsistent with holy love. Thus we are here dealing, not with an outgrown superstition, but with a permanent moral and spiritual reality—man's sin and God's judgment, man's need and God's offer of salvation.

(*b*) *The development of sin.*—From the universal fact we may turn to the individual feeling of sin. St. Paul was not merely generalizing his individual experience in his proof of the universality of sin, but it is certain that his individual experience gave emphasis to his statement. The classic passage is Ro 7^{7-25}, which the present writer must regard as an account of St. Paul's own individual experience, before the grace of Christ brought him deliverance; but there is no doubt that he desires us to regard his individual experience as in greater or lesser degree common to all men. Sin is a power dwelling in man, which may for a time be latent, but which is provoked into exercise by the

Law. The knowledge of the prohibition stimulates, and does not restrain, the opposition of sin to law; as the common proverb says, 'Forbidden fruit is sweet.' While the mind knows, approves, and delights in the law of God as holy, righteous, and good, the flesh is the seat and vehicle of sin. The 'law in the members' is opposed to, resists and conquers, the 'law in the mind,' and so the man is brought into bondage, doing what he condemns, unable to do what he approves. This passage raises three questions which must briefly be answered.

(1) *Sin as a power.* — For St. Paul here as throughout chapters 5. 6. 7 sin is personified as distinct from the animal appetites, the physical impulses, and even the human will itself as dwelling in men and bringing men into bondage. It enters into the heart ($7^{17.20}$), works on man, using the Law itself for its ends (vv.$^{8.11}$), and enslaves him ($6^{6.17.20}$). In Christ he is freed from sin (vv.$^{18.22}$) and dies to it (vv.$^{9.11}$). As freed from and dead to sin, the Christian is not to put his members at the service of sin (v.^{13}), and must not allow it to reign over him in his body (v.^{12}). Is this only personification, or does St. Paul regard sin as a personal agent? As a Jew he believed in Satan and a host of evil spirits; and probably, if pressed to explain the power of sin, he would have appealed to this personal agency; but we must not assume that when he thus speaks of sin he is always thinking of Satan. Sin is for him an objective reality without being always identified with Satan (see Sanday-Headlam, *ICC*, 'Romans,' p. 145 f.). For us the personification is suggestive in so far as we must recognize that in customs, beliefs, rites, institutions, in human society generally, there is an influence for evil that hurtfully affects the individual — what Ritschl has called the Kingdom of sin as opposed to the Kingdom of God. 'The subject of sin, rather, is *humanity as the sum of all individuals*, in so far as the selfish action of each person, involving him as it does in illimitable interaction with all others, is directed in any degree whatsoever towards the opposite of the good, and leads to the association of individuals in common evil' (*Justification and Reconciliation*, Eng. tr., Edinburgh, 1900, p. 335).

(2) *The flesh as the seat and vehicle of sin.*—As there is in this Dictionary a separate article FLESH, the subject cannot here be fully discussed: a summary statement must suffice. The flesh is not identical with the body, animal appetite, or sensuous impulse; it is man's whole nature, in so far as he disowns his dependence on God, opposes his will to God, and resists the influence of the Spirit of God. It is man in the aspect, not merely of creatureliness, but of wilfulness and godlessness. It is as corrupted and perverted by sin that human nature lends itself as a channel to and an instrument of sin as a power dwelling in and ruling over man.

(3) *The relation of the Law to sin.*—The Law reveals sin, because it shows the opposition between the will of God and the wishes of man (Ro 3^{20} 7^{7}). The Law provokes rather than restrains sin ($7^{8.9}$; cf. 1 Co 15^{56}): the commandment is like a challenge, which sin at once accepts. This St. Paul represents not only as the human result, but as the Divine intention (Ro 5^{20}, Gal 3^{19}), in order that a full exposure might be made of what sin in its very nature is (Ro 7^{13}), so that men might be made fully aware of their need of deliverance from it (11^{32}). The Law fails to restrain, because of its inherent impotence (τὸ γὰρ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου, Ro 8^{3}), as letter and not spirit (2 Co 3^{6}), as written on tables of stone and not on tables that are hearts of flesh (v.^{3}; cf. Jer 31^{33}). Thus sin as a power, finding its seat and vehicle in the flesh, not restrained but provoked by the law in the individual, brings a bondage from which the gospel offers deliverance, even as it sets a universal grace of God over against the universal sin of mankind.

(*c*) *The origin of sin.*—What explanation can be offered of the fact of the universality of sin? How has man's nature become so corrupted and perverted as to be described by the term 'flesh'? How can sin be represented as a power dwelling in, ruling over, man, and bringing him into bondage? While St. Paul does not in Ro $5^{12.21}$ formally offer this explanation, the passage being introduced into the argument for another purpose—to prove the greater efficacy of grace than of sin, by as much as Christ is greater than Adam—yet, as he is there dealing with his view of the introduction of sin into the world, we must regard that passage as his explanation both of sin as a power in humanity and of the flesh; for it is not likely that he would leave sin in the race and sin in the individual unconnected. In the art. FALL the subject has already been discussed; here only the considerations bearing immediately on the subject of sin need be mentioned. The relation of the race to Adam may be conceived as two-fold: (1) a participation in guilt; (2) an inheritance of a sinful disposition.

(1) *Participation in guilt.* — St. Paul teaches that all men are involved in the penalty of Adam's transgression, for 'death passed unto all men' (v.^{12}), but he does not teach that all men are held guilty of Adam's transgression; for (*a*) by a surprising change of construction and discontinuity of thought he affirms as the reason for the universality of death the actual transgression of all men 'for that all sinned,' and (*b*) he guards himself against the charge of imputing guilt when there is no conscious and voluntary transgression, by affirming that 'sin is not imputed when there is no law' (v.^{13}).

As regards (*a*), the clause ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον cannot mean that all sinned in Adam ('omnes peccarunt, Adamo peccante,' Bengel), either as the physical source or as the moral representative of the race; for ἐφ' ᾧ most probably means 'because.'

As regards (*b*), while St. Paul affirms that guilt is not ascribed unless there is transgression of law, as in the case of Adam, yet he asserts that nevertheless the same penalty falls on all. For him, therefore, penalty may be racial, while guilt must be personal. This statement, however, is qualified by his declaration in chs. 1 and 2 of the responsibility of the Gentiles as having an inward law. Did he really think of any period or nation as having had in this sense no law?

(2) *Inheritance of a sinful disposition.*—Unless the analogy with Christ is incomplete, there must be, however, some connexion between Adam's transgression and the actual sin of all mankind. How does St. Paul conceive that connexion? It has usually been taken for granted that he teaches that by Adam's transgression human nature was itself infected, and that from him there descends to all men a sinful disposition. But he might mean no more than that sin as an alien power found entrance into the race, and brought each individual under its dominion. He may regard social rather than physical heredity (to apply a modern distinction) as the channel of the transmission and diffusion of sin. In view, however, of his teaching about the 'flesh,' it is more probable that he did regard human nature as corrupted and perverted; and, in the absence of any other explanation, we seem warranted in assuming that he did connect this fact with the Fall. We must beware, however, of ascribing to him such definite doctrines as those of 'original sin' and 'total depravity'; for

later thought has probably read into his words more than was clearly present to his own mind.

It cannot be shown that St. Paul regarded all men as involved in Adam's guilt, either because of their physical descent from him or of any federal relation to him, even although all men are subject to the penalty of death. He does not explain how there is liability to the penalty without culpability for the offence; but he does regard mankind as guilty in the first sense, and not guilty (except by personal transgression) in the second sense. Later theology blurred this distinction in teaching 'original sin' in both senses. Nor is there any ground for holding that he ascribed to Adam that moral endowment which this theology assigned to him. He does not, as is sometimes maintained, represent Adam himself as subject to the flesh in the same way as are his descendants; for 1 Co 15^{47} contrasts not the unfallen Adam with the pre-existent Christ, but the fallen Adam with the Risen Christ; but he does emphasize the voluntary character of Adam's act: it was disobedience (Ro 5^{19}). Could he have assigned to it the moral significance he does, had he thought of Adam as in the hopeless and helpless bondage described in 7^{7-25}? This passage, however, represents that bondage not as directly inherited, but as resulting in the individual from a moral development, in which sin uses the flesh to bring it about. Thus he does not teach *total depravity* as an inheritance.

(*d*) *The penalty of sin.*—St. Paul undoubtedly teaches that death is the penalty of sin (Ro 5^{12}). While he includes physical dissolution, death means more for him (6^{21-23}); it has a moral and religious content; it is judgment and doom; it is invested with dread and darkness by man's sense of sin (1 Co 15^{56}). While we cannot in the light of our modern knowledge regard physical dissolution, as St. Paul regarded it, as the penalty of sin (for it appears to us a natural necessity), yet, viewing death in its totality, as he did, we may still maintain that it is sin that gives it the character of an evil to be dreaded. The connexion between death and sin, St. Paul affirms, is not that of effect and cause, but of penalty and transgression (Ro 5^{14}), or wages and work (6^{23}); for he thinks not of a natural sequence, but of a deserved sentence (2^{5}). He approaches our modes of thought more closely, however, in the analogy of sowing and reaping (Gal 6^{8}; cf. Ja 1^{15}).

(*e*) *The deliverance from sin.*—This is for St. Paul two-fold: it is an annulling of the guilt and removal of the penalty of sin, as well as a destruction of the power of sin. Sin is an act of disobedience (Ro 5^{19}), committed against God (1^{21}) and His Law (3^{20} 7^{7}), which involves personal responsibility (1^{20}), ill desert (13^{2}), and the Divine condemnation ($5^{16.18}$). This condemnation is expressed in the penalty of death, which is not, as we have just seen, a natural consequence, but a Divine appointment, an expression of God's wrath against sin (Ro 1^{18}, Eph 5^{6}, Col 3^{6}). The work of Christ as an act of obedience (Ro 5^{19}) reversed this condemnation (8^{1}), and reconciled men with God (5^{10}, 2 Co $5^{18.20}$). We shall miss what is central for St. Paul if we ignore this objective atonement of Christ for the race, and confine our regard, as we tend to-day to do, to the subjective influence of Christ in destroying sin's power in the individual.

That inward change St. Paul describes as dying to sin, being buried with Christ through baptism into death, a crucifixion or dying with Christ, a resurrection and living with Christ (Ro 6^{1-11}, Eph 2^{1-10}). By this he does not mean insensibility to temptation, or cessation from struggle, but a deliverance from the impotence felt in bondage to sin, and a confidence of victory through Christ. Nor does he mean a process completed in man by Divine power apart from his effort; for believers are to reckon themselves to be not only dead unto sin, but alive unto God in Christ Jesus. But they are not to let sin reign in their mortal selves, nor are they to present their members unto sin (Ro 6^{11-13}); and they are to mortify by the spirit the deeds of the body (8^{13}; cf. Col 3^{5}). Thus St. Paul knows from his own personal experience a complete remedy for the universal fatal disease of sin; and all that in his letters he presents regarding this subject is presented that he may commend the gospel to men, as the sole, sufficient, Divine provision for the universal dominant human necessity.

2. St. John's teaching.—(*a*) In the *Fourth Gospel* sin is primarily represented as unbelief, the rejection of Christ (1^{11} 16^{9}), aggravated by the pretension of knowledge (9^{41}). As Christ is one with God, this involves hatred of the Father (15^{24}). The choice reveals the real disposition (3^{19-21}), and so justly incurs judgment. Sin is a slavery (8^{34}). One notable contribution to the doctrine of sin is the denial of the invariable connexion of sin and suffering (9^{3}), although it is not denied (5^{14}) that often there is a connexion.

In the *First Epistle* sin is described as lawlessness (3^{4}, ἀνομία) and unrighteousness (5^{17}, ἀδικία); and, as love is the supreme commandment, hatred is especially condemned (3^{12}). Further, as righteousness is identified with truth, sin is equivalent to falsehood (2^{22} 4^{20}); but this is not an intellectualist view, as truth has a moral and spiritual content; it is the Divine reality revealed to men in Christ. On the one hand, Christ is Himself sinless, and was manifested to take away sins and to destroy the works of the Devil ($3^{5.8}$); and, on the other hand, believers by abiding in Him are kept from sin (v.^{6}), because the Evil One cannot touch them (5^{18}).

Hence arises what has been called the paradox of the Epistle. On the one hand, the reality of the sinfulness even of believers is insisted on; to deny sinfulness is self-deception, and even charging God with falsehood ($1^{8.10}$), and confession is the condition of forgiveness and cleansing (v.^{9}). On the other hand, the impossibility of believers sinning is asserted; whoever abides in Christ cannot sin (3^{6}), the begotten of God cannot sin (v.^{9}), because kept by Christ and untouched by the Evil One (5^{18}). The explanation is that each of these declarations is directed against a different form of error. Of the first declaration Westcott says: 'St. John therefore considers the three false views which man is tempted to take of his position. He may deny the reality of sin (6, 7), or his responsibility for sin (8, 9), or the fact of sin in his own case (10). By doing this he makes fellowship with God, as He has been made known, impossible for himself. On the other hand, God has made provision for the realisation of fellowship between Himself and man in spite of sin' (*The Epistles of St. John*, 1883, p. 17). Regarding the second declaration, he offers this explanation: 'True fellowship with Christ, Who is absolutely sinless, is necessarily inconsistent with sin; and, yet further, the practice of sin excludes the reality of a professed knowledge of Christ' (*ib.*, p. 101). What the Apostle is referring to is not single acts of sin, due to human weakness, but the deliberate continuance in sin on the assumption that the relation to God is not, and cannot be, affected thereby. The one class of errorists denied the actuality of sin, the other declared that even the habit of sin did not deprive the believer of the blessings of the Christian salvation.

(*b*) Another contribution to the doctrine may be found in the conception of a sin unto death (5^{16}), for which intercession is not forbidden, and yet cannot be urged. The reference is not to any particular act, but rather to any act of such a character as to separate the soul from Christ and the salvation in Him. It may be compared to the sin against the Holy Ghost (Mk 3^{29}) and also to the sin of apostasy (He 6^{4-6} 10^{26}).

(*c*) It must be noticed that in this Epistle there is a very marked emphasis on Satan as the source of man's sin. The Devil has sinned from the beginning, and he that sinneth is of the Devil (3^{8}), and the whole world lieth in the Evil One (5^{19}; cf. Jn 8^{44}, where the Devil is described as a murderer and a liar).

3. St. James's teaching.—(*a*) St. James offers us, as does St. Paul, although much more briefly, a psychological account of the development of sin in the individual. Having asserted the blessedness of enduring temptation, he denies that God does or can tempt ($1^{12.13}$). Temptation arises when a man is drawn away and enticed by his desire (*ἐπιθυμία*). This desire need not itself be evil, but it acquires a sinful character when indulged in opposition to the higher law of duty. This desire has sin as its offspring, and this sin full grown is in turn the parent of death (vv.$^{14.15}$). This natural analogy, with which may be compared St. Paul's figure of sowing and reaping (Gal 6^{8}), does not, in suggesting a necessary sequence of desire, sin, and death, exclude either man's free will in consenting to the desire or God's free will in decreeing death as the penalty of sin. Nor does the passage teach that every sin must issue in death. The sin must reach its full development before death is its result. We can also here compare 1 Jn 5^{16}, 'a sin unto death.' As St. James teaches the possibility of conversion ($5^{19.20}$) and enjoins the confession of sin and mutual intercession for forgiveness (v.^{16}), this development from sin unto death may be arrested by Divine grace. The sequence is a possibility, not a necessity.

(*b*) What appears at first sight an echo of Rabbinic teaching in 2^{10}, that stumbling in one point makes a man guilty of all the law, proves on closer scrutiny entirely Christian. The law is not the Mosaic Law, but 'the perfect law,' 'the law of liberty' (1^{25}), and the 'royal law' is, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself' (2^{8}); and assuredly the respect of persons condemned is entirely inconsistent with that law. Stumbling in such a point is a violation of the principle of the law. As has often been pointed out, Jewish as St. James is, no other NT writer has so completely assimilated the teaching of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount; and it is from the inwardness of Jesus' standpoint, and not the externality of Rabbinism, that such a saying is to be judged.

(*c*) In one respect St. James does not, however, closely follow the teaching of Jesus. He assumes the probability of a connexion between sickness and sin (5^{15}), and enjoins not only prayer and anointing with oil in the name of the Lord for the healing of the disease, but also personal confession and mutual intercession for the forgiveness of the sin (vv.$^{14-16}$). For sin involves Divine judgment (4^{12} $5^{9.12}$). There is a friendship with the world which is enmity against God (4^{4}). As for the other NT writers, there is in the background of St. James's thought about sin the belief in Satan and demons (3^{15}).

4. Teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews.—(*a*) The standpoint of Hebrews must be understood if the teaching on sin is to be understood. The Epistle is primarily concerned with man's access to God, and sin, as guilt involving God's judgment, bars man's approach.

In the New Covenant there is no more conscience of sins, for the worshippers have been once cleansed, as they could not be by the sacrifices of the Law ($10^{1.2}$). While the Law failed to take away sins (v.^{11}), and could not, as touching the conscience, make the worshippers perfect (9^{9}), the blood of Jesus, the new and living Way, gives boldness to enter the holy place of fellowship with God (10^{20}), 'having obtained for us eternal redemption' (9^{12}). On account of this sacrifice offered once for all, there is remission of sins (10^{18}) and believers are sanctified (not in the sense of being made holy, but as set apart for God's service, 10^{10}). This guilt, which Christ by His atonement removes as all the propitiatory rites of the Old Covenant had failed to do, involves man in the fear of death with consequent bondage (2^{15}) and an evil conscience (10^{22}), by which is meant the sense of guilt. The writer is thus concerned not with the subjective aspect of sin as individual bondage to the power of sin, as is St. Paul in Ro 7^{7-25}, but with the objective aspect of God's judgment on sin, and the echo of that judgment in man's sense of guilt and fear of death.

(*b*) The sin which he especially warns against is the rejection of this Divine provision for the removal of sin in Christ. 'How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?' (2^{3}). There are two passages of very solemn warning, of even terrible severity (6^{4-6} $10^{26.29}$). Those who have been guilty of apostasy, having yielded to 'an evil heart of unbelief, in falling away from the living God' (3^{12}), cannot be renewed 'unto repentance,' as they have crucified 'to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame' (6^{6}): for them 'there remaineth no more a sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful expectation of judgement,' because they have 'trodden under foot the Son of God, and have counted the blood of the covenant . . . an unholy thing, and have done despite unto the Spirit of grace' (10^{26-29}). G. B. Stevens' interpretation of the two passages may be added: 'If a man deliberately and wilfully deserts Christ, he will find no other Saviour; there remains no sacrifice for sins (x. 26) except that which Christ has made. The Old Testament offerings are powerless to save; one who refuses to be saved by Christ refuses to be saved at all. For him who turns away from Christ and determines to seek salvation elsewhere, there can be only disappointment and failure. While such an attitude of refusal and contempt lasts, there is no possibility of recovery for those who assume it. But this impossibility is not an absolute but a relative one; it is an impossibility which lies within the limits of the supposition made in the context, namely, that of a renunciation of Christ. Nothing is said against the possibility of recovery to God's favor whenever one ceases from such a contempt of Christ and returns to him as the one only Saviour' (*The Theology of the NT*, Edinburgh, 1899, pp. 521-522).

(*c*) Unlike St. James, the author of this Epistle does not connect suffering with sin as its penalty, but urges his readers to regard their afflictions as fatherly chastisement ($12^{5.13}$), for Christ Himself was perfected by suffering (vv.$^{1-8}$; cf. 2^{10} 4^{15}).

5. St. Peter's teaching.—There is nothing distinctive about the teaching of St. Peter in the *First Epistle*. He warns his readers, 'as sojourners and pilgrims, to abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul' (2^{11}). He describes the Christian redemption as from the 'vain manner of life handed down from your fathers' (1^{18}). Christ's atonement for sin by substitution is distinctly taught: 'he bare our sins in his body upon the tree, that we, having died unto sins, might live unto righteousness' (2^{24}); and he 'suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God' (3^{18}). In sin he sees a personal agency, 'Your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour' (5^{8}).

In the *Second Epistle* (and also in Jude) the demonology is still more pronounced. The rebellion in heaven against God, and the expulsion of the rebels to hell (2 P 2^{4}, Jude^{6})—this is the ultimate cause of the sin in the world, on which the Divine judgment by fire will fall (2 P $3^{7.12}$).

6. Apocalyptic teaching.—A vivid anticipation of this last judgment pervades the Revelation (6^{10} 15^{1} 20^{12}): God will at last triumph over sin. But into the detailed account of that victory it is not necessary here to enter, as it belongs to eschatology (*q.v.*).

Summary.—It will be useful, having thus passed the different apostolic writers in review, to attempt a more systematic statement of the apostolic teaching. In the background there is the Jewish demonology and eschatology, although it would be a mistake so to emphasize the personal agency of Satan as to give the impression that sin was always thought of in this connexion. St. Paul distinctly personifies sin as a power; and we must recognize this personification as a characteristic feature of his teaching. In accordance with Jewish belief also, the entrance of sin and its penalty death into the race is connected with the Fall of Adam. A morally defective nature is not ascribed to Adam; and such moral freedom and responsibility are assigned to him as make his transgression an act of disobedience deserving punishment. The whole race is subject to the penalty of death; but it is not taught that the guilt of his sin is imputed as personal culpability to his descendants, for the sin of all is affirmed, and imputation of sin, where there is no law, is denied. The assumption that, when there is no outward law, there is an inward, however, deprives the latter statement of its significance. While St. Paul does thus connect the death of all with the sin of all, it would be quite in accord with Jewish thought if he regarded all men as guilty in the sense of liable to the penalty of death, while not guilty as personally culpable for voluntary transgression of known law. It is very probable, if not altogether certain, that he did connect the perversion and corruption of human nature, which he indicates in the use of the term 'flesh,' with the sin of Adam by physical heredity; for it is not likely that he left this fact unexplained, or had another explanation of it than that which he gives of the introduction of sin. While the use of the term 'flesh' in this special sense is peculiar to St. Paul, St. James indicates that the desires of man often issue in sin. All the apostolic writings agree in recognizing the universality of human sinfulness, although St. Paul alone gives a proof of it. The possibility of the process of sin going so far that no recovery is possible is recognized by St. John in his reference to the sin unto death, and by the Epistle to the Hebrews in its warnings against apostasy. The Law fails to restrain, it even provokes, sin; and the gospel alone offers an effective deliverance from sin. The worst sin is the unbelief that rejects the sole means of salvation from sin. For all sin there is judgment; but the severest judgment falls on the neglect of the offered salvation. In Christ there is both the forgiveness of sin and the victory over the power of sin. While actually the conflict with sin still continues in the believer, ideally, according to St. Paul, he is dead to sin as crucified with Christ, or, according to St. John, he cannot sin, for he is kept by Christ. While the Epistle to the Hebrews specially emphasizes the objective aspect of sin as guilt rather than the subjective aspect as weakness, in the NT generally the need of atonement for the guilt is probably even more insisted on than the need of deliverance from weakness. The doctrine of sin is everywhere presented, not for its own sake, but as the dark background on which shines the more brightly the glory of the gospel of the grace of God.

While we cannot subject Christian faith to-day to Jewish eschatology, demonology, psychology, or anthropology, even on the authority of a Christian apostle, and while the apostolic doctrine must in these respects at least be modified for our thought, yet, as it rests on a real moral and religious experience, such truths as the universality of sinfulness in the race, the reality of the moral bondage of the individual, the certainty of future judgment on persistent transgression, the necessity of forgiveness and deliverance, the sufficiency of the grace of God for salvation, will find confirmation from the moral conscience and the religious consciousness wherever there has been the obedience of faith to the Divine revelation and human redemption in Christ Jesus. To most modern thought the apostolic emphasis on these truths seems disproportionate and exaggerated; but, whatever difference of terms and even of ideas there may have been between the disciples and the Master, they did not take sin more seriously than did He who gave His life a ransom for many, and who in His own blood instituted the New Covenant unto the remission of sins.

LITERATURE.—The standard books in NT Theology and Christian doctrine; commentaries on the apostolic writings such as W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam, *ICC*, 'Romans,' Edinburgh, 1902; B. F. Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, London, 1889, *The Epistles of St. John*, do., 1883; J. B. Mayor, *The Epistle of St. James*^{3}, do., 1910; H. St. J. Thackeray, *The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*, do., 1900; J. Laidlaw, *The Bible Doctrine of Man*, new ed., Edinburgh, 1895; J. S. Candlish, *The Biblical Doctrine of Sin*, do., 1893; F. R. Tennant, *The Origin and Propagation of Sin*^{2}, Cambridge, 1906, *The Fall and Original Sin*, do., 1903, *The Concept of Sin*, do., 1912; H. W. Robinson, *The Christian Doctrine of Man*, Edinburgh, 1911; F. J. Hall, *Evolution and the Fall*, London, 1910; A. Ritschl, *Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung* (Eng. tr., *The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation*, Edinburgh, 1900).

A. E. GARVIE.

SINAI.—The peninsula between the Gulf of Suez and the Gulf of Akabah; also one of the high peaks there. The peninsula is usually called in Scripture 'the desert (or wilderness) of Sinai.' St. Stephen (Ac 7^{30}) recalls how an angel of the Lord appeared to Moses 'in the wilderness of mount Sinai, in a flame of fire in a bush.' Mount Sinai was a sacred mountain from very early times, being possibly connected with the worship of the Babylonian moon-god Sin. In the Jewish tradition it was sacred to Jahweh, and was memorable as the place where God gave to Moses the 'lively oracles' (Ac 7^{38}). See, further, MOUNT, MOUNTAIN. For Gal $4^{24f.}$ see HAGAR. J. W. DUNCAN.

SINGING.—See PRAISE.

SIRACH.—Sirach (Σειραχ or Σιραχ) is the Greek form of the name which in Syriac and post-biblical Hebrew is written סִירָא, and resembles in structure עֶזְרָא and numerous other names which appear in late Hebrew lists (*e.g.* Ezr 2), though its etymology is obscure. The Greek transliteration has been compared to Ἀκελδαμάχ for חקל דמא in Ac 1^{19}, and appears to be an attempt to render a sound sometimes called the glottal catch.

1. Author.—The person who bore this name was the father of a Jesus, author of a Hebrew work of which the original is lost, but which is preserved in a Greek translation called Σοφία Ἰησοῦ υἱοῦ Σειράχ, a Syriac translation called *The Words of Jesus son of Simon called son of Asira* (*i.e.* the Captive), and a Latin translation called *Ecclesiasticus Iesu filii Sirach.* In the Jewish oral tradition it is cited as *The Book of Ben-Sira*, whereas according to Jerome it was called *Proverbs.* The Latin name is explained by the Latin Father Rufinus as a 'non-canonical book suited for churches'; but this is very probably a conjecture, and the suggestion in the mediæval chronicle called סדר עולם (A. Neubauer, *Mediæval Jewish Chronicles*, Oxford, 1887–95, i. 167) that the title was a Latin one derived from *Ecclesiastes*, *i.e.* 'Book in the style of Ecclesiastes,' is attractive. The Hebrew original doubtless perished when the rest of the non-canonical literature in that language was destroyed; and such specimens as are preserved in the collections of oral tradition are exceedingly inaccurate, inconsistent, and mixed up with biblical and other matter, while at times sayings of Ben-Sira are ascribed to other Rabbis. In some cases the gradual merging of a saying of his in some biblical text can be followed in different collections of tradition. From this source, then, nothing certain can be learned about him or his book.

In the colophon (50^{27}) some Greek MSS give the grandfather's name as Eleazar, and, as has been seen, the Syriac gives the father's as Simon, supposing Asira to be an Aramaic sobriquet. The last seems improbable, since we should have expected the Hebrew form to be ben-ha-Asir; but the word may have been a sobriquet, and the other statements may be correct.

To the Greek translation there is prefixed a preface of great interest, said to be the only known honest paragraph by any Israelite of this period, in which the translator states that the original was by his grandfather, a diligent student of the Law, the Prophets, and the other national books (a phrase which represents the Rabbinical *TNK*, *i.e.* *Law, Prophets, Writings*, as a name for the OT), and that he himself had come to Alexandria in the year 38 under King Euergetes, and studied there for a long time. He implies further that the whole OT already existed in Greek. Though the chronological expression is not perfectly clear, it seems probable that it should be interpreted as the year 38 of Euergetes II., which synchronizes with 132 B.C. The author in the Greek translation calls himself in the colophon (50^{27}) 'of Jerusalem,' according to some MSS 'a priest of Jerusalem'; and the list of eminent Israelites with which the book closes ends with an encomium on the high priest Simon son of Onias ('Nathania' of the Syriac is a corruption to be explained from the Syriac script). If this personage is to be identified with the Simon the Just of Josephus, his period of office appears to have been from 300 to 287 B.C., and the words of Ben-Sira imply, though they do not distinctly state, that he had seen this Simon officiate. Various ways have been devised of reconciling the dates of the original and the translation, which according to this would be separated by about 150 years, though the translator was the grandson of the author; probably the solution is to be found in the great uncertainty which attaches to the list of the high priests, as may be seen from the works of those who have endeavoured to restore it (*e.g.* L. Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Jisrael*^{2}, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1863, ii. Excursus 6). It is clear that Ben-Sira is pre-Maccabæan; his *floruit* is probably to be placed near the end of the 3rd or the beginning of the 2nd pre-Christian century. The appendix to his work (ch. 51), which has the heading 'A Prayer of Jesus the son of Sirach,' contains some biographical details, but they are too vague and obscurely worded to convey much information. He claims to have travelled, and this may also be inferred from his praise of travel (31^{10-12}), and in both passages he asserts that he had many times been in great danger; in the Prayer he specifies an occasion when he had been falsely accused before a king. Neither this nor the other perils which he enumerates are anywhere explained in detail. Since in 43^{24} he quotes hearsay for the dangers of the sea, we should infer that he had not himself crossed it; it is noticeable that he gives the correct seasons for the overflow of the rivers Jordan, Tigris, and Nile (24^{23-25}), and, though the first of these may have been got from Jos 3^{15}, the others could scarcely have been learned from the Bible. If (as seems likely) the account of the scribe in ch. 39 is autobiographical, he must at some time have obtained employment at a Court.

The century in which he lived is one of the most obscure in Israelitish history; hence it is not possible to interpret any political allusions with certainty. Some have endeavoured to find a political programme in $45^{24.\ 25}$, where the author insists that the high-priesthood belongs for ever to the house of Aaron, but the royal title to the house of David. The true explanation seems to be that he is projecting himself into the period of national independence for the restoration of which he prays, and indeed Jewish authors of a much later period do the same; in the *Tanna d'Be Eliahu* of about the 10th cent. A.D. (ed. Warsaw, 1893, p. 563), the 'crown of the house of Aaron and the crown of the house of David' are still said to be inalienable.

2. Sources.—The translator mentions the author's biblical studies, and in $24^{28.\ 29}$ the latter confesses that his book is a biblical anthology, though in 39^{1-3} his enumeration of what the scribe should study seems to be rather too copious to be confined to the OT as we know it. Besides the Law, he is to study the wisdom of all the ancients, prophecies, the dicta of renowned men, strophes, mysteries, and enigmas. From his list of famous men we should gather that his Bible contained no book that, or at any rate no author who, has since been lost, and in the main the Torah (in the wider sense) which he possessed was identical with ours. Thus he utilizes the whole of Isaiah, all five books of Psalms, Job, Ecclesiastes, and every division of the Proverbs. He fails, indeed, to mention Daniel and Ezra in his list of famous men, and this silence is often used as a strong argument against the genuineness of both; nevertheless he appears to quote Daniel in 33^{8b}, *καὶ ἠλλοίωσε καιροὺς καὶ ἑορτάς*, from Dn 2^{21}, *ἀλλοιοῖ καιροὺς καὶ χρόνους* (perhaps מועדים), and the name for the Deity, *ὁ ζῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* (18^{1}), is found in the OT only in Dn 12^{7}. The phrase *εἰρηνεύοντες ἐν κατοικίαις αὐτῶν* (44^{6b}) is from Dn 4^{1}. 40^{29c}, *ἀλισγήσει τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐδέσμασιν ἀλλοτρίοις*, is probably an allusion to Dn 1^{8}. Further, the passage $39^{13.\ 14}$, in which the 'holy sons' are addressed and bidden 'bless the Lord for all his works,' is very like a reference to the hymn of the 'three holy children' inserted in the Greek Daniel 3^{52}. For it is not clear who else the 'holy sons' can be, and the words addressed to them, 'thrive as a rose growing on a water-brook,' are easily interpreted from Dn 1^{15}. It does not appear possible to demonstrate acquaintance on Ben-Sira's part with Chronicles or Esther; on the other hand, it cannot be shown that he was unacquainted with them.

Besides the OT, Ben-Sira displays very considerable acquaintance with Greek literature, though he nowhere confesses this, or even makes the study of Greek a necessary part of the equipment of the 'scribe.' Homer's comparison of the race of men to leaves (*Il.* vi. 146–149) is fairly closely paraphrased in 14^{18}. There is a reference to an Æsopic fable in 13^{2}. Many thoughts are borrowed from the works of Aristotle: the sleeplessness of the stars (43^{10}) from *de Cœlo*, 284 A 32; the changeableness of the fool (27^{11}) from *Eudemian Ethics*, 1239 B 12; the comparison of a friend to wine (9^{10}) from *ib.* 1238 A 23; abuse preceding battle (22^{22}) from *Metaphys.* 1013 A 9; the enmity between the hyæna and the dog (13^{18}) from *Nat. Hist.* 594 B 3; the decoy partridge (11^{30}) from *ib.* 614 A 13; the pleasing effect of green vegetation on the eye (40^{22}) from *Problems*, 959 A 25; the description of a friend as 'one whose soul is like thine' (37^{12c}) from *Great Ethics*, 1211 A 32; the affection between animals of the same species (13^{14}) from *Problems*, 896 B 10. The use of Plato is far less considerable; still the author appears in 43^{8} to adopt from *Cratylus* 409 C Plato's derivation of the word 'month,' *μεὶς* or *μήν*, from *μειοῦσθαι*, 'to diminish' or 'wane' of the moon—a derivation which naturally applies to the Greek, not to the Hebrew, name of the month; and the puzzle in 6^{22}, 'wisdom is according to her name and is not manifest to many,' appears to be a misunderstanding of the passage in the *Cratylus* (412 B) where the etymology of *σοφία* is given, and is said to be *σκοτωδέστερον*, 'somewhat obscure,' with reference not to wisdom, but to the etymology which he suggests. (The coincidence of some precepts with those to be found in the *Story of Aḥikar* is to be explained by borrowing on the part of the latter from Ben-Sira, the Aramaic papyrus of Aḥikar published by Sachau being a glaring forgery.)

One or two additional cases of borrowing from Greek literature will be noticed below; there is of course some danger of discerning a loan where there is only a coincidence. Hence the saying (20^{18}), 'A slip off the ground rather than from the tongue,' need have no connexion with that ascribed to the Stoic Zeno (Diog. Laert. vii. 22), 'It is better to slip with the feet than with the tongue,' just as al-Muhallab may have been independent of both when he pointed out (A.H. 83=A.D. 702) that 'a man may slip with his foot and recover; but if he slips with his tongue, he will perish' (Ibn Khaldun, iii. 53). Where, however, an author acknowledges to composing an anthology and insists on the importance of learning by heart what wise men have said, the chances of borrowing on his part where there is close correspondence in thought and expression are very great. We shall probably be right, then, in supposing Ben-Sira to have got from the Greeks the maxim (11^{28}), 'Call no man happy before his end.' For this saying is definitely associated by the Hellenes with the name of Solon (Herod. i. 86; Aristotle, *Nic. Ethics*, 1100 A 11), though it is constantly quoted as a proverb.

The fact that Ben-Sira had before him no Hebrew or national literature which has not been preserved is of great interest; and, as has been seen, with his grandson the biblical books were classified as they are still. In the book itself certain other names appear. Thus a portion of the prophecies is called the *Remonstrances* (48^{10}), of which we recognize the original in התוכחות similarly used in Jerus. *Peah*, ii. 4. *Enigmas and Parables* is the title taken by Ps 78, to which there is a reference in 39^{3b}. The Bible as a whole is identified with Wisdom in $24^{21.\,22}$, and v.^{28} implies that it had already undergone several generations of expounders. The attitude of Jewish writers to their Bible has so often been dictated by that of their neighbours to their own sacred books that we may be justified in finding here the traces of the Hellenic estimate of the Homeric poems, to which the Greek translator makes a veiled allusion in the phrase 'narrating epics in writing' (44^{5b}).

3. Poetical form.—To any one who compares the lines of Ben-Sira with the corresponding passages of the OT it is apparent that the latter have been subjected to Procrustean treatment; thus Gn 17^{5}, 'a father of many nations have I made thee,' becomes in Sir 44^{19}, 'Abraham was a great father of many people'; but for Gn 22^{18}, 'in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed,' Sir 45^{21b} substitutes, 'that nations should be blessed in his seed.' Sometimes the order of the phrases is inverted; so Ec 3^{14}, 'nothing can be added to it nor anything taken from it,' becomes in Sir 18^{6}, 'there may be nothing taken from them, neither may anything be added to them.' Sometimes the verse reproduced undergoes so much inversion and padding that the sense is seriously injured, *e.g.* Job 8^{12} in Sir 40^{16}. Since in the first passages cited the author has altered a Divine etymology by the introduction of a monosyllable רב and seriously reduced a Divine promise by the omission of another monosyllable כל, it is evident that single syllables are of importance to him, *i.e.* that his Procrustean methods are due to his employment of a syllabic metre to which he accommodates the biblical material. That he should do this is very natural, since, as has been seen, he displays considerable acquaintance with Greek literature; and from the nearly contemporary *Pœnulus* of Plautus we find that the kindred Phœnician dialect was being accommodated to Greek syllabic metres. The metrical scheme is supplied by the correct re-translation of any two or three of the lines, and, where they are taken directly from the OT, this is easy; and this scheme is a trimeter of the rhythm called in Greek and Latin Bacchic, in Arabic and Persian *mutaqarib*, of which the basis is a foot of the form ⏑̲ /̲ ⏑̲. In Persian this rhythm is very popular, the whole of the great classic *Shah-nameh* being composed in it; the Hebrew variety (except in the substitution of three feet as the line-unit for four) resembles the Latin variety used by Plautus, *e.g.* 'multás res simítu in meó corde vórso.' Where the lines do not correspond with this scheme, there is some fault either in the tradition or in the re-translation. Thus 27^{11}, *διήγησις εὐσεβοῦς διὰ παντὸς σοφία*, when re-translated is one syllable short; but the Latin version which offers 'sicut sol' indicates that חכמה is corrupt for כחמה, which gives the ninth syllable required, and furnishes a correct antithesis to the changeableness which in clause *b* is compared to that of the moon. Where the lines contain lists, the fact that they are padded in order to obtain a metrical scheme is sometimes very obvious. So in the list 40^{9}, *θάνατος καὶ αἷμα καὶ ἔρις καὶ ῥομφαία, ἐπαγωγαί, λιμός, καὶ σύντριμμα καὶ μάστιξ*, Fritzsche ejected *ἐπαγωγαί*, 'utpote explicationis causa adsutum.' It seems unnecessary for the sense, but the two syllables which it represents (צרות) are very necessary for the metre.

The re-translation, if ever satisfactorily accomplished, will be of importance for the study of Hebrew grammar, which at present depends on a tradition codified some 1000 years later. For it will be found that, when the consonants are restored, the metre settles the vocalization (to a certain extent) as in 33^{6}, *ἐγκαίνισον σημεῖα καὶ ἀλλοίωσον θαυμάσια*, חדש אתות ושנה נפלאות, where the metre and the sense both require that ושנה should be read *ushneh*, not *w'shanneh* ('and repeat,' not 'and alter').

4. Language.—The language employed by the author was from the nature of the case mainly that of the OT, of which his book is so largely a metrical cento; but here and there the traces of a later development of Hebrew, such as we find in the Mishna, can be discovered; and indeed the fragments preserved by the Oral Tradition exhibit a considerable amount of this. No confidence can indeed be placed in the accuracy of these; it is, however, of some interest that the transmitters of that tradition thought of his language as Rabbinic. One interesting technicality, הלכות, 'rules of conduct,' which clearly underlies *πορεῖαι* in 1^{4d} occurs in an obelized passage; but comparison of Greek and Syriac seems to reveal החזיר for 'to beg' in 40^{28b}, and בישן for 'shamefast' in 41^{14}; while in 37^{1b} the sentence rendered 'there is a friend, which is only a friend in name' meant 'which is really a friend,' the usage which is here hidden being that of the later Hebrew, where 'to be named' means 'to be in reality' (*e.g.* Bab. *Giṭṭin*, 47*a*). The use of late or Aramaic words seems at times to have been dictated by metrical reasons; so in 8^{10} גומרי can be restored with certainty for 'coals,' and it would seem that this word was employed because גחלי contained a syllable too many. The Greek word *ἀγωγός* may have been employed in 48^{17b}, but this seems to be isolated.

5. Subject.—The subject of the work belongs to what is called in Arabic *Adab*, sometimes rendered

'Miscellanies'; it is didactic, devotional, and to a slight extent historical. The last portion is clearly marked off from the rest and occupies the final chapters 44–50, being a record of the great men mentioned in the OT, to whom the high priest Simon is added; it is preceded by a description of the wonders of Nature occupying ch. 42 from v.^{15} and ch. 43. The matter which precedes seems to fall into two books, each of which starts with a hymn to Wisdom (chs. 1–23 and 24–42^{14}).

Since the aphorisms are very largely counsels of prudence, rules of conduct and behaviour, or observations on 'things in general,' even where they are not reproductions of OT verses, they contain little that is original or distinctive; man in all known societies has developed largely the same characteristics, which therefore have been noticed by observers in very different countries and periods. The interest of the work consists largely in the differences which it exhibits from the OT on the one hand and the later Jewish literature on the other. The former are largely due to the influence of Greek culture, which in the OT itself appears only in the Book of Ecclesiastes. It has been observed that in our time contact of Orientals with the West leads either to contempt on the part of the former for their own civilization or to exaggerated appreciation of it; Ben-Sira's case seems to resemble the latter. He places the home of Wisdom in Jerusalem (24^{11}), and ignores all celebrities save biblical heroes in his list of statesmen, authors, and musical composers (44$^{1-6}$). Nevertheless his debt to Greek authors is, as has been seen, considerable; and though in one place he ridicules sacrifices to idols (30^{19}), which he compares with the practice of offering meats to the dead, his book is on the whole singularly free from that invective against foreign cults which reaches its climax in Isaiah and the Wisdom of Solomon, and made the Jews, in the words of Pliny, notorious for their contempt of the gods. Of the sacrifices enjoined by his own religion he can only say that they should be offered because the law enjoins them (32^{5}). His theory of life (14$^{11-16}$) reproduces that of Heracles in the *Alcestis* of Euripides (770–802): since man has only one life, and death may come at any time, he had best enjoy himself while he has the chance. If this is slightly modified or explained away in what follows, in the demonstration that the pursuit of wisdom is the happiest form of existence, the Greek hedonistic schools were prepared to accept this gloss, or rather provided it themselves. Quite in Hellenic style he dilates on the delights of a *symposium*, where there is good wine and choice music (34^{25}–35^{6}), and, parodying the words of Mimnermus, who declared that life would not be worth having without love (T. Bergk, *Lyrici Græci*, Leipzig, 1882, ii. 25), asserts that it would not be worth having without wine (34^{27}). He is, however, by no means inclined to disparage female beauty, as appears from 26$^{13-18}$. Comparison of this passage with Pr 31$^{10-31}$, on which it is partly modelled, indicates very clearly the influence of the beauty-cult of the Hellenes on the Israelitish mind. The precepts on the use of wine display very close correspondence with those of Theognis (*Lyrici Græci*, ii. 162–164), from whom they are likely to have been taken.

The influence of Greek thought appears very strongly in the account which he gives of the training necessary for the scribe (38^{24}–39^{11}). For this purpose leisure is required; and, although in another context he had recommended industry (10$^{25.\ 26}$) and especially agriculture (7$^{15.\ 22}$), he now asserts that these occupations and those of craftsmen and artists, *e.g.* potters and gem-engravers, are inconsistent with the two which Aristotle in the *Politics* declares alone suitable for gentlemen, viz. the service of the State and philosophy. The service of the State is expressed in terms of the Athenian Republic, where the governing bodies were the *βουλή* and the *ἐκκλησία*, while the *δικαστήριον* was the judicial authority; it is, however, clear that the *δικαστής* of whom he is thinking is not the Athenian juror but the judge, or *qadi*. Although there is not a little in this passage which reminds the reader of Greek treatises on preparation for a political career, *e.g.* Plato's *Alcibiades I.*, probably it is nearer in many respects to the Islāmic discipline called *Adab al-Katib*, or studies necessary for a Secretary of State. This is doubtless due to the changes introduced into Hellenic life by the fall of the free Republics. Part of the scribe's training is to be got by travelling abroad and entering the service of some ruler (39^{4}); but it very largely consists in accumulating books and learning them by heart (vv.$^{1-3}$), as was the case in Islāmic times.

Another profession to which some attention is devoted for the first time in the literature of the Israelites is the medical (38$^{1-15}$), the existence of which has, however, to be defended from passages in Genesis and Exodus. The author expresses himself with great caution, and implies that what the physician can do is to pray for the patient.

As compared with the later Jewish literature, *i.e.*, the Talmudim and Midrashim (of which the general antiquity is certified by the Gospels, though the process of oral tradition through many centuries has introduced great modifications), Ben-Sira's book seems to exhibit few of the same interests. He looks forward to the coming of Elijah (48$^{10.\ 11}$), on the faith of the prophecy of Malachi; but he knows nothing of a Messiah. He does not even mention the Sabbath or the food-legislation (unless 40^{29c} be a reference to it). His idea of religious obligations consists in offering the prescribed sacrifices and paying the priest his dues, which the Greek text assesses more highly than the Syriac (7$^{29-31}$). He thinks of the glyptic art as a normal industry (38^{27}), not as a violation of the Second Commandment. The profound darkness which covers Israelitish affairs in the 3rd cent. B.C. renders this phenomenon difficult to explain. The cases in which the formulæ of the later Halākhāh and Haggādāh are suggested are exceedingly rare. In 37^{3} the *πονηρὸν ἐνθύμημα* evidently stands for the יצר הרע, which was derived from Gn 6^{5}, and this faculty may be what is meant by *διαβούλιον* in 17^{6}, where a rather curious list of faculties is given. In v.^{17} the theory is stated that every nation has 'a ruler,' *i.e.* guardian angel, which is worked out in the Midrashim (*e.g. Exodus Rabba*, 21, 32). In 39^{28} the 'spirits' are identified with forces whereby God wreaks vengeance on evil-doers; this theme is also worked out in the Midrash (*e.g. Genesis Rabba*, 10). From his account of a banquet (31$^{12-32}$) we should guess that the 'hand-washing' of which we read in the Gospels had not yet been introduced as a religious observance; the only ceremonial washing mentioned is after contact with a corpse (34^{25}). The only trace that has been found of Alexandrian exegesis is in 44^{16}, where Enoch is said to have been a pattern of repentance to the generations. This is inferred by Philo from the Greek word *μετέθηκεν* used in Gn 5^{24} for the Hebrew לקח, 'took' (*de Abrahamo*, 3), for 'metathesis' signifies change, in this case change of mind. If the verse were genuine, we should have to conclude that the author had studied the OT in the LXX version, and that the interpretation found in Philo was some 200 years earlier than Philo's time. It seems certain that this verse is an interpolation, not only because it is wanting in the Syriac, but chiefly because Enoch is mentioned in the supplementary list of celebrities (49^{14}), where what happened to him is interpreted according to the Hebrew. The interpolation, then, is later than the time of Philo, but it seems to have found its way into all the Greek MSS.

6. Place of the work in Jewish literature.—The mode wherein 'the Law' is eulogized in the work makes it clear that the canon in the author's time was so well fixed that the admission of any later work would be extremely difficult; although, then, verses of Ben-Sira are at times cited as from the Hagiographa, it is reasonable to explain this as due to defective memory on the part of the Rabbis who cite them, not to the work ever having been canonical. It is clear that Josephus was either unacquainted with its existence or did not regard it as sufficiently important to deserve notice. It is not actually cited in the NT, but the parable in Lk 12^{17-20} appears to be an amplification of $11^{16, 17}$, which is based on Ec $4^{7, 8}$; and the doctrine involved in 'forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us' is so clearly stated in 26^{1-7} that we are justified in regarding the latter as the source. Further, the precept against vain repetitions in prayer (Mt 6^7), whatever the correct rendering of the phrase in the original, is nearer 7^{14b}, 'repeat not a word in thy prayer,' than Ec 5^2, the source of the latter. It is probable, then, that Ben-Sira's book was at this time used in the education of the young.

The last person known to have possessed the original appears to be R. Eleazar b. Azariah, of the first half of the 2nd century. For $3^{20, 21}$ are cited on his authority from Ben-Sira in *Gen. Rabba* 8, where the four hemistichs are increased to six, and Jerus. *Ḥagigah*, ii. 1, where they are reduced to four, but interpolated from Job 11^8; in Bab. ***Ḥagigah***, 13*a* they are again reduced to four, but by arbitrary omission of two synonymous clauses. The first of these collections comes nearest to the original as certified by the Greek and Syriac together. Naturally the connexion of R. Eleazar with the citation may be inaccurate, but the fact of its occurrence in two separate collections inspires some confidence. Numerous sayings which approximate more or less closely to verses of the book are to be found in various collections, often wrongly ascribed; thus in *Aboth* 4, Sir 7^{17} is quoted according to the text of the Syriac version, and ascribed to R. Levites, a man of Yabneh. Sir 11^{22} is to be found in the *Tanna d'Be Eliahu*, i. 61, without sign of quotation. An Aramaic form of 12^1 is quoted in *Gen. Rabba* 22 as a proverb. Some of these resemblances may be coincidences, but in other cases (*e.g.* 7^{17}) there can be no doubt that verses of the book have been preserved in a mangled form, with erroneous ascriptions. Since the period wherein they were transmitted orally covered several centuries at the least, they furnish a good example of this mode of transmission, whereby accuracy seems always to be lost. The date when any of these collections ceased to be oral cannot now be determined, since Jewish writers invariably falsify the evidence on this subject; examples will be found in the variants of Yahuda's edition of R. Bachya's *Hidayah*, Leiden, 1912, pp. 145, 146.

From the discussion in Bab. *Sanh.* 100*b* we can infer that the original had been lost by the time of Rab Joseph (4th century). This personage couples it with 'foreign literature,' by the reading of which eternal life is forfeited; and the first passage cited and interpreted quite certainly does not belong to it. It thus appears that the book was already thought of as in the hands of Christians, though originally Jewish. Jerome indeed (about 400) professes to have seen a copy of the original; as he made no use of it for the correction of the *Vetus Itala*, his statement is liable to suspicion. Jewish writers either know nothing about Ben-Sira or get their information from Christians. Before the book became part of the inheritance left by the Hellenic and Syrian Jews to the Christians, it appears to have received some additions which are found in certain Greek MSS and are obelized in the Hexaplar Syriac. Some of these, *e.g.* those after 1^4 and 1^8, are evidently translated from Hebrew; and the long passage that follows 26^{16} in MS 248, which contains most of these additions, seems to be certified as a translation from the Hebrew by the fact of its occurrence in the Syriac. The MS cited and some others occasionally exhibit variants which go back to a Hebrew original, *e.g.* 37^{26b}, *ἔσται* for *ζήσεται*; 25^{2c}, *μωρόν* for *μοιχόν* (*i.e.* שוטה); 10^{15}, where *ὑπερηφάνων* is added to *ἐθνῶν*, doubtless an improved rendering of גאים. Since it is certain, nevertheless, that all Greek MSS go back to *one* copy, if the Hebrew disappeared about A.D. 150 these improvements must all have been made before that date, though perpetuated in late MSS.

7. Place in the Christian Church.—The process whereby the literature of the Hellenic and Syrian Jews was appropriated and inherited by Christians is exceedingly obscure. With this question is connected that of the origin of the Peshiṭta OT, which is now known to lie behind certain passages in the Greek text of the Gospels, whence it appears to be pre-Christian; just as Christian books of interest were translated into Syriac shortly after their appearance in Christian times, we may suppose the same to have been done with Hebrew books in Jewish times. The work of Ben-Sira formed part of the inheritance taken over by the Christian communities from their predecessors; but, though associated with the canonical books, it failed to obtain admission into the canon; hence it is found in neither of the canons preserved in the *HE* of Eusebius, who notices the fact (vi. 13) that although *ἀντιλεγόμενον* it is cited by Clement of Alexandria. That various Christian writers should quote it as by Solomon is not surprising. The Latin version is certainly early, and in a curious language, said to be African Latinity; it appears to have been made from the Greek either directly or indirectly with the help of a copy of the original; for not only does it exhibit the chapters in their right order as does the Syriac, whereas in all copies of the Greek there is a serious transposition of chapters in the middle of the work, but in a considerable number of cases its renderings are explicable on this supposition. An example has been given above.

The other versions add little or nothing to the criticism of the text; of these the Armenian, Coptic, Ethiopic, and Syro-Hexaplar are from the Greek, the Arabic from the Syriac.

8. In Islāmic literature the name of Ben-Sira appears to be unknown, but in spite of this his work is perhaps more frequently cited than any other biblical book. Thus 30^{1-8} are cited in the *Kamil* of Mubarrad (i. 45) as the words of 'a sage'; 26. 20 was cited by Malik b. Dinar († A.H. 123 = A.D. 740) as 'written in the Wisdom' (*Mikhlat*, 49, 16); 18^{24} is cited by Ghazali (*Iḥyā 'ulūm al din*, iii. 66) as from the Torah; 29^{21} is ascribed to the prophet Muhammad in the *Musnad* of Ibn Hanbal (i. 62) as is 25^2 in the *Sahih* of Muslim (i. 41); while 26^{26} is cited as 'a tradition' by Yaqut (*Dictionary of Learned Men*, ed. D. S. Margoliouth, London, 1913, i. 15). Early authors, *e.g.* the poet Abu Nuwas and the polygraph Jahiz of Basrah, occasionally employ phrases which seem traceable to the book, though there is no suggestion of the source; thus in the *Misers* of the latter (ed H. van Vloten, Leiden, 1900, p. 99, 12) 'the people call miser one whose loaves are few in number' looks like a reproduction of 34^{24a}; it is, however, difficult to distinguish in such cases between reproduction and coincidence, whence it is likely that the verse of Ibn Hijjah (Cairo, 1304, p. 96), 'death is sweeter than a bitter life,' is his own, though the words are all but identical with those of Sir 30^{17}.

9. Re-translations.—Re-translation, in the sense of restoring the lost original, is a difficult task, yet somewhat facilitated by the extreme faithfulness of the Greek; it is further aided by comparison with the independent Peshiṭta Syriac, which seems to have followed a mutilated and partly obliterated copy, which it often paraphrased rather than translated. In recent times the task has been attempted by J. L. Wolfsohn (Ben-Zeb), who followed the Syriac, which he supplemented from a German version of the Greek (^{3}Vienna, 1814). A more scholarly re-translation is that of I. Z. Frankel (re-printed Warsaw, 1894, in a complete version of the Apocrypha made from the Greek). Both these works aim at providing a readable rendering for those who are accustomed to read Hebrew rather than at restoring for philological purposes the *ipsissima verba* of the original.

In the years 1897–99 considerable fragments were published in Oxford by A. E. Cowley and A. Neubauer, and in Cambridge by S. Schechter and C. Taylor, of a re-translation made in the 10th or 11th cent., which, doubtless owing to its extreme badness, had been consigned to oblivion in an Egyptian *Genizah*. This was, indeed, mistaken for the original by the editors and for a time by some others, but that it is a re-translation is demonstrated by all the tests that can be applied, and only a few arguments need be adduced here.

(1) It borrows from the Talmud, and not *vice versa*. In Bab. *Erubin* 54*a* the following is quoted: 'My son, if thou hast, do good to thyself, for there is not in Sheol luxury, neither is there to death delay.' This comes originally from Sir 14^{11}, 'Child, according as thou hast, do good to thyself, and offerings to the Lord worthily bring'; v.^{12}, 'Remember that death will not delay, and a covenant of Hades has not been shown thee'; v.^{16}, 'Give and take and deceive thy soul, for there is not in Hades to seek luxury.' It is clear that the reminiscence in the Talmud is of vv.$^{11a,\ 16b,\ 12a}$. The Egyptian document for v.^{12} gives the two clauses v.^{16b} and v.^{12a} in the order in which they appear in the Talmud: 'Remember that there is not in Sheol luxury, neither will death delay.' The clause which in the Greek is v.^{16b} is here transferred to the place before v.^{12a}. But when we come to v.^{16} we find the same clause repeated: 'Give to a brother and give and indulge thyself; for there is not in Sheol to seek luxury.' The only explanation of this is that, when re-translating v.^{12}, the translator recollected the Talmudic citation and inserted it whole, without noticing that the clause about Sheol and luxury came later in the copy before him; and when he came to v.^{16b} he translated it afresh. Practically the same thing is done by Wolfsohn, who inserts the Talmudic quotation as v.^{13}, but does not repeat the clause about Sheol and luxury in v.^{16} because the Syriac omits it.

(2) In numerous places where the Greek and Syriac versions differ slightly, yet quite clearly represent the same original, the Egyptian document has two texts, translating or mistranslating both the Greek and the Syriac. So in 30^{20} where the Greek has 'eunuch' and the Syriac *mhaimna*, *i.e.* 'faithful,' but used ordinarily for 'eunuch,' the Egyptian document has two verses, one with 'eunuch' and the other with 'faithful.' Similarly in 30^{17}, where the Greek has 'Better is death than a bitter life, and eternal rest than constant sickness,' but the Syriac, 'Better is it to die than an evil life, and go down to Sheol than a sickness which is permanent,' the Egyptian document has two verses, one with 'eternal rest' and the other with 'to go down to Sheol.' Since the Greek and the Syriac clearly represent the same original, somewhat differently rendered, it is obvious and certain that the Egyptian document is compiled from the Greek and the Syriac, not *vice versa*.

(3) The Egyptian document has numerous readings which are easily explicable as mistranslations of Syriac or Greek words, *e.g.* that already cited of *mhaimna*, 41^{12b}, 'wisdom' for רעתא, which really means 'of injustice,' but would be certainly misrendered thus by one acquainted only with the Jewish Aramaic; 35^{5}, 'a judgment of song' for *σύγκριμα μουσικῶν* (!). Others are explicable by the medium of another language; for it is not probable that the re-translator had access to the Greek directly. This language is identified with certainty as Persian written in the Arabic character by the mistranslation in 43^{2} of *διαγγέλλων* by 'pouring out heat.' This is obviously due to the Persian *skhn*, which means both 'speech' (its Persian sense) and 'heat' (its Arabic sense). Since the subject is the sun, one who did not remember Ps 19 might not unreasonably think that he poured forth heat rather than speech. Another certain mistranslation from Persian is in 43^{13}, 'lightning' for 'snow,' since in this language the words are all but indistinguishable (*barq* and *barf*, distinguished by a dot). Besides containing mistranslations this document sometimes absolutely fails to understand the author, *e.g.* the 'decoy-partridge' of 11^{30}.

(4) Even if the document were not condemned hopelessly by internal evidence, the external evidence would condemn it. As has been seen, the nature of the references in the Oral Tradition makes it certain that the work had been lost before that tradition had been compiled. The only work in which the Egyptian document is quoted is a mediæval squib called *Sefer ha-Galuy*, composed in mockery of the Gaon Saadyah († A.D. 941), though ascribed to him; but even this work is rather against it than in its favour, since it classifies it with a notorious forgery, the Hebrew Hasmonæan Roll, and makes the ludicrous statement that the authors of these works provided them with points and accents—inventions of the 8th cent. at the earliest. The real Saadyah knows Ben-Sira only from the citations in the Talmud. In the pseudo-Josephus, a Hebrew work of the 9th cent., the latter is called Ben-*Shirach*, a form which must come from the Greek; and in a chronicle of the 11th or 12th cent. (Neubauer, *Mediæval Jewish Chronicles*, i. 167) his work is called *Maqhil*, which is a rendering of the Latin *Ecclesiasticus*. Towards the end of the 10th cent. the author of the Arabic *Fihrist* mentions the work as in the hands of the Christians, but not of the Jews. When the Gaon Hai († 1038) was asked to account for certain words of Ben-Sira being said in the Talmud to be in the *Writings*, his reply is 'they *were* written,' implying that they were so no longer (*Teshuboth ha-Gaonim*, Lyck, 5624, p. 12).

(5) The appearance of the MS, in which the text is corrected with the greatest licence, resembles an author's *brouillon* more than a copy of an ancient work.

Against this evidence no argument can be adduced which deserves to be refuted or even cited. Even if it be true that it sometimes has a text which explains both the Greek and the Syriac where they differ, this is fully accounted for by the fact that the re-translator had the two texts before him, and tried to reconcile them; there is no reason why he should not occasionally succeed.

But that the original author should have written a series of verses twice with slight differences, and the Greek and Syriac translators in each case have selected *one* and selected differently, is a supposition which takes us into the region of sheer impossibility. Moreover, any one mistranslation, such as that of *mhaimna* above, condemns the whole work absolutely.

Since in Islāmic States Jews were regularly associated with Christians in the public bureaux and the medical profession, they saw much of each other, and those Jews who wished to consult Ben-Sira's book could easily do so by borrowing it from their Christian friends; hence it may be suspected that it was translated into Hebrew from Christian copies many times. In the *Seder Olam* of the 11th or 12th cent., as we have seen, it is quoted from the Latin; and at least one passage of the Egyptian re-translation shows use of the Latin version. This is in 32^{10}, 'Before thunder there hurries lightning, and before a shamefast man there will precede grace.' The Latin renders this, 'ante grandinem præibit coruscatio, et ante verecundiam præibit gratia.' The Egyptian document gives two renderings which agree in substituting 'hail' for 'thunder,' while one repeats נצח as a rendering of *prævivit*, but a very erroneous one, since the Hebrew verb means (as Gesenius renders it) 'cantum prævivit.' Since lightning precedes not hail, but thunder, this Latin is a certain mis-rendering of the original. But why the re-translator should in this case have called in its assistance and in what medium is unknown.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

SISTER.—See FAMILY.

SLANDER.—See EVIL-SPEAKING.

SLAVE, SLAVERY.—**1. Universal prevalence in the Apostolic Age.**—Slavery was a conspicuous and unchallenged feature of the social order into the midst of which Christianity was born. Modern readers easily fail to realize its presence in the background of the NT Scriptures, so great are the social changes that have been brought about in the course of time, and so much is the harsh fact softened by the phrasing of our versions. The AV 'servant,' with its present connotation, is a very mild equivalent for δοῦλος; the RV 'bond-servant' is clearer, but is still a euphemistic substitute for 'slave'—the term which exactly represents what the δοῦλος of the NT really was. In the only instance in which the EVV use the term 'slaves' in the NT (Rev 18^{13}) it represents a late but significant use of σῶμα ('body'). Similarly, the EVV 'master' stands for terms (whether δεσπότης or the commoner κύριος) that imply ownership. The existence of slavery must have lent special vividness and point to the early use of redemption as a figure to describe the experience of salvation.

In the old civilization of the world slavery appears as a most natural and inevitable fact. The well-known Code of Hammurabi, fragmentary as it is, affords us considerable insight into the social conditions of Babylonia as existing more than twenty centuries before the Christian era. Therein we have a number of remarkable laws regulating relations between slaves and their owners, side by side with others dealing with the wages payable for the employment of different kinds of free labour. And, most probably with a real relation to this older legal system, we have at a later period the Mosaic legislation similarly embodying slave laws, slavery having been just as much a recognized part of the system of things among the Hebrews as among other ancient peoples. Only the Pentateuchal Code (or Codes) must be admitted to be marked by a conspicuous humanity in this as in some other respects, and especially in the Deuteronomic form (see, *e.g.*, Dt $15^{12\text{ff.}}$). The existence of slavery, indeed, was so old and general a phenomenon in human history that St. Augustine could explain it only as a result of sin, so sure was he that it was not the Divine intention that man should own and lord it over his fellow-man (*de Civ. Dei*, xix. 15). (St. Chrysostom takes a similar line in *Hom. xl. ad 1 Cor.* x. 5.) Incidentally he comments *more suo* on the fact that the term 'servus' first appears in Scripture in the strange Genesis story of the curse of Canaan (Gn 9^{25})—a source whence, curiously enough, many a Christian owner of negro slaves in modern times has derived 'flattering unction' in defence of his position.

But never was slavery more conspicuous as a social institution than it was in the Roman Empire in the 1st cent. A.D. Numerous wars of conquest had swollen the numbers of the slave class to an enormous extent: for all prisoners of war were made slaves as a matter of course. Slave-dealers followed the armies on their campaigns and purchased on the spot those who were taken captive. Indeed, St. Augustine (*loc. cit.*) gives currency to a popular etymology of the term 'servus,' deriving it from the verb 'servare.' The *servus* was a man who might justly have been slain, but was *preserved alive* by the conqueror, though inevitably doomed to lose his freedom. There was, moreover, a regular slave-trade carried on in the East, the markets being abundantly supplied from the barbarous tribes of Western Asia. Barbarians were regarded as being naturally designed to be the slaves of their superiors—a sentiment not wholly wanting even yet in many white people towards the 'inferior races.'

As in the Greek States at an earlier period the slaves numbered four or five times as many as the citizens proper, so the proportion in the Roman Empire must have been similarly great. Thus Pliny (*HN* xxxiii. 47) mentions a wealthy Roman, named Claudius Isidorus, of the time of Augustus, who left by will 4116 slaves as part of his possessions. When, too, it was proposed that slaves should wear a distinctive dress, the proposal was abandoned lest this should reveal their strength; and Roman history had already furnished evidence of grim possibilities in the serious slave wars of Sicily which occurred in the latter part of the 2nd cent. B.C. Similar considerations caused the enactment of severe laws that supplied drastic *in terrorem* methods for keeping slaves in subjection. Tacitus mentions the case of Pedanius Secundus, prefect of the city, who had been murdered by one of his slaves, and under a law requiring that, should a slave kill his master, all the slaves of the same household should forfeit their lives, some 400 of the culprit's fellow-slaves were put to death at Rome A.D. 61 (*Ann.* xiv. 42).

2. The 'libertini.'—As an outcome of the system of slavery, the class of *libertini* or freedmen, which formed so conspicuous a feature of Roman society, calls for passing notice. These were citizens who either had actually been slaves themselves aforetime or were the immediate descendants of freed slaves. They must have far outnumbered the free-born, and possessed overwhelming influence in the State. Manumission was of frequent occurrence. The enormous numbers of captives reduced to slavery after every war, and the frequent fluctuations in great Roman establishments, all tended to make manumission easy. Many slaves were permitted by their masters to accumulate savings and purchase their freedom with the money. Sometimes the enfranchisement was accomplished by the solemn rite of fictitious purchase on the part of some divinity. The slave first paid the purchase money which he had saved into the treasury of some temple: then owner and slave went together to the temple, and the latter was supposed to be sold to the god, the price being duly paid to the master. The slave became technically the property of the god (and was indeed regarded as his protégé), but was to all intents and purposes, and especially as regards his former master, a completely free man. In inscriptions and papyri frequent references are to be found to slaves who had been bought by this or that god *for freedom.* The practice sheds much light on the argument pursued by St. Paul in Gal 4. 5 (see A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East* [Eng. tr., London, 1911, p. 326]). Manumission was often regarded as a normal result of faithful service. A man would emancipate slaves in individual cases during his own life-time, whilst very commonly a master would set a multitude at liberty on his death-bed or by will. But such wholesale emancipation was attended with evils of its own. One result was to flood the citizens' roll with crowds of 'undesirables.' On this account Augustus ordained (*lex Furia Caninia*, A.D. 8) that in no case should more than 100 slaves be emancipated by will.

When a slave was set free not by a legal but by an extra-legal process, *i.e.* by a simple exercise of authority on the part of his master, a kind of feudal tie still united the two. The freedman was his master's *cliens*, his master being now known as his *patronus.* A Roman noble depended very much on the multitude of his 'clients' for his political and social importance. Only in the third generation did these restrictions disappear and the family of the freedman come into the enjoyment of complete liberty. But the power possessed by this class in the early Christian period was very great: emancipated slaves or their descendants occupied all kinds of State offices. The *libertini*, too, prospered greatly in trade and commerce, being, indeed, as a class notorious for their ambition to amass wealth. The literature of the early Empire exhibits many of them as playing the part of the *nouveaux riches* and vulgarly emulating the luxury of aristocratic palaces.

3. Evils of slavery.—The evils of slavery were manifold, deep-seated, far-reaching. If, as Matthew Arnold puts it,

> 'On that hard Pagan world disgust
> And secret loathing fell.
> Deep weariness and sated lust
> Made human life a hell'
> (*Obermann once More*, lines 93–96),

the evils of slavery contributed materially to that result.

(*a*) The slave population was necessarily *a hotbed of vice*, contaminating all who came into contact with it. Moral excellence was not expected in a slave. He was only 'an animated chattel' (κτῆμα ἔμψυχον): a tool could similarly be described as 'an inanimate slave' (ἄψυχος δοῦλος). (Cf. Varro's classification of implements, in *de Re rust.* I. xvii. 1: (1) those with voice and speech, *e.g.* slaves; (2) those with voice but not speech, *e.g.* oxen; (3) those without voice, *e.g.* wagons.) The term 'slaves' occurs only once in EVV of the NT, viz. in Rev 18^{13} as a crowning item in Babylon's merchandise: and there it represents σώματα ('bodies'). How significant that σῶμα thus came to denote a slave! The somewhat similar use of the term 'hands' in modern industrialism—with subtle possibilities of suggestion lurking in the use—has often been remarked upon. Vast numbers of slaves hailed from Greece, from Western Asia, and from Egypt, whose great cities were the notorious seats of the wildest abominations; and their vices flourished with unimpeded growth.

(*b*) *Luxury and extravagance* increased in society as slaves increased in numbers and were more easily acquired. Friedländer points out that in great houses large numbers of slaves were kept merely for ostentatious display. Their service was often limited to ridiculously insignificant functions. Some had only to act as torch-bearers, or as street-attendants: there were instances in which slaves had merely 'to serve as clocks and announce the hours' (*Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire*, ii. 219). Masters and mistresses were thus spared every kind of personal exertion. Clement of Alexandria gives a scathing account of these evils in *Pædagogus*, iii. 4.

(*c*) *A tyrannical and ferocious spirit* found easy development in the masters. There was always the temptation to treat slaves worse than dogs. Moreover, an iron rule seemed the only means of keeping slaves in subjection and guarding against outbreaks of violence. Masters could not feel perfectly sure even of slaves born on their estates, how much less of those who could be described as a rabble of various nationalities! (Tacitus, *Ann.* xiv. 44). This state of things gave rise to the proverb: 'Quot servi, tot hostes.' The master might reckon every slave he had as a foe.

(*d*) *The economic influence of slavery was disastrous.* Trade and labour came more and more to be carried on by slaves. Poor citizens found themselves almost entirely excluded from ways of getting an honourable livelihood, and suffered degradation in consequence. Many even came to regard trade with repugnance. They betook themselves to corrupt and corrupting occupations, as actors, pantomimes, hired gladiators, political spies, and the like. Large numbers lived in idleness, having corn given them as a right and amusements gratuitously provided ('panem et circenses').

(*e*) Friedländer and others emphasize as the most revolting feature of slavery its '*contemptuous disregard of human dignity*' (*op. cit.*, p. 221). But this is to speak from a modern point of view. We may well agree with J. S. Mill that what most injures and dishonours a country is 'the personal slavery of human beings'; but it has taken the world many centuries to realize this. The average Roman citizen of the 1st cent. would be incapable of such a sentiment.

4. The better side of things.—There must, however, have been not a few lights to relieve the heavy shadows of such a system. Instances are not wanting of kindly affection in masters and of loyal devotion in slaves. Tacitus tells of the slave-girls of Octavia who braved torture and death in defence of her good name (*Ann.* xiv. 60). Slaves were to be found who preferred to remain slaves even when offered the chance of manumission (see the case of a slave belonging to the famous Mæcenas referred to by Suetonius, *de Gramm. Illustr.* 21). Dt $15^{16f.}$, it may be remembered, provides for such a case as a quite possible thing as regards slavery among the Hebrews. There must have been many houses like that of the younger Pliny, in which, as Seneca says, slaves were regarded as 'humble friends and real members of the family' (Ep. 47. See also *de Benef.* iii. 21). Inscriptions, again, often reveal a better side of slave life, testifying to mutual love between master and servant, and also to faithful love between slave-husband and wife, even though *de iure* slaves could not occupy the status of matrimony (Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, p. 117).

Many a slave found some amelioration of his lot in being (with his master's permission) a member of one of the numerous *collegia* or sodalities which formed such a feature of plebeian society in those days. These clubs or unions, as an institution, were of great antiquity, and were maintained 'for protection against oppression, for mutual sympathy and support, for relief from the deadly dulness of an obscure and sordid life' (Dill, *op. cit.*, p. 256). In their gatherings fraternity found expression: slave could meet with freeman on equal terms and fully share in the same rights and privileges. Such gilds, indeed, most probably furnished to some extent the model on which the first societies of Christians were formed.

It must also be said that from the time of Augustus onwards a growingly humane sentiment made itself felt in legislation which decidedly improved the condition of the slave. The fact, also, that many people of superior ability, such as physicians, sculptors, and *littérateurs*, were of this class made legislative reforms urgent. The mass of laws dealing with slavery was immense (see Buckland, *The Roman Law of Slavery*). By the changes that were made from time to time the absolute power of masters over slaves for life or death was curtailed. Thus, the *Lex Petronia* (in the time of Augustus or Nero) prohibited masters from condemning slaves to fight with wild beasts unless with judicial sanction. Under Nero, a special judge was appointed to hear complaints of slaves, and now masters could be punished for ill-treating them. There is on record a case in which Hadrian exiled a Roman lady for five years for treating her slaves with atrocious cruelty.

5. **Christianity and slavery.** — One thing is clear, however surprising it may seem to some: it was no part of the Christian propaganda to attack slavery as a system and seek its overthrow. But, as B. F. Westcott incidentally remarks, 'the abolition of slavery would have seemed in the first age more impossible than universal peace' (*Lessons from Work*, London, 1901, p. 179). The existing social order was accepted as a fact. The Christian message addressed itself primarily to men in themselves. It had nothing to say as to their environment, their social status, the government and laws under which they lived—except so far as there were usages and characteristics of society to be denounced (*e.g.* idolatry, impurity, cruelty) as in deadly conflict with the cultivation of Christian character. So far from directly advocating efforts to effect social changes, Christianity rather counselled its adherents to acquiesce in their condition, though, as far as the servile class was concerned, their lot too commonly was degraded and hopeless.

Jesus Himself used the relation of master and slave to illustrate His teaching, without any word condemning slavery as an evil in itself (see, *e.g.*, Mt $18^{23\text{ff.}}$). So, too, St. Paul in his Epistles has nothing to say against the institution. Indeed, in one important passage (1 Co 7^{20-24}) he definitely counsels slave converts to stay contentedly in their lot, even if they should have an opportunity to become free. The rendering of the EVV ('use *it* rather') is enigmatical; and certainly from early times some have understood the Apostle's phrase (μᾶλλον χρῆσαι) thus rendered to mean, 'take your freedom, if you can get it,' but there is more to be said for viewing it as counselling them to stay as they were. (RVm dimly indicates this.) Again, in his letter to Philemon (that little classic in the literature of slavery), St. Paul does not dream of suggesting that Onesimus should be set at liberty because he has become a Christian. Nor is this attitude to be explained merely by the fact that St. Paul was absorbed in the expectation of the Parousia and the break-up of all society in the near future (as A. E. Garvie suggests in *Studies of Paul and his Gospel*, London, 1911, pp. 73, 304). Rather, surely, slavery was so ancient and established a feature in the social framework as to be regarded as quite natural. Besides, in the Apostle's eyes, a slave could be as good a Christian as a freeman. The life of faith, the spiritual experience, was the one thing that mattered; and 'in Christ' the distinction between slave and freeman, like other distinctions, was of no moment (Col 3^{11}, etc.). And then, did not the Lord Himself assume the μορφὴ δούλου?—a consideration repeatedly used by the Fathers of the Early Church in consoling and encouraging believers who were slaves.

From the first both slaves and slave-owners were found in the ranks of the Christian society. No doubt the greater proportion of converts to the Faith came from the servile class—witness St. Paul's references in 1 Co 1 and elsewhere; but, as Friedländer says, the evangel 'certainly penetrated often enough from the cell of the slave to the house of the master' (*op. cit.*, iii. 195). There was many another Philemon as well as many another Onesimus. Otherwise there would be little point in the reiterated NT counsels addressed to masters and slaves. Athenagoras, the 2nd cent. apologist, mentions as a simple matter of fact: 'We have slaves, some more and some fewer' (*Apol.* 35). In the persecution at Lyons, A.D. 177, pagan slaves gave evidence against their Christian masters (Eusebius, *HE* v. 1). And, again, from Constantine's time onwards we find numerous laws in operation dealing with the case of Christian slaves. Thus, Jews (against whom, especially as proselytizers, strict laws also existed in the Early Empire) were forbidden to possess such.

Yet the principles of Christianity were bound in time to act as powerful solvents on this institution. They contributed to its ultimate downfall. For one thing, Christianity set up a new order of relations that did not recognize class-distinctions. Master and slave sat together at the Agape, received the sacred elements together, and joined together in public worship. The Epistle to Philemon, though written to restore a runaway slave to his master, had within it the seeds of revolution in the words, 'No longer as a bond-servant, but . . . a brother beloved' (v.^{16}). In penitential discipline, wrongs done to a slave were not distinguished from wrongs done to a freeman. Church legislation carefully guarded the chastity of female slaves. Slave-birth was no bar to admission to the priesthood: *e.g.* Callistus, a 3rd cent. bishop of Rome, was originally a slave. Many names of slaves appear in the roll of the martyrs, and the memories of such as Blandina, Felicitas, and Vitalis, who suffered in the persecutions of the first two centuries, received highest honour.

Again, Christianity placed a high value on what might be called servile virtues—the qualities that any master would esteem as most desirable in his slaves. Humility, obedience, patience, gentleness, resignation are cardinal virtues in a Christian. Jesus said to His disciples, when speaking of the high-handed exercise of authority and power in the world, 'Not so shall it be among you' (Mt 20^{26}), and apostolic teaching followed the same line. It emphasized qualities that paganism neglected or under-rated, as was only natural since Roman society in general held slaves in utter contempt.

Primitive Christian teaching, however, in relation to the various duties of life, kept the balance even as between masters and slaves. That teaching in its essence still supplies the fundamental principle for regulating similar relations (masters and servants, employers and employees) under whatever changed conditions they may continue to exist. Masters were warned against a tyrannical spirit, a disdainful inhumanity; slaves were counselled to avoid 'eye-service' and do their work as for Christ

(Eph $6^{5ff.}$), and even to be patiently submissive towards hard masters (1 P 2^{18}). So also the *Didache* (4) exhorts Christian masters not to show harshness towards their slaves, 'whose hope is in the same God,' and slaves to submit to their lords as being a type, or copy, of God. The regulating consideration for both parties is summarily given in the so-called *Apostolic Constitutions* (iv. 12); it is their common humanity—'even as he is a man.' The warning addressed to slaves in 1 Ti $6^{1f.}$ is noticeable, and by no means superfluous, human nature being what it is. If their masters were fellow-believers, they were not to *despise* them, 'because they are brethren.' Similarly Ignatius (*Ep. ad Polyc.* 4): 'Do not despise slaves, yet neither let them be puffed up with conceit, but rather submit themselves the more (*sc.* as Christian slaves with Christian masters) for the glory of God.' He adds: 'Let them not long to be set free at the public expense, lest they be found slaves to their own desires.' With the continuance of slavery in the Christian era the need for such counsels continued. How imperfectly Christians sometimes followed them may be gathered from the simple fact that the Synod of Elvira (*c.* A.D. 300) could legislate for the possibility that a Christian mistress might whip her handmaid to death (Canon v.).

The Church also in the course of time sought to bring about practical ameliorations of the state of servitude. A surprising illustration of this is afforded by *Apostolic Constitutions*, viii. 33, where it is laid down that slaves are to be exempt from labour at all the great ecclesiastical seasons, on the days of apostles and martyrs, and on both the Jewish Sabbath and the Lord's Day. The reference to enfranchisement 'at the public expense' found in the quotation from Ignatius given above points also to the encouragement given by Christianity to the liberation of slaves as its influence increased. Christian slaves, as such, had no claim to help from the Church in order to purchase their freedom, yet cases occurred in which such help was given. After the time of Constantine still more is heard of the manumission of slaves by Christian masters. It came to be regarded as a meritorious, and even expiatory, act.

It must be fully admitted that in the ancient non-Christian world there were those who felt the manifold evils of slavery. Sentiments of enlarged philanthropy were not wanting. Among the Jews, the community of the Essenes, with their interesting experiment in social reconstruction, must not be forgotten. Philo says: 'There is not a slave amongst them, but all are free' (*Quod omnis probus liber*, 12). The Stoics held the fraternity of mankind. 'We are members of one great body,' says Seneca (*Ep.* 95), and the same spirit breathes in many of his writings. Cicero, too, emphatically proclaims universal brotherhood (see, *e.g.*, *de Officiis*, iii. 6). Still, such voices were comparatively rare. Men for the most part acquiesced in the system: some argued for its necessity. It is idle to ask if humaner sentiments would have gained force in time and brought about the overthrow of slavery, had Christianity not emerged. All that we know is that Christianity, with all its imperfections, *is* the one power that has most effectively led to such a result.

6. In no instance has the incubus of slavery been easily or speedily removed. Serfdom, that modified form of slavery, lingered in Europe well into the last century. In Scotland colliers were legally serfs up to the end of the 18th cent.; and Archibald Geikie (*Scottish Reminiscences*, Glasgow, 1904, p. 341) speaks of having talked in his boyhood with men and women who had been born in servitude and had worked as serfs in the pits of Midlothian. And long after the system itself in any particular instance has disappeared, its baneful effects are clearly traceable, sometimes in conditions of national decadence, as Wallon says regarding Greece: 'degradation of the man, disorganization of the family, ruin of the States—these were the certain effects of slavery' (*Histoire de l'esclavage dans l'antiquité*, i. 452). Our very language, too, bears witness to long-lingering legacies in character and temper derived from this source, *e.g.* in 'servility' and a 'domineering' spirit—both hateful things.

Slavery still exists in various parts of the world, and anti-slavery campaigns are not unnecessary. The sons of freedom themselves sometimes succumb to the temptation to make slaves practically of their weaker fellow-men. If the cause of world-wide liberty for men is to prosper, the teaching of the NT must have full effect given to it. Christians have, indeed, sometimes defended slavery (as in America), and often failed to carry out the Christian doctrine of brotherhood: but the doctrine is there, and its corollary is liberty. Nor has Christianity wholly failed in exemplifying both brotherhood and the passion for freedom. It is surely bias that makes I. Benzinger hold up Islām and ancient Israel as perfect examples of 'the brotherhood in the faith,' and declare that this 'has come to be, in the Christian world, a mere empty phrase' (art. 'Slavery,' in *EBi* iv. 4658; also in his *Hebräische Archäologie*², Tübingen, 1907, art. 'Sklaven').

LITERATURE.—H. Wallon, *Histoire de l'esclavage dans l'antiquité*², 3 vols., Paris, 1879; W. W. Buckland, *The Roman Law of Slavery*, Cambridge, 1908; L. Friedländer, *Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire* (tr. from *Die Sittengeschichte Roms*⁷, Leipzig, 1901), 3 vols., London, 1908–1909; S. Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, do., 1904; W. E. H. Lecky, *History of European Morals*⁷, 2 vols., do., 1886; J. B. Lightfoot, *Colossians and Philemon*, do., 1879, *Philippians*⁴, do., 1878 (Excursus on 'Cæsar's Household').

J. S. CLEMENS.

SLEEP.—The English word 'sleep,' derived from O.E. *slæpan*, denotes that normal periodic condition of the organism in which the inactivity of certain nerve centres is accompanied by unconsciousness, more or less complete. In the OT the two most common words are the noun שֵׁנָה, 'sleep,' and the verbs, יָשֵׁן, 'to rest in sleep,' and שָׁכַב, 'to lie down to rest,' the latter being the most frequent to describe the condition of those who were laid to rest with their fathers, and who thus sleep in death. In the NT the noun ὕπνος means sleep proper, whilst the verbs καθεύδειν, 'to lie down to rest,' and κοιμᾶσθαι, 'to fall asleep,' are in most common use. Both these words refer to ordinary sleep, and in a symbolic manner they are employed with reference to death. Christ uses the former in describing the condition of Jairus' daughter (Mt 9^{24}, Mk 5^{39}, Lk 8^{52}), and the latter in respect of Lazarus (Jn 11^{11}). In both these cases natural death is spoken of by Christ as 'sleep,' on the ground doubtless that through the exercise of His miraculous power this 'sleep' would be followed by an awakening in the present world. As in the OT, sleep is used in the Apostolic Church as a euphemistic term for death. Stephen is said to have fallen asleep when he died as the effects of stoning (Ac 7^{60}). According to St. Paul, true believers live and die unto the Lord, under the symbolism of waking and sleeping respectively (1 Th 5^{10}); hence the beautiful phrases occur, 'fallen asleep in Christ' (1 Co 15^{18}) and 'those who sleep (or are fallen asleep) in Jesus' (1 Th 4^{14}). Sleep is also used as a symbol of spiritual torpor and death, especially in several of our Lord's parables; hence the duty of watchfulness (Mt 25^{1-13}, etc.). St. Paul is emphatic in warning men against that suspension of spiritual activity which is implied in sleep, inasmuch as Christians are the children of the day (1 Th $5^{6.7}$) and not of the night, and he calls upon them to awake out of sleep (Ro 13^{11}, Eph 5^{14}).

Sleep has always been a profound mystery, and it is still the crux in physiology and psychology. The avenues of sense are closed and the mind is detached from the outside world. There is something awe-inspiring in the motionless face of the sleeper, temporarily deprived of sight and movement, the torpor of muscle and nerve and the unresponsiveness of the whole organism presenting a striking contrast to the same personality when completely awake. All the activities are lowered, the pulse falls about one-fifth, the circulation is slower, the process of nutrition is retarded and the excitation of the nerves diminished. Whilst the central activity is lowered, it is a moot point whether there is a greater or a less quantity of blood in the brain during sleep, and there is also some doubt with regard to the state of the blood itself. It is believed that the 'tensional forces' have a chance of recuperating themselves during the muscular inactivity induced by sleep and by the diminished production of heat. Whilst the nerves are in a less excitable condition during sleep, the organic processes, which are still continued in a less active degree, make themselves felt in dreams. The mental activity, liberated from the effort of attention to outward objects, may co-operate with the organic sensations to work up the materials of dream-fancies.

F. W. H. Myers, in harmony with his own theories, treats sleep as a positive and definite phase of personality co-ordinate with the waking phase. He contends that in special cases the power over the muscles is much greater than during the waking consciousness. The mind is set free from the activity of the organism to pursue its own quest, and it is refreshed and enriched thereby for the tasks of ordinary waking life. Like genius, it draws upon unknown and spiritual sources, and is exempt from the limitations of connexion with nerves and brain. It is not surprising, therefore, that sleep should appear to the onlooker as 'Death's twin-brother' and that the old Hebrews should have committed their dead to the tomb with the reflexion that they had fallen asleep and were laid to rest with their fathers. And all through the ages death has been spoken of as a sleep, but with far more appropriateness under Christian influence, as with the Christian's hope there will be a glorious awaking to life at its fullest and best. Since we discriminate amongst our experiences, as to whether we are dreaming or fully awake, by the higher degree of vividness and of the sense of activity as well as by the deeper conviction of reality in the latter states, so may we be led to expect that when we see things as they are, *sub specie æternitatis*, our experience will be analogous at least to awaking out of sleep, and our earthly life found to be the stuff of which dreams are made. See art. DREAM. J. G. JAMES.

SMOKE (*καπνός*).—Smoke is the visible vapour or volatile matter which escapes from a burning substance. It is one of the commonest categories of apocalyptic prophecy. In St. John's imagery the smoke of incense (*q.v.*), with (or rather 'for,' *i.e.* 'in aid of') the prayers of saints, goes up before God (Rev 8^4). The heavenly temple is filled with smoke from the glory of God (15^8, Is 6^4), a symbol of the dark and mysterious side of His self-manifestation, representing perhaps the reaction of His holiness against sin. The prophet Joel's omens of blood and fire and vapour of smoke (Ac 2^{19} ‖ Jl 2^{30}) may refer either to carnage and destruction in war or to lurid appearances in Nature. The smoke which issues from the opened pit of the abyss, darkening sun and air like the smoke of a great furnace (*καμίνου*), and resolving itself into demons in the form of locusts (Rev $9^{2f.}$), was suggested either by the mephitic fumes emitted from chasms and caverns, or the clouds of vapour rising from hot springs, or the fire and smoke belched forth by volcanoes, all of which phenomena seemed to the pre-scientific mind to be connected with a subterranean Hades. Out of the mouths of the apocalyptic horses, which have the heads of lions, there come fire and smoke (9^{17}), as from the mouth of Leviathan (Job 41^{20}; cf. Diomede's horses, Lucret. *de Rerum nat.* v. 29). The smoke of the torment of Cæsar-worshippers goes up for ever in sight of the holy angels and the Lamb (Rev 14^{11}), a weird conception suggested by *Enoch*, xxvii. 2. 3, xlviii. 9, xc. 26. 27. The smoke of burning Babylon—Imperial Rome—resembling that of the cities of the Plain (Gn 19^{28}), is seen from afar by the kings of the earth (Rev 18^9) and all shipmasters and mariners ($18^{17f.}$), as it ascends for ever and ever (19^3). JAMES STRAHAN.

SMYRNA (*Σμύρνα*).—Smyrna has been an important city for at least 3000 years. Occupying one of the most beautiful and commanding positions in the eastern Ægean coastland, at the head of a deep and sheltered gulf, it has had a very chequered but honourable history, and it is to-day by far the most prosperous city in Asia Minor having a quarter of a million inhabitants. 'Old Smyrna'—*ἡ παλαιὰ Σμύρνα* (Strabo, XIV. i. 37)—was colonized by the Æolians, captured from them by the Ionians, and almost destroyed (in the 7th cent. B.C.) by the Lydians. It lay under Mt. Sipylos, 2 or 3 miles N. of 'New Smyrna,' which was founded by Lysimachus (*c.* 290 B.C.), and built along the southern shore of the Gulf and up the slopes of Mt. Pagos, the westernmost spur of the Tmolus range.

Smyrna was the emporium for the trade of the fertile Hermus valley, and the terminus of one of the great roads from the interior of Asia Minor. It was noted for its carefully-planned streets—one of them called 'Golden Street'—and splendid public buildings. Its citizens owed much to their sagacious friendship with Rome. As early as 195 B.C. they dedicated a shrine to Roma, and in all the struggles of the next two centuries Smyrna was invariably on the Roman—that is, the winning—side. She was rewarded for her fidelity by being constituted a *civitas libera et immunis*, and under Tiberius she was chosen from among twelve keen rivals, of whom Sardis was the most powerful, to have the honour of building a temple to the Emperor (Tacitus, *Ann.* iv. 55 f.).

The message to Smyrna in Rev. (2^{8-11}) is at once the briefest and the most eulogistic of all the Seven Letters. Like the others, it unquestionably contains a number of pointed local allusions. Words which may now seem pale and neutral were deeply significant to the first readers. St. John knew each of his churches almost as a living personality, and no touch is superfluous or irrelevant in his clearly-conceived and carefully-etched portraits. The title which he chooses for the Sender of the letters is in every instance apposite. The message to Smyrna comes from 'the First and the Last' (v.^{8}). Smyrna was the most ambitious of all the cities of Asia, and her municipal self-consciousness was inordinately developed. She could brook no rivals; she coveted all the honours and prizes; she appropriated the title *πρώτη Ἀσίας*. Her claim to be first in beauty was scarcely disputed, Strabo (XIV. i. 37) calling her *καλλίστη πασῶν*. She counted the greatest of poets one of her sons—though many other cities questioned the claim—and built a Homereion in his honour. She convinced the Roman Senate that she 'first reared a temple to the city of Rome' (Tacitus, *Ann.* iv. 56), and she wished to be first, as a *νεωκόρος* or temple-warden, to pay divine honours to the Emperor. She was like the Homeric hero whom nothing would satisfy but *αἰὲν ἀριστεύειν, καὶ ὑπείροχον ἔμμεναι ἄλλων* (*Il.* vi. 208). To this 'First City' comes a letter from the First and the Last. Let her but once recognize *His* primacy, and she is likely to revise all her civic ideals, to renounce all her self-centred ambitions. Her first and most illustrious citizens will be her martyrs. Her standard of comparison will no longer be Ephesus or Sardis or Pergamos or even Rome, but the City of God, in which the last is first.

The Smyrniote Church, for which St. John has not a single word of blame, is thus led to welcome Christian paradoxes. She is in poverty, but she is rich (v.^{9}); she is reviled by a powerful synagogue of Jews, but they are only 'a synagogue of Satan' (v.^{9}). Just because she is so faithful, she is chosen for the most difficult tasks; because she is so brave, she is exposed to the greatest dangers. She has to face suffering, imprisonment, trial; but it is only a ten days' tribulation. Death by violence comes within her horizon, but it is transfigured: the martyr is not to be pitied but emulated, for fidelity unto death wins the crown which is life (v.^{10}). When man has done his worst to the body, there is no more that he can do; no second death shall hurt the spirit that overcomes (v.^{11}).

'The crown of life' (*ὁ στέφανος τῆς ζωῆς*) may have been suggested by one of the most familiar elements in the life of Smyrna, the athletic contests and the presentation of the garlands of victory; or it may be an allusion to the fact that the lovely city itself, on its mountain slope, was commonly likened to a garland, as some of its coins prove (B. V. Head, *Historia Nummorum*, 1887, p. 509). It was not for intellectual errors that the name of 'Jews' was denied to the synagogue of Smyrna, while that of 'synagogue of Satan' was attached to it (Rev 2^{9}). An honest scepticism regarding the claims of the Nazarene to be the Messiah could have been understood and forgiven. It was because the Jews of Smyrna were morally wrong—hating instead of loving—that they forfeited their traditional titles and privileges (cf. Ro $2^{28.29}$). That they were often fanatically hostile to the Christians is shown by the narrative of the martyrdom of Polycarp. When he was sentenced to death 'the whole multitude both of the heathen and Jews, who dwelt in Smyrna, cried out with uncontrollable fury and in a loud voice,' and the sentence 'was carried into effect with greater speed than it was spoken, the multitudes immediately gathering together wood and faggots out of the shops and baths, the Jews especially, according to custom, eagerly assisting them in it' (*προθύμως, ὡς ἦθος αὐτοῖς*). It was 'at the suggestion and urgent persuasion of the Jews' that the body of the martyr was refused to the Christians, 'lest, forsaking Him that was crucified, they should begin to worship this one' (*Mart. Polyc.* xii. f., xvii.). Modern Smyrna, being predominantly Greek Christian, is called by the Turks *Giaour Ismir*.

LITERATURE.—C. Wilson, in Murray's *Handbook to Asia Minor*, 1895, p. 70 f.; W. M. Ramsay, *The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia*, 1904, p. 251 f.

JAMES STRAHAN.

SOBERNESS, SOBRIETY.—The object of this article is to determine the meanings of the two word-groups, *νηφάλιος* (*νήφω*) and *σώφρων* (and cognates), which are translated 'sober' in the NT. (The term *ἐγκράτεια* is discussed in the art. TEMPERANCE.) These two groups of words differ both in their original and in their secondary meanings and are accordingly treated separately here.

1. νηφάλιος (νήφω).—The AV translates the adjective twice and the verb four times by 'sober' (1 Ti 3^{11}, Tit 2^{2}; 1 Th $5^{6.8}$, 1 P 1^{13} 5^{8}), the adjective once by 'vigilant,' and the verb twice by 'watch' (1 Ti 3^{2}, 2 Ti 4^{5}, 1 P 4^{7}). The reason for this variety of rendering on the part of the AV may be the natural desire to avoid dull uniformity, but probably also it is due to dubiety as to whether in the original the words are used in their primary or in their secondary sense. The RV adopts a uniform rendering—for the adjective always 'temperate' and for the verb 'sober.'

The primary meaning is clearly seen in a passage such as Xen. *Cyr.* VII. v. 20. The elder Cyrus encourages his soldiers to attack Babylon, and he reminds them that once before they overcame those enemies when they (*i.e.* the enemy) were awake (*ἐγρηγορότας*), sober (*νήφοντας*), armed (*ἐξωπλισμένους*), and drawn up in battle array (*συντεταγμένους*). Therefore they should overcome them now when many of them are asleep (*καθεύδουσι*), many of them drunk (*μεθύουσι*), and all of them unprepared (*ἀσύντακτοι*). The word *νήφω* is thus the direct opposite of *μεθύω*, and it is excellently rendered 'sober' (Lat. *sobrius*=*sine*+*ebrius*). There is such a literary similarity between the above passage from Xenophon and 1 Th $5^{6ff.}$ that, if it were conceivable, one might say that St. Paul had it in his mind; and therefore it is especially instructive as a parallel. To be sober, then, is more intensive (1 Th $5^{6ff.}$) than to be awake (*γρηγορέω*), for a man may not be asleep and yet not be sober. His wits may be wandering, the loins of his understanding may be loose. (In 1 P 5^{8}, however, *γρηγορέω* seems to be the stronger word.) From the Latin equivalent of *γρηγορέω* we get 'vigils' and the proper name Vigilantius; and in the history of the Church the *vigilantes* did not always escape the vices of drunkenness and lust, as even Jerome, who with his usual coarseness of language defends them against Vigilantius (a curious irony in the name), has to admit (*c. Vigilantium*, 9). The primary meaning of *νήφω* in the NT thus excludes two ideas—on the one hand the slumber of the drunkard, and on the other the listless stupor which is characteristic of the half-awakened, or the weariness which creeps over those who watch long. The word is also used tropically in the NT, but the literal meaning is almost invariably in the background, and in some cases it is preponderant. This is probably largely due to the influence of our Lord's parable (Mk 13^{34-37}), in which some are depicted as overtaken by their lord's coming, in a drunken state; and it is appalling to think how many even yet in Christian lands die in this sad condition.

To describe the transition from drunken sleep to sobriety *ἐκνήφω* is used in the LXX (*νήφω* and *νηφάλιος* do not occur), of Noah (Gn 9^{24}), of Nabal (1 S [LXX 1 Kings] 25^{37}), of the drunkards of Joel's time (Jl 1^{5}). When Eli asks Hannah to put away her wine from her, his meaning is that she should sleep it off (1 S 1^{14}; LXX *περιελοῦ*). In Sir 34^{2} (31) the word is used tropically and transitively. 'Wakeful anxiety will crave slumber, and a grievous sickness will banish sleep' (*ἐκνήψει ὕπνον*—the reading, however, may be *ὕπνος*). In the only passage where *ἐκνήφω* occurs in the NT (1 Co 15^{34}, 'Awake to a righteous life of sobriety and sin not') the tropical sense is evident but the original force of the word is not absent. The Corinthians must not forget the Resurrection, for 'evil communications corrupt good manners.' If they did, their motto would soon become, 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.' Already at the love-feasts did not some of them get drunk, while their poorer brethren had neither food nor drink sufficient for their needs (1 Co 11^{21})? It is thus clear that the danger of actual drunkenness is included in the warning, 'Do not err.' The ideas of sobriety, righteousness, and the Parousia are here associated, as in St. Paul's speech to Felix, where he spoke of righteousness, temperance, and the judgment to come (Ac 24^{25}). The word *νήφω* indeed is commonly used with a reference to the coming of the Lord (1 Th $5^{6f.}$, 1 P 1^{13}). To be ignorant of this or to forget it in pleasure is foolish and dangerous. Included in the idea of sobriety or closely akin to it is the thought of vigilance, as of the sentinel, and of preparedness and armed security, as of the soldier. There is a military atmosphere about the word. It is the necessary equipment of prayer—the watchful longing of the Christian soldier for the coming of his Lord (1 P 4^{7}). He is not to sleep on duty even if his Lord should tarry till the third watch. Nor should the Christian forget that he fights against a subtle, powerful enemy—the Great Adversary who is ever on the outlook to devour him (1 P 5^{8}). This is also a favourite idea with St. Paul. The ignorance of the day and hour of Christ's coming is an additional motive to sobriety—cf. Rev 16^{15}: 'Behold I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame.' But this ignorance has for its sphere a day of moral and spiritual life in which Christians are to live as children of the day. So in 1 Th $5^{6ff.}$ St. Paul contrasts the Christian with the heathen who sleeps and is drunken in the night. He means not simply the avoidance of intoxication; he means also spiritual sobriety.

As Anaxagoras appeared to Aristotle (*Met.* i. 3) like a sober (*νήφων*) man among a crowd of drunkards, so in a deeper sense must the Christian appear. Similarly in Ro 13^{11-14} the night is the sphere of spiritual blindness resulting in all manner of riotous excess, but the day calls for wakefulness, sobriety, and spiritual readiness. St. Peter (1 P 1^{13}) compares the Christians to the Israelites in Egypt ready to march out. His warning against a relapse into their former life of lusts indicates that he does not forget the possibility of actual drunkenness, but this is only one symptom of spiritual stupor—ignorance of God (1 Co 15^{34}). Just as pleasure and ease must not tempt to slumber and drunken stupor, so must not danger and suffering; rather should suffering warn them against this sin and make them cast their cares on God (1 P $5^{7.8}$, 2 Ti 4^{5}). The unusual compound *ἀνανήφω* occurs in 2 Ti 2^{26}. Those who resist the Christian evangelist are taken captive by the devil to do his will. (It is forced to refer this to God's will or the will of the Evangelist.) They are in his snare, but perhaps by considerate dealings they may be aroused to sobriety (*ἀνανήφω* only here in the NT and not in the LXX).

We may thus say that *νήφω* on its positive side is the watchful, alert state of soul which knows that the day of Christ has already dawned, the earnest expectation (*ἀποκαραδοκία*) of the coming of the Master, the prayerful, hopeful, longing spirit of love for the coming of the full day of Christ. On its negative side it implies a knowledge of the power of evil, of the night in which the Great Adversary roams for prey, when sons of Belial flown with insolence and wine are active, the night of secret sinful conclaves. The Christian soldier is armed against this by a life of sobriety, of righteousness, of longing prayer. Thus he cannot be surprised by the force of the enemy, or by the suddenness of his Lord's returning, as the Babylonians were by Cyrus or the Egyptians by the angel of death. It is specially indispensable for the Christian evangelist to have this wakeful attentive attitude for himself and for those under his care, for whom he must give account (He 13^{17}; cf. also Ac 20^{31}, Mk 13^{34}). So St. Paul says to Timothy, 'Be sober in all things,' not like the dumb dogs, the blind watchmen of Isaiah's time (Is 56^{9-12}, an instructive contrast).

The adjective *νηφάλιος* is confined to the Pastorals. The bishop must be sober (1 Ti 3^{2}, Tit 2^{2}), so also deaconesses (1 Ti 3^{11}). The question here is whether the word is used in its primary meaning of 'not given to much wine' (*μὴ οἴνῳ πολλῷ προσέχοντες*, 1 Ti 3^{8}; *μὴ πάροινος*, 1 Ti 3^{3}) or in the more general sense of 'vigilantes animo' (Bengel, on 1 Ti 3^{2}). The Greek interpreters favour the wider meaning, but much can be said for the more restricted one. Josephus says that Moses did not permit priests to drink wine so long as they wore their sacerdotal garments (*Ant.* III. xii. 2), and the word *νηφάλιος* seems to be a sacrosanct term for priestly sobriety or the prerequisite of a true worshipper. Œdipus considers it a favourable omen that he came untasting wine to the seat of the Erinyes, who loathe the wine cup in libations offered to them (Soph. *Œd. Col.* 100). This is similar to the usage in 1 P 4^{7}, 'Be sober unto prayer,' and it is attested by inscriptions (see *Exp*, 7th ser., ix. [1910] 284). Fielding's Parson Adams was never wholly unknown in the Christian Church. On the other hand, the warning to Timothy, 'Be sober in all things,' favours the wider reference, as does also the fact that there is no reason to suppose that Christian ministers or members were addicted to this special vice. The wider meaning includes the narrower without unduly submerging it.

2. σωφρονέω and cognates.—Cicero found difficulty in rendering the ideas included in these terms in Latin (*Tusc. Disp.* iii. 5), and he used three words—*temperantia*, *moderatio*, *modestia* (*ib.* iii. 8; *de Off.* i. 27). The same difficulty is felt in regard to our own language, and as these words were used in a technical sense in Greek philosophy there is a danger, in fixing their connotation, of being over-precise.

(*a*) The words in Greek often mean 'sanity' in its literal sense, and *σωφρονέω* is thus used in the Gospels (Mk 5^{15}, Lk 8^{35}) of the Gadarene demoniac, after he was healed by Jesus. He was clothed and in his right mind—'rationis usu,' as Bengel has it (*in loc.*). The opposite is *μανία*. Thus when Helen is told that Ajax fell on his own sword and destroyed himself she exclaims, 'Was he mad, for no sane person would do so?' (*μανέντ', ἐπεὶ τίς σωφρονῶν τλαίη τάδ' ἄν*; Eur. *Hel.* 97). Xenophon also says that Socrates 'was always discussing about human affairs, asking what piety was, and what impiety, what beauty, what ugliness . . . what sanity (*σωφροσύνη*) and what insanity (*μανία*)' (*Mem.* I. i. 16). Insanity is the supreme example of mental derangement, of lack of self-control, and so *δαιμονίζεσθαι* is the very opposite of *σωφρονεῖν*. Akin to this is St. Paul's usage of the word in Ac 26^{25}, 2 Co 5^{13}. Festus, as he heard the Christian message, especially of the Resurrection, from St. Paul's perfervid lips, exclaimed, 'Paul, thou art mad; thy much learning doth turn thee to madness' (*εἰς μανίαν*). In the ancient world the enthusiastic utterance of an oracle-giver was attributed to a temporary suppression of the reason. 'No man, when in his wits, attains prophetic truth and inspiration; but when he receives the inspired word, either his intelligence is enthralled in sleep, or he is demented by some distemper or possession' (Plato, *Timæus*, 71 E, tr. B. Jowett^{3}, Oxford, 1892, vol. iii. p. 493). St. Paul's courteous but firm reply reveals that he at once grasped Festus's attitude. He was not mad, but spoke the words of truth and sanity. It was natural for a man like Festus to imagine that St. Paul was living in a world of illusions and that his reason was for the moment obscured. St. Paul's message was utterly novel to him, and he consequently attributed his intense emotion to mental derangement, just as he regarded the content of his message as illusion and not reality (ἀλήθεια). Similarly, Penelope when roused from her slumber by the old nurse who came with the message that her long-lost Ulysses is home looks on the nurse as one whom the gods had deprived of her sanity (*Od.* xxiii. 13).

In 2 Co 5^{13} the opposite of σωφρονεῖν is ἐκστῆναι. The phenomena of the Day of Pentecost were familiar in the early Christian Church. Men were carried out of themselves by a new experience of the Divine power. Excitement and enthusiasm such as men had never felt before led them on to action. Now the cautious onlooker was tempted to put this down to aberration, and unfortunately such might be the case. Rationalism is always tempted to explain enthusiasm as madness. 'Quench not the spirit' was a necessary warning even to a Christian people. Men naturally distrust emotion, and this was especially true of an emotional people like the Greeks.

> 'The Greeks, or some sections of the Greek race, were very liable to violent emotions; and hence it was that the Greek moral philosophers insisted on control of emotion as they did. The Greeks had a sort of natural want of self-respect and a tendency to forget themselves which particularly struck the Romans as unworthy' (Nettleship, *Lectures on Plato's Republic*, p. 96).

St. Paul undoubtedly exhibited the signs of deep emotion. He was an enthusiast, but to God. The criticism that he was actuated by σωφροσύνη (ironical) was the best answer to this (2 Co 5^{13}). Here the word includes self-control—constraint which had reason on its side. It was due to the love of Christ that he was so enthusiastic, and that love prompted a sober judging of man's needs and of the means to meet those needs. The Spartan king Archidamus (ξυνετὸς δοκῶν εἶναι καὶ σώφρων) exhibits sanity in this sense when he warns his people to think σωφρόνως before going to war with Athens (Thuc. *Hist.* i. 79 ff.). They should see to it that their resources are sufficient. There is included in the word in this connexion a sober balancing of ways and means, a counting of the cost as our Lord enjoined—a distrust of a course of action simply because it appeals to the fancy or the feelings. It must also appeal to sober common sense. St. Paul had done this and so had reached a σωφροσύνη on a higher level than mere prudence, a true intellectual love of God and man, to use Spinoza's famous phrase.[*] Philosophers are divided as to whether will or intellect has the primacy in man's constitution, and emotion is distrusted; yet the true Christian σώφρων is one, like St. Paul, in whom the apprehended love of Christ rules the will and illumines the intellect. The emotional harmony is in the region of the spirit. Here is its source, and its sway is over the whole man from above.

In dealing with self-control Plato has always in view unworthy exhibitions of emotion. 'Is the picture of a hero rolling on the ground with grief a worthy example?' he asks. From this point of view he criticizes Greek religion, Greek poetry and music. He was thus correcting a national weakness. 'Throughout the treatment of these virtues we find the characteristic Greek idea that excess, whether in grief or in laughter or in appetite or in any passion or emotion, is intrinsically bad. We have to remember that dignity was not a strong point of Greek character' (Nettleship, *op. cit.*, p. 96). St. Paul also had to face this question, especially in Corinth, but he solves it by the appeal to love (1 Co 13). He philosophizes on a plane so different from that of Plato that in trying to compare their ideas we have no common denominator.

(*b*) In Ro 12^{1-8} σωφρονεῖν is contrasted with ὑπερφρονεῖν. The Apostle, as is clear from the context, includes in σωφροσύνη the absence of boasting, of vainglory, undue emphasis on and opinion of oneself, *et hoc genus omne.* It implies the Christian grace of humility, the recognition that all we are and have we owe to God. Positively there is included the thoughtful yet humble recognition of the nature and place of the powers that we possess, and their exercise in the service of the Christian community of which we are members. The reference is not obtrusively to the control of bodily pleasures—'eating and drinking and sexual desires' (περὶ σιτίων καὶ ποτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀφροδισίων), which is the specific meaning in Greek moral philosophy (see Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics*^{4}, p. 327). This restricted usage is not unknown in the NT. It is found in 1 P 4^{7}, where the meaning is determined by the opposition to ἐν ἀσελγείαις, ἐπιθυμίαις (1 P 4^{3}), and it is prominent in Tit 2^{12}, where prudence (σωφρόνως) is opposed to worldly lusts and associated with justice and piety. This passage in Titus is valuable because it gives us the ground, the scope, and the hope of Christian morals. The ground is in the revealed grace of God; the scope includes self-control, justice towards others, and piety towards God; the hope is the appearing of the Saviour God. Green (bk. iii. ch. v.) shows how much wider the scope of Christian self-control is than Greek, and, though he attempts to prove that the principle is still the same, few Christians will agree with him. What St. Paul calls the grace of God which brings salvation for all men is not within the vision of Plato or Aristotle. In Romans (ch. 12) the word is used rather of the humble temper of mind which saves from overweening excess or self-depreciating defect. The former error is more noticeable in men in general, but the latter is not unknown. The talent may be hid in a napkin or buried in the earth, and in this case there is a lack of σωφροσύνη as truly as there is in self-aggrandizement. 'God does not require of us a false humility. We are not to think less highly of ourselves than we ought to think. We are to think soberly. We are to find out the truth about ourselves and think that. Then there will be no danger of our thinking too highly' (Rabbi Duncan, *Colloquia Peripatetica*^{5}, Edinburgh, 1907, p. 169). The sphere of σωφροσύνη here is not so much the sensual pleasures as the Christian charismata in their social bearing. The social aspect of this grace is enforced just as it is enforced by Plato in his analysis of the same virtue (*Rep.* 430 D–432 B).

The whole passage Ro 12^{1}–13^{14} has to be considered if one is to grasp the wide scope of σωφροσύνη in St. Paul's teaching. It moves in the sphere of a community redeemed by the mercies of God (Ro 12^{1}), renewed in mind (12^{2}), endowed with varied graces by God's Spirit (12^{6}), to which love is the fulfilling of the law (13^{10}), and which is waiting for the day of Christ (13^{11-14}). On this plane light is thrown on the term by the wider Platonic usage, and we may go on to discuss (*c*) the third application of the term by St. Paul in Timothy and Titus.

> 'The meaning of σωφροσύνη is best understood by its opposite ὕβρις, which is the general spirit of setting oneself up against what is higher than oneself, whether by insubordination to constituted authority (cf. Ro 13^{1}) and divine law, or by the rebellion of the appetites against the law of reason (cf. Ro 13^{13}). Thus this quality in some degree includes what we call humility. It is often said that the virtue of humility is not recognised in the Greek moral code, but the man who was σώφρων in regard to the gods would be a humble man, and the ὑβριστικός is the "proud man" in the language of the Bible' (Nettleship, p. 98).

It is in this wide sense that we are to understand these terms in 1 Ti 2^{9}–3^{2} and Tit 2^{2-6} where St.

---

[*] Cf. *Ecce Homo*^{11}, London, 1873, p. 7: 'No heart is pure that is not passionate; no virtue is safe that is not enthusiastic. And such an enthusiastic virtue Christ was to introduce.'

Paul shows the universal application of this principle to conduct. It applies to all sections of the Christian community in all their relations, to men and women, to old and young, in the soul, in the family, in the Church, and in the State. In one passage it condescends even to the matter of dress. Married women should use decorous garb in adorning themselves with modesty and propriety. 'In "modesty" is involved an innate moral repugnance to the doing of the dishonourable act' (Trench, *Synonyms of the NT*^{8}, p. 65). Here it includes the feeling of disgust at unnecessary display, while propriety points rather to the sense of tact which leads a married woman to dress aright without erring either on the side of shabbiness or on that of show. But this saving grace extends much further and penetrates much deeper than the outward person. It implies the gentle, gracious sense of subordination and obedience to authority, the subordination of the younger women to their husbands; and the older women ought by their own conduct to teach* this virtue to the younger (Tit $2^{4.\,5}$). It implies the right attitude of the young to their elders and their superiors, and to their reason. It becomes the bishop and presbyter, for how else can they exercise authority without the excess of rigour or the laxity of weakness? There is an air of graciousness about the word which is not found in ἐγκράτεια, for ἐγκράτεια is forcible restraint, and even Plato and Aristotle insist that a man is not σώφρων 'unless his mastery of his passions and impulses is so easy and assured that there is no sense of constraint about it' (Nettleship, p. 97, footnote). Harmony as well as subordination is included—a harmony resulting from every thing and every person being in their appropriate place.

In 1 Ti 2^{15} there is doubt as to whether this virtue is to be understood of women or of children or of parents. 'She shall be saved through the childbearing, if they continue in faith and love and sanctification with sobriety.' It is possible to understand this of the women themselves; it is possible to understand it of husband and wife alike in their home relations; but it is better to refer it to the children who in the atmosphere of this virtue have been brought up in faith and love and sanctification. Thus the mother will see the primal curse turned into a blessing in her children. This virtue also avoids the extremes of softness and sourness, of laxity and harshness. Hence Timothy is reminded that the Christian spirit is one, not of fear, but of fortitude, of love, and of σωφρονισμός. This is to be understood not simply of personal self-control, but of ability to control others as well. Fear is the vice which shrinks from duty through terror of pain. Its opposite is fortitude—a virtue always associated with self-control, which is doing one's duty when pleasure would say 'No.'

J. Moffatt aptly quotes Gilbert Murray (*The Rise of the Greek Epic*^{2}, Oxford, 1911, p. 48), that σωφροσύνη 'is something like Temperance, Gentleness, Mercy; sometimes Innocence, never mere Caution; a tempering of dominant emotions by gentler thought. . . . The man or woman who is *sôphrôn* walks amid the beauties and perils of the world, feeling the love, joy, anger, and the rest; and through all he has that in his mind which saves.—Whom does it save? Not him only, but, as we should say, the whole situation. It saves the imminent evil from coming to be' (*Exp*, 8th ser., ii. [1911] 564).

Σωφροσύνη indicates that 'each sex and situation has lines of conduct appropriate to itself, and that the individual must have tact and strength of will enough to pursue these lines instead of lapsing into excesses on one side or the other' (Moffatt, *ib.* p. 564 f.).

LITERATURE.—The Lexicons under both words are most instructive; R. C. Trench, *Synonyms of the NT*^{8}, London, 1876, p. 66 ff.; T. H. Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics*^{4}, Oxford, 1899, bk. iii. ch. v.; R. L. Nettleship, *Lectures on Plato's Republic*, London, 1898, p. 96 ff.; Plato, *Cratylus*; Aristotle, *Nic. Ethics*, vi. 5. 6; John Caird, *Essays for Sunday Reading*. London, 1906, xi.; I. Taylor, *Natural History of Enthusiasm*, do., 1829, *Fanaticism*, do., 1833; Hugh Blair, *Sermons*, do., 1815, vol. i. no. xi., vol. iii. no. xii.; Augustine Birrell, *Selected Essays*, do., 1909, p. 258 f.; see also under 'Self-Control' and 'Self-Denial' in *DCG*.

DONALD MACKENZIE.

SODOM AND GOMORRAH.—Sodom and Gomorrah are mentioned in Mt 10^{15}, Jude ^{7}, 2 P 2^6, Rev 11^8 as affording by their fate a warning against strange sins, whether moral or spiritual. The verb (ἐκπορνεύω) used in Jude is also used in LXX of Ex $34^{15.\,16}$, Lv 17^7, Hos 4^{12}, Ezk $16^{26.\,28.\,33}$, of 'going after' other gods, and this seems to explain the use of Sodom in Rev 11^8. Rome is Sodom because its gods are no true gods. Beyond references in *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Test. Naph. 3) and in 3 Mac $2^{4\text{f.}}$ the symbolism of Sodom seems to have been dropped out of sight. It is not used in the Apostolic Fathers, or in any apocalyptic or heretical books of the Apostolic Age. The reason is possibly to be found in the belief (*Enoch*, lxvii. 4) that the angels who sinned are imprisoned in a subterranean burning valley (Ge-hinnom) which extended to the Dead Sea, so that Gehenna extruded Sodom by assimilating it.

W. F. COBB.

SOLDIER.—See ARMY.

SOLOMON (Σολομῶν).—Solomon is mentioned in St. Stephen's speech before the Sanhedrin as the builder of a house to God, such as his father David had asked (but failed to obtain) permission to erect as a habitation for the God of Jacob (Ac $7^{46.\,47}$). Stephen dares to put Solomon's Temple into the category of houses 'made with hands,' in which the Most High does not dwell, and contrasts it with the universe in which God has heaven for His throne and earth for His footstool (v.^{49}). The speaker's assumption that the Maker of all things could not have a man-built place of rest, with the implication that He was in reality no more present in the Temple than in other parts of His vast world, was just what roused the fanatical fury of the audience, bringing the speech to an abrupt and tragic conclusion. His fate is all the more remarkable because Solomon himself is represented as protesting, in his prayer at the dedication of the Temple, against the notion that God would dwell on earth, much less in the house which had been built for His worship (1 K 8^{27}). But careful students of history know that there was division of opinion, even among the prophets, on this question, and Ezekiel's conception of 'the glory of the Lord' filling the Temple (Ezk $43^{4.\,5}$, etc.), together with the later Rabbinic doctrine of the Shekinah ('that which dwells' or the 'dwelling'), which St. Paul calls the δόξα (Ro 9^4), indicates how deep-rooted in the Jewish mind was the conviction that God did in some mysterious way inhabit the Temple of Solomon, of Zerubbabel, and even of Herod. Stephen's attempt to revive the spiritual conception ascribed to Solomon was therefore an assault upon the citadel of Jewish materialism, and cost him his life.

JAMES STRAHAN.

SOLOMON'S PORCH.—See PORCH, TEMPLE.

SON.—See FAMILY.

SON OF GOD.—See CHRIST.

SONS OF GOD.—See CHILDREN OF GOD.

---

* σωφρονίζειν, 'sophronize.' The word is sometimes used in English; cf. A. P. Stanley, *Life of Arnold*^{8}, London, 1858, vol. i. p. 30: 'I am confirmed in my resolution not to do so [*i.e.* raise the entrance fees] lest I should get the sons of very great people as my pupils whom it is almost impossible to sophronize.'

SON OF MAN.—The only instance in the NT outside the Gospel records of a direct reference to Jesus as *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* occurs in the speech of Stephen before the Jewish Sanhedrin (Ac 7^{56}). Assuming its genuineness, it is significant that the expression is used by a Hellenistic Jew recently converted to Christianity. Even on the assumption that the speech is largely the composition of the author of Acts, the same significance attaches to its employment here. Not only is it evidence that the gospel tradition was, in the main, correct as to its use by Jesus of Himself, but it shows how early the consciousness of the Church awoke to the claims which the designation involves. The strange hesitation of primitive Christianity in using this title proves the sturdiness of the growth and development of independent thought within the Church of the Apostolic Age. The rage of Stephen's audience, on hearing the words of the speaker, is accounted for only on the supposition that 'the Son of man' was recognized as the Jesus whom they had so recently done to death, and who now is described as occupying the transcendent position, and discharging the functions, of Messiah. The great and final synthesis — the Suffering Servant and the Eternal Judge—had received its justification in the alleged exaltation of the Crucified to the right hand of God. Now, no less than in the days of His humiliation, His sympathies were active for the despised and the suffering. It is, perhaps, too much to say that 'He is revealed to the eyes of His first martyr, that Christians may learn that that which is begun in weakness shall be completed in eternal majesty' (B. F. Westcott, *The Speaker's Commentary*, 'St. John and the Acts,' London, 1880, p. 35), but St. Luke's use of the term in this connexion shows how profoundly its implicates had affected the Christology of the primitive Church (note the word *ἑστῶτα*; cf. *ἐκάθισεν*, Mk 16^{19}, and *κάθου*, Ps 110^{1}).

The absence of the phrase *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* from the general body of NT writings cannot, therefore, be explained as entirely due to a reverent or superstitious disinclination to use a title which Jesus had appropriated to Himself. If the details of the martyrdom of James the Just given by Hegesippus and quoted by Eusebius be accepted, we have the designation used of the glorified Jesus Messiah. On being asked concerning Jesus who was crucified, he answered in a loud voice, 'Why do ye ask me about Jesus the Son of Man? He is now sitting in the heavens, on the right hand of the great Power, and is about to come on the clouds of heaven' (*HE* ii. 23). According to Jerome, the Gospel according to the Hebrews stated that Jesus had revealed Himself to James after His resurrection as 'the Son of man' ('filius hominis' [*Vir. Ill.* 2]), and we may conjecture that the expression in Hegesippus is a reminiscence of that event. It may be readily accepted that the words of James the Just are 'of the nature of a quotation.' It is not, however, so easy to see why the same should be said of 'the use of the phrase by the martyr Stephen in the Acts and the martyr James the Just in Eusebius and by the angels in Luke after the Resurrection' (E. A. Abbott, *The Son of Man*, Cambridge, 1910 [3317]; cf. note on [3317*a*]). The vision of Stephen gives a wider and deeper significance to the Messianic activities of the ascended Jesus. 'The Son of man' *stands* on the right hand of God ready to express His feelings of love and sympathy with the sons of the race to which He belongs.

There are two passages in the NT where the words *ὅμοιον υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου* are found (Rev 1^{13} 14^{14}) both in descriptive accounts of the Seer's visions. Quite obviously the references are to Jesus as the glorified Messiah (see, on the other hand, H. Lietzmann, *Der Menschensohn*, Tübingen, 1896, p. 56), and evidently are allusions to the apocalyptic language of Daniel (7^{13}). According to G. Dalman, the origin of the expression is to be discovered not in Dn 7^{13} but in $10^{5f.}$ (*The Words of Jesus*, Edinburgh, 1902, p. 251). The peculiar phraseology of the NT apocalyptist shows that, although he may have known and even been thinking of Jesus' self-designation, his eschatological doctrine had its roots in the soil of Judaistic transcendentalism, moving in a plane higher than that of grammatical construction (cf. *ὅμοιοι χαλκολιβάνῳ*, 1^{15}, etc.), and that we cannot equate his expression with the *θεωρῶ . . . τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* of Stephen (see H. B. Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*², London, 1907, p. 15). The use of *ὅμοιος* as an adverb in both passages may have been due to the translation he was accustomed to use, but in any case the above conclusion is not affected (*ὅμοιος υἱός = ὡς υἱός*).

There seems, indeed, no reason to doubt that this designation was well known to the writers and teachers of the apostolic period in spite of non-usage. We need not stay to inquire into the ultimate origin of the idea underlying the term or whether it is to be traced to the Persian doctrine of the Primal Man (see C. Clemen, *Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources*, Edinburgh, 1912, p. 150 ff.). The expression has become native to Palestinian thought and was a *terminus technicus* of Jewish eschatological speculation. The use of the 8th Psalm by St. Paul in 1 Co 15^{27} and his discussion as to the relative appearances in time of the 'earthy' (*χοϊκός*) and the 'heavenly' (*ἐπουράνιος*) man suggest his acquaintance with the term *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*. The same may be said of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Jesus' superiority in rank to the angelic beings, notwithstanding the fact that He is *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου*, is insisted on. The author of the Epistle to the Ephesians not only quotes this Psalm (*πάντα ὑπέταξεν*, Eph 1^{22}), but does so as if its highest application is discovered in the eternal exaltation of Jesus (*ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς, κτλ.*) 'the Lord,' and in His session (*καθίσας*) at the right hand of God in the heavenly regions (*ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις*; see J. Moffatt's translation in *The Historical New Testament*², Edinburgh, 1901, p. 232; cf. the use of the Danielic visions in 2 Es $13^{3ff.}$).

Widely different reasons are given by scholars to explain the absence of the term 'the Son of man' in the writers of the apostolic period. All the Greek-speaking leaders of Christian thought from Ignatius and Justin Martyr to Chrysostom agree in teaching that the title has a special reference to the human nature of Jesus, the human side in His descent. So also do Tertullian, Cyprian, Augustine, and Ambrose. For them its importance and significance were mainly dogmatic and theological, less suitable for the exigencies of practical instruction and life. For whatever reason, it did not then, and it never has, become a popular designation of Jesus by the Church (see *DCG* ii. 664ᵃ).

J. R. Willis.

SOOTHSAYING.—A comparison of the words used in different versions of the Scriptures to indicate the various practices and practisers of divination—using that word in its very widest sense—shows how indefinite was and is the significance attached to all these, and intensifies the desire that research may speedily classify them and determine the exact meaning of each. The English word 'soothsay' strictly means 'to tell authoritatively the truth.' The phrases 'sooth to say,' 'in good sooth' show the primary meaning. Men are especially anxious regarding the future; hence a soothsayer is a sayer of truth as regards the future.

'Soothsayer' is used in Jos 13^{22} (AV and RV; AVm 'diviner') to translate קוֹסֵם, Qal pt. act. of קָסַם, which, with its kindred terms, is translated 'divine' in Nu 22^{7} 23^{23}, Dt $18^{10.14}$, 1 S 28^{8}, 2 K 17^{17}, Is 44^{25}, Ezk 12^{24} $13^{6.7}$ $21^{21.22.23}$, Mic $3^{6.7}$, the LXX in all these cases employing *μάντις* and its cognates. But in 1 S 15^{23} the same Hebrew word is translated 'witchcraft' (AV and RV; marg. 'divination'), the LXX using *οἰώνισμα*; in Pr 16^{10} the word is translated 'a divine sentence' (AV and RV; marg. in all three 'divination'), the LXX using in this case *μαντεῖον*. Finally, in Is 3^{2} it is translated 'the prudent' in AV, but 'diviner' in RV, and the LXX translates by *στοχαστήν*. 'Soothsayers' is the translation in Is 2^{6} of עֹנְנִים, Qal pt. act. of עָנַן in AV and RV, the LXX employing *κληδονισμῶν*, while in Is 57^{3} עֹנְנָה is translated 'sorceress,' possibly because 'soothsayeress' is an impossible word; but the LXX renders 'ye sons of the sorceress' by *υἱοὶ ἄνομοι*. 'Soothsayers' is the translation in Mic 5^{12} of מְעוֹנְנִים (AV and RV), the LXX in this case rendering the word by *ἀποφθεγγόμενοι*. In Dn 2^{27} $4^{7(4)}$ $5^{7.11}$ 'soothsayers' is the translation of participles of the verb גְּזַר, 'to cut,' 'to decree,' 'to decide,' the LXX employing participles of a verb which is evidently a mere transliteration of the Hebrew.[*]

In Ac 16^{16} the word *μαντεύομαι* is used to indicate the art of the pythoness of Philippi. The girl's work was to predict accurately, and hence the word is here used in its strict English sense. 'Soothsayer,' then, is used of one who professes to indicate the future truthfully by a writer who does not believe that the soothsayer possesses such a power. In Hermas (*Mand.* xi. 2) the man who has the Divine spirit is differentiated by his life from the *ψευδοπροφήτης* to whom doubters go as a *μάντις*. The latter exalts himself, is bold, impudent, talkative, luxurious, and without reward gives no predictions. The soothsayers would appear, at least at a later time, to have been superior to and more skilful than the augurs. Perhaps part of their success lay, as in the famous case of Pyrrhus, in the cleverness with which they gave deliverances so worded that whatever happened their reputation did not suffer.[†]

LITERATURE.—E. B. Tylor, *PC*⁴, London, 1903, i. 145, 147; *HDB* v. 145, 618ª n., and the literature under DIVINATION and PYTHON.

P. A. GORDON CLARK.

SOPATER (*Σώπατρος*, a common Greek name).—Sopater is mentioned in Ac 20^{4} as a companion of St. Paul, who accompanied him from Greece to Asia Minor on his return journey to Palestine, whither he was bearing the offering of the churches 'for the poor among the saints that are at Jerusalem' (Ro 15^{26}). It has been conjectured that all the persons referred to in Ac 20^{4} were delegates of their respective communities appointed 'in the matter of this grace' (2 Co 8^{19}). If this was so, we shall suppose that they went all the way to Jerusalem. We know that one of them, Trophimus, did so (Ac 21^{29}), and evidently also Aristarchus (27^{2}). Sopater was perhaps the delegate of the church at Berœa. He is described as a native of that place (*Βεροιαῖος*), and was perhaps a Hellenistic Jew, one of those who contrasted so favourably with the Jews of Thessalonica, one of the 'many' who believed during the Apostle's visit (17^{10-14}). If he was not a Jew he cannot be identified, as is sometimes suggested, with Sosipater (*q.v.*), whose salutation is sent by St. Paul in Ro 16^{21}, and who is described as one of the Apostle's 'kinsmen,' *i.e.* fellow-Jews. Nothing further is known of Sopater than that he was 'the son of Pyrrhus' (*Σώπατρος Πύρρου*), of whom, however, we are entirely ignorant. The patronymic is omitted by TR and AV but is found in ℵABDE, several ancient versions, and RV. See art. PYRRHUS.

T. B. ALLWORTHY.

SORCERY.—The indefiniteness attaching to the meaning of words connected with divination, noticed in the art. SOOTHSAYING, is quite as applicable to sorcery. From *sors*, 'a lot,' come *sortiri*, 'to cast lots,' and *sortiarius*, 'one who foretells fortunes by lots.' To enable the foreteller to do his work, assistance was gained from spirits; and the latter conception gradually banished the idea of lots, confined now to 'sortilege,' and sorcery came to mean accomplishing one's object by means of evil spirits. It is applied to making the wind blow in a certain direction, causing storms and disasters; bringing on darkness; manipulating the rain-clouds, etc.[*]

From the word כָּשַׁף, not used in the Qal, but evidently meaning 'to pray,' we have the Piel כִּשֵּׁף, which means 'to pray intensely and effectively.' This word, which has no connexion with lots, is used in an anti-religious sense, and in 2 Ch 33^{6} is translated 'used witchcraft' (AV), 'practised sorcery' (RV); and in the LXX *ἐφαρμακεύετο*.[†] The participle of this word מְכַשֵּׁף means one who by intense prayer, or spell, achieves supernormal results. It is translated in Ex 7^{11}, Dn 2^{2}, Mal 3^{5} 'sorcerers' (AV and RV), and in LXX *φαρμακός*, while the feminine מְכַשֵּׁפָה in Ex $22^{17\,(18)}$ is translated by 'witch' (AV), 'sorceress' (RV),[‡] in LXX *φαρμακούς*. מְכַשֵּׁף itself in Dt 18^{10} is translated by 'witch' (AV); clearly it should at least be 'wizard,' unless 'witch' is here used as a word of common gender; by 'sorcerer' in RV, while in this case the LXX uses *οἰωνιζόμενος*.[§]

In Jer 27^{9}, כַּשָּׁפֵיכֶם, the practisers of the art, is translated 'your sorcerers' in AV and RV, while the LXX uses *φαρμακῶν* (Jer 34^{9}). The noun כֶּשֶׁף in Is $47^{9.12}$ is translated by 'sorceries (AV and RV), and by *φαρμακεία* in the LXX; but in 2 K 9^{22}, Mic $5^{11(12)}$, Nah 3^{4} it is translated by 'witchcrafts,' LXX *φάρμακον*, where clearly the right translation is 'magic arts.'[‖] But in Is 57^{3} the phrase בְּנֵי עֹנְנָה is rendered in AV and RV 'sons of the sorceress,' and in LXX by *υἱοὶ ἄνομοι*. In Dn 1^{20} $2^{2.10.27}$ $4^{4(7)}$ $5^{7.11.15}$ the word אַשָּׁף, which is translated 'astrologers' in the AV, is rendered 'enchanters' in RV, and in the LXX by *μάγοι*. Herodotus (i. 101) uses this word to indicate the Magi, one of the six tribes of the Medes, who were probably a sacred priestly class, devoted to astrology, divination by dreams, and the practice of magic generally.[¶] This word is applied by the writer of the First Gospel to the men from the East who visited the cradle of Jesus (Mt $2^{1.7.16}$), but that incident throws no light either on their status, the rites which they practised, or the country from which they came.

In Ac $13^{6.8}$ the name *μάγος* is applied to the Jew Bar-Jesus of Paphos. It is translated 'sorcerer' by AV and Moffatt, and also by the RV, with 'Magus' in the margin. The further designation *ψευδοπροφήτης* would indicate that he was by profession a prognosticator, probably of fortunes or events, but this is the only hint given of his arts or pretensions.[**] In Ac $8^{9.11}$ Simon of Samaria is spoken of as *μαγεύων*, and the art which he practised is named *μαγεῖαι*. These are translated in AV and RV 'used sorcery' and 'sorceries,' but Moffatt's translations, 'practised magic arts' and 'skill in magic,' are much truer to the Greek and to the facts so far as we can judge. The writer of the Apocalypse, to describe a sin or set of sins, falls back on the LXX, and uses words connected with *φάρμακον*. This word means a drug which can be given to a person, or used magically by one person on another to produce an effect hurtful or the reverse. *φαρμακεία* is the practice of this art, and *φαρμακός* is the practitioner. In the apostolic writings these are used in a bad sense. In Rev 9^{21} the unrepentant are grouped into those who have not forsaken four vices, one of which is *φαρμακεία* (the variant readings in this and the following cases do not affect the sense). The word is translated in AV and RV 'sorceries,' by Moffatt 'magic spell,' and by Weymouth 'practice of magic.' The place of the word and the well-known custom of the time suggest that the true meaning, in conformity with the original designation of the word, is 'poisoning.' In the condemnation of Babylon (Rev 18^{23}) it is said: 'all nations were seduced, *ἐν τῇ φαρμακείᾳ*.' This is translated in AV 'sorceries,' in RV 'sorcery,' by Moffatt 'magic spell,' by Weymouth 'magic thou didst practise'; the *Twentieth Century New Testament* has come nearest to the right translation in 'magical charms,' *i.e.* charms not natural, but produced by magic; but the true meaning seems to be 'magical love philtre.' One class of those who are to be cast into the lake of fire (Rev 21^{8}) is that of the *φαρμακεύς*, which is translated 'sorcerers' by AV and RV and Moffatt, while Weymouth's version 'those who practise magic' might be improved by translating 'those who practise poisoning.' Outside the Holy City are the *φαρμακοί* (Rev 22^{15}), concerning whom the remarks just made apply. In Gal 5^{20}, among the deeds of the flesh is *φαρμακεία*, which is translated in AV 'witchcraft,' in RV 'sorcery,' and by Moffatt 'magic.' Among the clauses of the second commandment of the *Didache* are *οὐ μαγεύσεις, οὐ φαρμακεύσεις*, which H. D. M. Spence * translates, 'thou shalt not practise magic' and 'thou shalt not use enchantments.' But the other sins mentioned naturally suggest that the latter command is, 'thou shalt not practise poisoning.' Sorcery in one form or another is practised in all the religions of the lower culture.† It long survived among Western Christians, if it does not still survive. 'A prefect of Honorius (A.D. 395–423) proposed to employ the Tuscan sorcerers, who offered the aid of their arts against Alaric, and Litorius, fighting against a successor of Alaric in Gaul, consulted the pagan seers before the last battle, under the walls of Toulouse. In the last years of the Western Empire, the diviners of Africa were practising their arts among the nominal Christians of Aquitaine.' ‡ In the Armenian Church there are still 'good sorcerers, who are quite disposed, with the aid of supernatural powers, to render service to human beings.' §

---

[*] Augustine, *de Civ. Dei*, iii. 11. 17.

[†] For functions of the Semitic soothsayers see *EBr*¹¹ xxii. 319ᵇ. On Babylonian soothsaying see *ERE* ii. 316ᵇ, 319ᵇ.

[*] *Exp*, 8th ser., vii. [1914] 21; *The Book of Ser Marco Polo*, tr. by H. Yule², London, 1875, i. 99, 108, 175, 178, 292, 300, 339; ii. 399.

[†] *Exp*, 8th ser., vii. 24; *EBi* iii. 2900.

[‡] *Exp*, 8th ser., vii. 22, 23.

[§] *Exp*, 8th ser., vii. 22; W. R. Smith, *JPh* xiii. [1884–85] 273 ff., xiv. [1885] 113.

[‖] *Exp*, 8th ser., vii. 25; *EBi* iii. 2900.

[¶] *HDB* iii. 203; J. H. Moulton, *Early Religious Poetry of Persia*, Cambridge, 1911, p. 75; G. Maspero, *The Passing of the Empires*, London, 1900, pp. 452, 577, 595, 783. The Rabmag (Jer $39^{3.13}$) was probably the (or a) chief of this tribe who may have been either the chief physician attached to the Court or, more probably, a high official charged with the care of the horse and chariotry (see A. H. Sayce, *The Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments*, London, 1894, p. 456; *Records of the Past*, 2nd ser., ii. [London, 1889] 182; C. H. W. Johns, *Babylonian and Assyrian Laws, Contracts, and Letters*, Edinburgh, 1904, p. 375).

[**] W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, London, 1895, p. 76.

LITERATURE.—See under the articles DIVINATION and EXORCISM.

P. A. GORDON CLARK.

SORROW.—See REPENTANCE, GRIEF.

SOSIPATER (Σωσίπατρος, a Greek name).—Sosipater is one of three men, Lucius and Jason being the others, who send salutations in Ro 16^{21} and are described by St. Paul as 'my kinsmen' (*οἱ συγγενεῖς μου*), *i.e.* fellow-Jews (cf. Andronicus and Junia(s), v.^{7}, Herodion, v.^{11}). It is possible that Jason (*q.v.*) is identical with Jason of Ac $17^{5f.}$, who was the Apostle's host at Thessalonica. Sosipater may be the same as Sopater (*q.v.*)—another form of the name—of Ac 20^{4}, who is said to have been a Berœan. If these identifications are correct, we shall suppose that these men were visiting St. Paul at Corinth at the time of writing or had become missionary companions of the Apostle. We know that Sopater did accompany St. Paul afterwards on at least part of his return journey to Palestine. It is perhaps in favour of this theory that the salutations of Lucius, Jason, and Sosipater are sent with those of Timothy and not with those of the Corinthian Christians, Gaius, Erastus, Quartus (v.^{23}), the personal greeting of the amanuensis being interposed (v.^{22}). If we think the identification unlikely, we shall suppose Sosipater and the others to have been members of the church at Corinth. It is perhaps easier to believe that their salutations were meant for fellow-Christians at Ephesus than at Rome, but we must remember that in the Apostolic Church sympathy and even affection were possible between converts who were not personally acquainted. It is interesting but of little importance for our present purpose to know that the name Sosipater is found among the list of Thessalonian politarchs (*CIG* ii. 1967).

T. B. ALLWORTHY.

SOSTHENES.—The name occurs twice in the NT. In Ac 18^{17} a Sosthenes is 'the ruler of the synagogue' in Corinth. Although in the Diaspora this title gained a more extended sense than in Palestine as an honorary title, there seems to have been only one ruler of the synagogue in Corinth. In that case Sosthenes must have been recently appointed when Crispus became a Christian; and probably he took a prominent part in the proceedings when 'the Jews with one accord rose up against Paul, and brought him before the judgement-seat' (Ac 18^{12}). The charge having been dismissed, Sosthenes was laid hold of and beaten before the judgment seat, but Gallio (*q.v.*) 'cared for none of these things' (v.^{17}). RV, dropping *οἱ Ἕλληνες*, favours the idea that it was the Jews who beat Sosthenes, venting on their own leader their rage over their disappointment. Another view has been that Gallio allowed the Jews to console themselves by beating Sosthenes, who was a Christian. Both these views are, however, rejected as historically inconceivable. Probably the reading *οἱ Ἕλληνες* has dropped out through a misapprehension of the scene due to the fact that a Sosthenes is mentioned with St. Paul in 1 Co 1^{1}. It cannot be decided whether these two men are the same person. The name was common; and nothing is said in the NT which identifies them. What happened when Gallio dismissed the charge against St. Paul was that 'the Greeks, who always hated the Jews, took advantage of the marked snub which the governor had inflicted on them, to seize and beat Sosthenes, who had been appointed to replace Crispus as *Archisynagogos*,'—a 'piece of "Lynch law," which probably seemed to him [Gallio] to be a rough sort of justice' (Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, p. 259). If Ac 18^{17} and 1 Co 1^{1} refer to the same person, Sosthenes must have been converted subsequently and become a Christian leader. There is nothing impossible in this. If one ruler of the synagogue was converted, why not another? It is conceivable that his sufferings in a religious riot may have turned his mind again to St. Paul's teaching. As a former ruler of the synagogue, his presence with St. Paul in Ephesus is explicable on two grounds: (*a*) his presence in Corinth as a Christian might irritate the Jews and make Christian work harder; (*b*) his social position and ability would probably mark him out as a suitable fellow-worker with St. Paul, who would delight to make an ally of a persecutor. It is certainly in favour of this identification that St. Paul mentions Sosthenes not as an amanuensis but as a Christian of standing, whose name is well known in Corinth and will carry authority with the Church. It has been suggested also that his subsequent conversion would account for St. Luke's exceptionally preserving the name of St. Paul's assailant. Whilst these considerations favour the identification, it cannot be proved. But it would be an interesting coincidence that both Crispus and Sosthenes should be mentioned in 1 Co 1, if both were converted rulers of the synagogue.

---

* *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, London, 1885, ch. ii.

† See, *e.g.*, G. T. Bettany, *Primitive Religions*, London, 1891, pp. 20, 36, 90, 113; *ERE* ii. 362^{b}.

‡ Samuel Dill, *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire*^{2}, London, 1905, p. 5.

§ *ERE* i. 806.

Eusebius (*HE* i. 12) states that Sosthenes was one of the Seventy; but probably this is a worthless tradition. Tradition is responsible also for the statement that he became bishop of Colophon.

LITERATURE.—W. P. Dickson, art. 'Sosthenes' in *HDB*; W. M. Ramsay, art. 'Corinth,' *ib.* i. 482^a; C. von Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age*, $i.^2$ [London, 1897] 113, 306–310; A. Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity*, $i.^2$ [London, 1908] 321; F. Godet, *Commentary on 1st Corinthians* (Eng. tr., Edinburgh, 1886); *EGT*, 'Acts,' London, 1900, p. 391, and '1 Corinthians,' do., p. 758; W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, London, 1895, pp. 257–259.

J. E. ROBERTS.

SOUL (ψυχή).—**1.** While ψυχή primarily denotes the animal soul or vital principle (Lat. *anima*), and hence is equivalent to life, 'soul' is not used in the NT outside of the Gospels (the AV of Mt 16^{26}, Mk $8^{36f.}$; but cf. the RV) to render ψυχή in this meaning of the word, 'life' being always employed instead (Ac $20^{10.\ 24}$, Ph 2^{30}, etc.). Occasionally, however, 'soul' is employed of the subject, whether man (1 Co 15^{45}, Rev 18^{13}) or lower animal (Rev 16^3; cf. 8^9), in which the principle of life inheres. Cf. art. LIFE AND DEATH.

2. Frequently 'soul' denotes the subject in the distinctness of his existence as an individual, and so is only an emphatic designation of the man himself. 'Every soul' (Ac 2^{43} 3^{23}, Ro 13^1) is equivalent to 'every one'; and the plural 'souls' is often used in cases of enumeration as a synonym for persons (*e.g.* 'three thousand souls,' Ac 2^{41}; 'eight souls,' 1 P 3^{20}).

3. While in its original meaning 'soul' refers to the physical or animal life, in its ordinary use it denotes the inner and higher as distinguished from the bodily nature of man—that in him which is the seat of thought, feeling, and will, and especially that which is the subject of the Christian salvation (1 Th 2^8, He 6^{19} 10^{39} 13^{17}, Ja 5^{20}, 1 P 1^9, 3 Jn ^{2}). In this meaning the word is frequently associated with 'spirit' (πνεῦμα), but usually in such a way as to show that there is no intention of so distinguishing between the two as to imply that man is possessed of a tripartite nature—body, soul, and spirit—or that the soul is concerned with earthly things while the spirit relates itself to God and heaven. When St. Paul writes, 'Stand fast in one spirit, with one soul striving for the faith of the gospel' (Ph 1^{27} RV), it seems evident that he is using the terms in a manner analogous to the parallelism of Hebrew poetry (cf. Lk $1^{46f.}$). And when St. James (2^{26}) declares that 'the body without the spirit is dead' (cf. Mt 10^{28}, 'which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul'), he is certainly not making use of 'spirit' in a more exalted sense than that in which 'soul' is employed when he speaks of the word 'which is able to save your souls' (1^{21}), or declares that he who converts a sinner from the error of his ways 'shall save a soul from death' (5^{20}).

4. In a few cases 'soul' denotes the inner and higher part of man's being as disembodied, but still living a life of its own after it has been separated from the physical part which is subject to corruption (Ac 2^{27}, Rev 6^9 20^4).

5. There is another use of 'soul,' however, in which it appears to be definitely distinguished from 'spirit' (1 Th 5^{23}, He 4^{12}). These passages might seem to lend some support to trichotomist views, if it were not that the use of the derived adjectives ψυχικός (lit. 'soulish'; AV 'natural,' 'sensual') and πνευματικός (AV 'spiritual') points not to any psychological distinction in the elements of human nature, but to a theological distinction between two stages of religious experience. This distinction of soulish and spiritual, which is especially characteristic of St. Paul (1 Co $2^{11\text{-}16}$ $15^{42\text{-}47}$; cf. Ja 3^{15}, Jude ^{19}), is evidently, as the contexts show, one between the natural or unregenerate man and the regenerate man who is living through grace under the power of the Divine Spirit. And so when St. Paul, in the passage above referred to, writes, 'And may your spirit and soul and body be preserved entire' (1 Th 5^{23}), he probably means by 'soul' the human individuality with all its natural powers, and by 'spirit' that individuality as charged with the new Divine potencies of the Christian life. And when the author of Hebrews (4^{12}) describes the word of God as 'piercing even to the dividing of soul and spirit,' this should perhaps be taken not as 'a mere rhetorical accumulation of terms' (A. B. Davidson, *Hebrews*, 1882, *in loc.*), much less as suggesting a psychological distinction between the sensuous soul and the rational spirit, but rather as pointing to a power possessed by the Divine word of discriminating between the natural and the regenerate heart and of bringing conviction to both alike. See, further, art. SPIRIT, SPIRITUAL.

LITERATURE.—H. Cremer, *Bib.-Theol. Lex. of NT Greek*^{3}, 1880, p. 582; J. Laidlaw, *The Bible Doctrine of Man*, 1895, pp. 87 ff., 135 f.; W. P. Dickson, *St. Paul's Use of the Terms Flesh and Spirit*, 1883, p. 193 ff.; *ExpT* x. [1898–99] 2.

J. C. LAMBERT.

SPAIN (Σπανία).—Spain was St. Paul's objective during the later years of his missionary activity. It was characteristic of him that he was always thinking of 'the parts beyond' (τὰ ὑπερέκεινα, 2 Co 10^{16}). Sensitively regardful of 'the province (κανών) which God apportioned' him, and determined not to intrude 'in another's province' (2 Co $10^{13.\ 15.\ 16}$), he felt drawn to the fresh fields of the distant West. It is in his letter to the Romans ($15^{24.\ 28}$) that he first broaches the idea of evangelizing Spain. Eager as he was to 'see Rome' and to preach the gospel in it, he did not purpose to remain there long. The metropolis was not in his κανών, for others had already laboured there, and he intimates that in his visit to the Roman Christians he would be *en route* (διαπορευόμενος) for his proper sphere. He would 'go on by' them (ἀπελεύσομαι δι' ὑμῶν) as he journeyed westward. The Imperial width of his horizon and boldness of his policy were worthy of his Roman citizenship, and the fact that Spain was the most completely Romanized of all the provinces no doubt made it seem a very attractive and promising mission field. It is true that half a century after St. Paul's time Juvenal could still write, 'Horrida vitanda est Hispania' (*Sat.* viii. 116), but he was doubtless thinking of the barbarous tribes of the northern mountains. In the beginning of our era Strabo (III. ii. 15) says that the southern Spaniards, 'especially those who dwell about the Bætis (Guadalquiver), have been so entirely converted to the Roman mode of life as even to have forgotten their own language.' Carrying over the permanent benefits of an earlier Phœnician and Carthaginian civilization, Spain had become a Roman province at the end of the Second Punic War (201 B.C.), and by the days of Cicero and Cæsar the southern districts were almost wholly Italian. 'If preparation was anywhere made by the republic for the great all-significant work of the imperial period—the Romanising of the West—it was in Spain. . . . In all Spain under Augustus there were numbered fifty communities with full citizenship; nearly fifty others had up to this time received Latin rights, and stood as to inward organisation on a par with the burgess-communities. . . . Like the Roman dress, the Roman language was largely diffused even among those Spaniards who had not Italian burgess-rights, and the government favoured the *de facto* Romanising of the land' (T. Mommsen, *The Provinces of the Roman Empire*, 1909, i. 67–70). Many of the writers of Rome's silver age, notably Lucan, the two Senecas, Martial, and

Quintilian, were Spaniards. The Emperors Trajan and Hadrian were born in Spain.

If St. Paul ever reached this goal, he must have made Latin for a time his missionary language, for even when half the population of Rome was speaking Greek, Spain was never in any degree Hellenized. But the question whether the Apostle succeeded in carrying out his purpose cannot be confidently answered. There are only two authorities for a Spanish journey—the Muratorian Fragment on the Canon, and Clement of Rome. The writer of the former (about A.D. 200) may have had independent knowledge, but it is more likely that when he mentions the 'profectionem Pauli ab urbe ad Spaniam proficiscentis,' he is merely drawing an inference that the purpose expressed in Ro $15^{24.\,28}$ was fulfilled. The words of Clement (*ad Cor.* v.) are well known: 'Paul . . . having taught the whole world righteousness, and having come to the bound of the West (*ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως ἐλθών*), and having borne witness (*μαρτυρήσας*) before the rulers, so was released from the world and went to the Holy Place, having become the greatest example of patience.' Lightfoot interpreted 'the bound of the West' as Spain, but, since the next clauses certainly refer to St. Paul's testimony and martyrdom in Rome, it seems natural to take *ἐλθών* and *μαρτυρήσας* together, and difficult to interpolate a journey between them. Sanday-Headlam ('Romans' ^{5} [*ICC*, 1902], 414) ask: 'Is it quite certain that a Jew, as Clement probably was, speaking of St. Paul, another Jew, would not look upon Rome relatively to Jerusalem as the *τέρμα τῆς δύσεως*, "the western limit"?' It is significant that the Pastoral Epistles contain no suggestion of a campaign, possible or actual, in the West.

LITERATURE.—J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 1891, *Biblical Essays*, 1893, p. 423 f.; A. C. McGiffert, *A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, 1897, p. 415 f.; C. von Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age*, ii. [1895] 137 f.

JAMES STRAHAN.

SPEARMAN.—See ARMY.

SPICE.—See AMOMUM.

SPIRIT, SPIRITUAL (*πνεῦμα, πνευματικός*).—**1.** In the Acts and the Epistles *πνεῦμα* very frequently refers to the Divine Spirit, conceived either as a power proceeding from God (Ac 2^{17}, Ro 8^{11}) or as a definite personality (Ac 8^{29}, Eph 4^{30}). See, further, HOLY SPIRIT.

2. It is applied to created beings other than human, whether angels (He 1^{14}) or evil spirits (Ac 5^{16} 19^{15}, 1 Ti 4^{1}, Rev 16^{14}; cf. Eph 6^{12}, 'the spiritual hosts [*τὰ πνευματικά*] of wickedness').

3. It is used of disembodied human spirits (Ac $23^{8f.}$), whether in a state of blessedness (He 12^{23}) or of condemnation (1 P 3^{19}).

4. It personifies various kinds of influence, as in the phrases 'spirit of bondage' (Ro 8^{15}), 'spirit of stupor' (11^{8}), 'spirit of the world' (1 Co 2^{12}), 'spirit of fear' (2 Ti 1^{7}), 'spirit of truth' and 'spirit of error' (1 Jn 4^{6}).

5. It is employed in contrast with 'the letter' (*γράμμα*) to denote inward reality as opposed to outward form (Ro 2^{29} 7^{6}, 2 Co 3^{6}).

6. Psychologically it occurs in a sense not to be distinguished from 'soul,' to designate the whole of man's inner nature as something separate from, or contrasted with, his body (Ac 7^{59}, 1 Co 2^{11} $5^{3.\,5}$ 7^{34}, Ja 2^{26}). See art. SOUL.

7. In St. Paul's theology 'spirit' receives a specific religious meaning that must be distinguished from the psychological one just noted. The Apostle's doctrine of salvation, with its antithesis between sin and grace, leads him to recognize an opposition between flesh and spirit which is much more than the natural contrast between spirit and body (Ro 8^{1-13}). 'Flesh' (*q.v.*) stands for fallen human nature, human nature as defiled and determined by sin (cf. Ro 8^{3}, 'sinful flesh,' lit. 'flesh of sin'), in contrast with which 'spirit' stands for the Christian's new or regenerate nature, in which the Spirit of God dwells (v.^{9}) in such a way as to bring deliverance from the law of sin and of death (v.^{2}). And the Apostle had so keen a sense of the difference between the unregenerate and the regenerate condition, and of man's fallen and sinful estate as affecting his whole nature, that he found it necessary to express the contrast in a way which would make it plain that the soul as well as the body is subject to the dominance of sin. For this purpose he makes an antithesis between 'spirit' and 'soul'—though for ordinary psychological purposes he treats the words as synonyms—and therefore opposes (1 Co $2^{14f.}$ $15^{44.\,46}$) the spiritual (*πνευματικός*) to the psychical or soulish (*ψυχικός*, AV 'natural,' 'sensual'). The soulish man is the merely natural man, the spiritual man is one into whom the Divine Spirit has entered, transforming the natural *πνεῦμα* and raising it to a higher power by this indwelling. This distinction which the Apostle makes between 'soulish' and 'spiritual' is not an arbitrary one, however, though he has adopted it for theological purposes of his own, but rests upon a differential use in the OT of *nephesh* ('soul,' LXX *ψυχή*) and *rûaḥ* ('spirit,' LXX *πνεῦμα*). 'Soul' in the OT stands for the natural life regarded from the point of view of its separate individuality (Gn 2^{7} 17^{14}), while 'spirit' is the principle of life considered as flowing from God Himself (Job 27^{3}, Ps 51^{10}, Ec 12^{7}), who is thus fitly called the God of the spirits of all flesh (Nu 16^{22} 27^{16}). Even in the OT 'spirit' stood, as 'soul' did not, for both the Divine and the human essence, and thus lent itself more readily to the thought of a vital connexion between the two, in which life is imparted from the higher to the lower. Hence St. Paul was only carrying OT usage and suggestion into a region of clearer theological definition when he contrasted the soulish with the spiritual, applying the former to man as he is by nature apart from Divine grace, and the latter to the new man in whom the Spirit of God has taken up His abode (Ro 8^{9}). This theological use of 'spiritual,' which is characteristic of St. Paul though not wholly confined to him, is extended from persons to things, so that we read of spiritual meat and drink (1 Co $10^{3f.}$), a spiritual body (15^{44}), spiritual songs (Col 3^{16}), a spiritual house and spiritual sacrifices (1 P 2^{5}). In all these cases 'spiritual' points to the presence of the Divine Spirit or to the activity of a human spirit that has been Divinely quickened and renewed.

LITERATURE.—H. Cremer, *Bib.-Theol. Lex. of NT Greek*^{3}, 1880, p. 503 ff.; J. Laidlaw, *Bible Doctrine of Man*, 1895, pp. 131 ff., 269 ff.; W. P. Dickson, *St. Paul's Use of the Terms Flesh and Spirit*, 1883, p. 168 ff.; B. Weiss, *Biblical Theology of the NT*^{3}, Eng. tr., i. [1882] 346 ff.

J. C. LAMBERT.

SPIRIT, HOLY.—See HOLY SPIRIT.

SPIRITS IN PRISON.—This expression appears in 1 P 3^{19}, and some of its implications have been already discussed under DESCENT INTO HADES. It remains to summarize the principal interpretations that the phrase has received.

1. Augustine argues (*Ep.* clxiv. 'ad Euod.' 13 ff.) that 1 P 3^{19} alludes to a preaching by the preincarnate Christ to the contemporaries of Noah, imprisoned in the darkness of ignorance, who were afterwards overwhelmed in the Flood for their sins. He is led to this conclusion by the difficulty which is presented by the apparent restriction of Christ's preaching, if it was in Hades, to one section only of the men who lived before

His advent, viz. the antediluvian patriarchs. Augustine's interpretation has had a wide influence, but it must be dismissed as inconsistent with the whole tenor of 1 P $3^{17\text{f.}}$. It was after Christ had been 'put to death in the flesh' that He was 'quickened in the spirit,' in which He 'went and preached unto the spirits in prison.' The words must refer to a ministry of Christ in Hades after His Passion. To whom was this ministry addressed?

2. *πνεύματα* in the NT generally means 'angels,' and it has been held that the fallen angels are indicated by *τὰ πνεύματα ἐν φυλακῇ*. This would agree with the language of Jude ^{6} and 2 P 2^4, the latter passage (as in 1 P 3^{19}) going on to speak of Noah and the Flood. So in *Eth. Enoch*, x. 12, the sons of God who had taken wives of the daughters of men (Gn 6^2) are represented as bound fast under the hills until the Day of Judgment; cf. also *Eth. Enoch*, xxi. 10, and *Slav. Enoch*, vii. 1, where the fallen angels in the second heaven are described as 'the prisoners suspended, reserved for the eternal judgement.' So also *Apoc. Baruch*, lvi. 12 f.: 'Some of them descended, and mingled with women. And then those who did so were tormented in chains. . . . And those who dwelt on the earth perished . . . through the waters of the deluge.' But in this literature there is no trace of a preaching by Christ to the fallen angels; although in *Eth. Enoch*, xii. 4, xiii. 8, the 'watchers of the heaven' who have fallen from their high estate are reproved and condemned by Enoch. Again, the 'spirits in prison' of 1 P 3^{19} must be included among the *νεκροί* of 1 P 4^6 to whom the gospel was preached, and these cannot be angels. Augustine, indeed, was forced by the exigencies of his theory to explain *νεκροί* of the spiritually dead, but the contrast between 'the quick and the dead' in the preceding verse (1 P 4^5) proves that the physically dead are in view.

The objection of Loofs (*ERE* iv. 659) that *σαρκί* in 1 P 4^6 proves that the *νέκροι* must be alive in the flesh is not convincing. When they were judged, they were in the flesh; but 'the difference in tense in *κριθῶσι, ζῶσι* makes the former verb antecedent in time to the latter, and the sense is the same as if St. Peter had written *ἵνα κριθέντες ζῶσι*' (Bigg, *ICC, in loc.*).

3. We have, then, to interpret *πνεύματα* of the disembodied spirits of men (as in He 12^{23}; cf. Lk $24^{37.\ 39}$), and *φυλακή* of Sheol or Hades, in which after death they are imprisoned, according to Jewish belief. Thus in *Apoc. Baruch*, xxiii. 4, we read of 'a place prepared where the living might dwell and the dead might be guarded'; cf. 2 Es $7^{85.\ 95}$ and Is 42^7 49^9 61^1 for phrases out of which the idea of Sheol as a prison might have grown (see, further, DESCENT INTO HADES, § 3). The idea was taken over by the early Christian Church. *E.g.*, Hippolytus (*c. Græcos*, ed. P. A. de Lagarde, Leipzig, 1858, p. 68) writes: *τοῦτο τὸ χωρίον* (*sc.* *ᾍδης*) *ὡς φρούριον ἀπενεμήθη ψυχαῖς*, and describes Hades as divided into two compartments, for the good and the evil, both guarded by angels, the unrighteous being haled to their own place as prisoners (*ὡς δέσμιοι ἑλκόμενοι*). And Tertullian (*de Anima*, 58) explains the *φυλακή* of Mt 5^{25} as the Hades of discipline for the soul. Indeed, the Peshiṭta Syriac of *τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν* (1 P 3^{19}) is equivalent to 'animabus illis quæ detinebantur in inferis,' which leaves no doubt as to the sense which the Syriac translators attached to the phrase under consideration.

4. The 'spirits in prison' of 1 P 3^{19} are, therefore, human souls in Hades or the abode of the departed, to whom Christ 'preached' after His Passion, a further allusion to the same mysterious ministry being found in 1 P 4^6. This has already been discussed under DESCENT INTO HADES, where it has been shown that various opinions were held by the early Christian theologians as to the scope of Christ's mission to the under world, some confining it to Jews, some to Gentiles, and some admitting all the departed, righteous or unrighteous, to a share in its benediction. But in 1 P 3^{19}, where alone in the NT the phrase 'spirits in prison' is found, it is immediately followed by the words 'which aforetime were disobedient, when the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah,' etc.—an apparent restriction of its content which is not easy to understand.

An explanation which has much to recommend it is that the Noachian patriarchs are here particularly specified, because the Flood was the great typical judgment of the ancient world, and thus the 'disobedient in the days of Noah' are representative of the disobedient in every age (see an excellent discussion of this by F. H. Chase in *HDB* iii. 795). There is, however, no suggestion in 1 P 3^{20} that the Noachians are mentioned as representative of all those who died in sin. The emphasis is on the fact of Christ preaching in Hades after His death, and not upon the persons to whom He preached. Great stress was laid in the next age upon this ministry as the direct issue of the Passion. Irenæus actually says (*Hær.* iv. 33) that the final cause of Christ's sufferings was that, having died, He might thus visit and deliver the dead. And Origen (*in Ps* 3^6), arguing that Christ effected by the separation of His soul from His body much more for the salvation of mankind than would otherwise have been accomplished, quotes 1 P 3^{19} in proof. Thus the words *θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκί, ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι* lead directly to the recital of the Descent into Hades. If any of those to whom Christ preached were to be specified, the argument would, indeed, require mention of *ἄδικοι*, as it is the suffering of the just for the unjust that is in question; but to proceed to specify any individuals at this point is a digression. It must be remembered, however, that the two topics—Hades and the Flood—were closely associated in Jewish thought, although to the modern mind they are quite distinct. For the Flood was caused primarily by the breaking forth of the fountains of the great deep (Gn 7^{11}), upon which the earth rested, and which was the mysterious abode of dread monsters and evil things (Gn 1^{21}, Is 51^9). These abysmal waters were waters of destruction; and the 'abyss' (Lk 8^{31}) was the home of devils, from which the Beast of the Apocalypse came forth (Rev 11^7 17^8). Now Sheol or Hades, the place of departed souls, was conceived as beneath these abysmal waters under the solid earth. 'They that are deceased tremble beneath the waters and the inhabitants thereof' (Job 26^5). And it was into this 'abyss' that Christ descended after His Passion (Ro 10^7).

Hence the mention of the *Descensus* would at once suggest to a Jew the abyss, whence the waters of judgment burst forth at the Flood. Of the countless souls imprisoned there, the writer recalls, naturally and immediately, those who were carried to its depths in that overwhelming visitation of God's wrath. To these (but not to the exclusion of others) Christ preached, that, having been judged in the flesh as men are judged (*κατὰ ἀνθρώπους*), they might henceforth live in the spirit as God lives (*κατὰ θεόν*, 1 P 4^6). And so was Christ's 'quickening in the spirit' manifest after His death.

LITERATURE.—To the books named under DESCENT INTO HADES may be added A. Schweizer, *Hinabgefahren zur Hölle als Mythus ohne biblische Begründung*, Zürich, 1868; E. H. Plumptre, *The Spirits in Prison*, London, 1887; R. H. Charles, *Eschatology, Hebrew, Jewish, and Christian*, London, 1899.

J. H. BERNARD.

SPIRITUAL GIFTS.—See GIFTS.

SPIRITUAL SONGS.—Spiritual songs (Eph 5^{19}, Col 3^{16}) cannot be distinguished as such from hymns and psalms (*qq.v.*). But the meaning of the epithet 'spiritual' deserves attention. St. Paul contrasts truly religious thoughts and words inspired by the Holy Spirit with the effusions of drunkards or the odes of heathen poets composed in ecstasy. A. E. BURN.

STACHYS (Στάχυς, a Greek name).—Stachys is saluted by St. Paul in Ro 16^{9} and described as 'my beloved' (τὸν ἀγαπητόν μου). The only other persons so described in these salutations are Epænetus (v.^{5}) and Ampliatus (v.^{8}). A woman, Persis (*q.v.*), is saluted, perhaps with intentional delicacy, as 'the beloved' (v.^{12}). The term may indicate a personal convert of the Apostle or one closely associated with his work. Nothing further is known of Stachys. We shall suppose him to have been a Roman or Ephesian Christian, according to our view of the destination of Ro 16. The name is comparatively rare, but occurs in inscriptions of the Imperial household (J. B. Lightfoot, *Philippians*^{4}, 1878, p. 174). T. B. ALLWORTHY.

STAFF.—The word ῥάβδος is translated 'sceptre' in He 1^{8} and 'rod' in 9^{4}, 1 Co 4^{21}, Rev 2^{27}, etc. In He 11^{21}, 'Jacob . . . worshipped [leaning] upon the top of his staff.' The reference is to the act of the patriarch when he received the solemn oath of Joseph, that he would bury him with his fathers ('Israel bowed himself upon the bed's head,' Gn 47^{31}). In Hebrews the words are an exact quotation from the LXX. The difference of translation has arisen from the different ways of vocalizing מטה. The LXX read it as מַטֶּה, 'staff,' and the Massoretes as מִטָּה, 'bed.' The question is, Which is the more likely to be right? The date of the LXX is uncertain (see *HDB*, art. 'Septuagint'), and the rise of the Massoretic system of vocalization is even more obscure (see *HDB* iv. 730^{a}). It is not improbable that the LXX gives an earlier and more correct interpretation. The phrase 'bed's head' is both curious and difficult. It suggests ideas which are associated with an early Victorian 'four-poster,' and are quite out of place in relation to a bed in the East (see *HDB*, art. 'Bed'). Usually the bed was laid on the floor or on a low platform, but sometimes a slight portable frame was used (2 S 3^{31}). There is a reference to the head of a bed in 1 S 19^{13}. The bed's head may simply mean the place where the pillow was laid. Dillmann and Driver (*Comm. on Genesis*) accept the reading of the Massoretic text. To get over the difficulty, Cheyne (*EBi*, art. 'Staff') suggests that ראש, 'head,' should be read as עֶרֶשׂ, 'couch.' There is no difficulty of interpretation if the LXX is followed: Jacob may have stood up to receive the oath of Joseph. Equally it may be said that there is no difficulty if the bed or couch had an end which might be called its 'head,' and that Jacob leaned upon it. It is impossible to decide whether 'staff' or 'bed' is right, but the fact that the LXX is the oldest commentary on the Hebrew Bible makes its reading the more probable.

LITERATURE.—*Comm. on Genesis* by A. Dillmann (1897), S. R. Driver (Westminster Com., 1904), and J. Skinner (*ICC*, 1910) *in loc.*; F. Rendall, *Com. on Hebrews*, 1883; *EBi*, art. 'Staff'; *HDB*, artt. 'Bed,' 'Rod,' 'Sceptre'; Smith's *DB*, art. 'Staff'; C. Geikie, *Hours with the Bible*, new ed. vi. [1884] 28 n. JOHN REID.

STAR.—There are only two passages in which the word 'star' occurs outside its frequent symbolical use in the book of Revelation. The first is in St. Stephen's defence, where he quotes a passage from the prophet Amos (Am 5$^{25-27}$), speaking of the idolatry of the Israelites and mentioning 'the star of the god Rephan' (Ac 7^{43}). It is admittedly a difficult passage, but the probable reference is to the Assyrian star-god. The other is in St. Paul's well-known argument on the resurrection of the body: 'One star differeth from another star in glory' (1 Co 15^{41}). As in nature we observe identity of substance with diversity of form, so will it be in the risen bodies of God's people.

Turning to the use of the word 'star' in the Book of Revelation, we find in the vision of the Son of Man that 'he had in his right hand seven stars' (Rev 1^{16}) and that 'the seven stars are the angels of the seven churches' (v.^{20}). According to one view, the angels of the churches are their pastors or rulers; according to another, they are superhuman beings standing in some intimate relation to the churches. The latter is the ordinary use of ἄγγελος in the Apocalypse (see ANGELS; see also Rev 2^{1} 3^{1}).

In the message to the church of Thyatira the promise to those who overcome is: 'I will give him the morning star' (Rev 2^{28}), *i.e.* the conqueror is to possess Christ. 'Christus est stella matutina qui nocte sæculi transacta lucem vitæ sanctis promittit et pandet æternam' (Bede). In Rev 22^{16} Christ says of Himself: 'I am . . . the bright, the morning star.' 'If the churches are λυχνίαι and their angels ἀστέρες, the Head of the Church may fitly be the ἀστὴρ ὁ πρωινός' (H. B. Swete, *Apocalypse*^{2}, London, 1907, p. 47). See art. MORNING STAR.

At the sounding of the third trumpet 'there fell from heaven a great star . . . and the name of the star is called Wormwood' (Rev 8$^{10f.}$). This is a symbol of Divine visitation. Hence the name 'Wormwood,' which is associated with Divine chastisement. The waters are changed into wormwood, and many who drink of them die. This may represent the bitterness of the water with which men seek to quench their thirst, instead of partaking of the water of life. In Rev 9^{1} the Seer sees a star already fallen (πεπτωκότα) and lying on the ground, representing the fall of some person, perhaps Satan.

Lastly, the Woman in the vision (Rev 12^{1}) 'has a crown of twelve stars' (see art. SUN).

MORLEY STEVENSON.

STEALING. — The Apostolic Church could scarcely have increased in numbers without finding κλέπται within her borders from time to time. The thieving slave had not gained his place in comedy without reason, and now when the slave turned Christian the temptation to cling to an easy and profitable habit must often have been specially strong. If his master also happened to be a Christian, then a perverted notion of the meaning of brotherhood could easily provide an excuse for pilfering. There was no compelling body of public sentiment on the matter in the Græco-Roman world, so that it was necessary to speak with some emphasis. Thus the exhortation to slaves in the letter to Titus insists that they should not be unworthy of any trust committed to them: 'Exhort servants to be subject to their masters . . . not purloining' (μὴ νοσφιζομένους, Tit 2^{9}). It is worthy of note that this word is used also in Ac 5^{2} concerning the Ananias and Sapphira incident, where the pair 'set apart' some of the price obtained, and hoped to gain credit for the gift of the whole. The most natural explanation of St. Paul's words to Philemon (vv.$^{18. 19}$)—'if he hath wronged thee at all, or oweth thee aught, put that to mine account . . . I will repay it'—seems to be that Onesimus had been guilty of some theft, and had fled to escape punishment.

That theft was not confined to the slave class is clear from the language of both St. Peter and St. Paul. St. Peter warns the Christian that he is not to suffer as a thief (1 P 4^{15}). St. Paul, writing to the church at Corinth, mentions among those who cannot inherit the Kingdom of God fornicators and thieves, adding 'and such were some of you' (1 Co 6^{10}). The most important passage in this connexion, however, is Eph 4^{28}, *ὁ κλέπτων μηκέτι κλεπτέτω*. This must obviously refer to stealing as a fact not of the past but of the present. The thief still existed, and that within the Church. Writing not in the spirit of a legislator, and still less in the manner of one formulating an 'interim' ethic, he insists that the habit is to be broken off. They are to cease from actual thefts, and are to learn the high principle which would make thieving impossible—so to work that they may be able to give. Obviously it was more lasting work to state this principle than to have merely advised restitution. On this high ground the atmosphere is such that the thieving desire cannot live. 'Stealing is the typical form of using the labour of another to supply our wishes, while it is our duty to make our own labour minister to the needs of others' (Westcott, *Ephesians*, p. 73).

LITERATURE.—B. F. Westcott, *Ep. to Ephesians*, London, 1906; S. D. F. Salmond, *EGT*, 'Ephesians,' do., 1903; E. von Dobschütz, *Christian Life in the Primitive Church*, Eng. tr., do., 1904.

R. STRONG.

STEPHANAS.—In 1 Co 1^{16} St. Paul writes: 'I baptized also the household of Stephanas.' From 1 Co 16^{17} we learn that Stephanas was with St. Paul at the time. Perhaps he reminded the Apostle that his was one of the few cases of personal baptism at St. Paul's own hands. Usually he left the baptizing to his helpers. Two reasons for the less usual course are suggested in 1 Co 16^{15}: 'Ye know the house of Stephanas, that it is the first-fruits of Achaia.' It was natural for the Apostle to wish to baptize his first converts in Corinth; perhaps there was nobody else to baptize them. Moreover, the baptism of a household marked a real footing gained by Christianity in the city. These 'first-fruits' proved themselves valuable helpers: 'Ye know . . . that they have set themselves to minister unto the saints.' Stephanas himself was one of the deputation sent by the Corinthian Church to St. Paul, and was, therefore, a trusted leader. The Corinthian Christians are urged to 'be in subjection unto such,' and to 'acknowledge them that are such.' Here St. Paul holds up 'such' as Stephanas and his household as worthy of imitation and of deference. They seem to have been among the first assistants of the Apostle, outside the inner circle of his chosen companions, and they were specially valuable to the work in Corinth. No doubt their work was a voluntary consecration: there is nothing to indicate an ecclesiastical office. '*ἔταξαν ἑαυτοὺς* . . . implies a systematic laying out of themselves for service, such as is possible only to those free to dispose, as they choose, of their persons and their time' (*EGT*, '1 Corinthians,' London, 1900, *in loc.*). So the family must have been of independent means, and St. Paul is only asking the spontaneous submission and the respectful deference due to character and hard work. At the same time, there may have been in such voluntary service the germs out of which grew the Church's local ministry, as A. C. Headlam suggests (*HDB* iv. 613).

J. E. ROBERTS.

STEPHEN.—Of Stephen we know nothing beyond the short notice of him contained in the two chapters (6 and 7) of Acts. He is said by Epiphanius (*Hær.* xx. 4) to have been one of the Seventy; but such a statement has little weight. All we can say for certain is that, when elected to be one of the Seven, he was a man of position both within and without the Christian community (Ac 6^{3}). The office to which he was appointed was that of administering alms to the widows of Hellenists (*i.e.* Greek-speaking Jews) who considered themselves overlooked in the daily distribution from the common fund of food or money. But to this work Stephen, like others of the Seven, notably Philip, by no means restricted himself. He was 'full of grace and power' (6^{8}), and was impelled to engage in controversy with members of the Hellenistic synagogues established in Jerusalem, and 'they were not able to withstand the wisdom and the Spirit by which he spake' (6^{10}). It is generally supposed that, as he devoted himself to the members of these Hellenistic synagogues, he was himself a Hellenist. The inference, not unreasonable in itself, is confirmed by his name, and by the familiarity which he seems to show with the LXX version of the Scriptures, perhaps even by what seems to have been the tenor of his teaching. To the Hellenist Jews with whom he argued that tenor must have been unmistakable, even from the outset. He was at once accused of undermining the authority of the Law of Moses, denying the permanent sanctity even of the Temple ($6^{14.\ 15}$).

Those who brought these charges are called false witnesses. False witnesses they undoubtedly were, as they interpreted the words of warning and of insight which he uttered as threats thrown out against the Temple and the Law. In this it was with Stephen as it had been previously with our Lord. Our Lord Himself had said that He was to become the world's temple in the future, and was condemned for blasphemy for speaking ill words against the Temple in Jerusalem; Stephen proclaimed that Temple and Law had done their work and were to give place in time to a more spiritual temple, a more universal law, and was denounced for blasphemy. The speech which he delivers when summoned before the Sanhedrin makes it plain that this was his position; and the fullness with which the speech is given, as a sort of introduction to the section of the Acts which traces the gradual reception of the Gentiles into the Christian Church, makes it obvious that this is the right construction to be put upon his words.

The speech itself contains three lines of thought, sometimes kept separate, but oftener interlaced, all leading up to one and the same conclusion. The first line is this—that the original covenant made between God and Israel was concluded not with Moses but long before with Abraham and the patriarchs, and, since the Mosaic covenant had been thus preceded by an earlier and more spiritual one, it might also be followed by a later and more spiritual one ('A covenant confirmed beforehand by God, the law, which came four hundred and thirty years after, doth not disannul, so as to make the promise of none effect' (Gal 3^{17}). Secondly, there is the suggestion that since God was worshipped acceptably long before temple or even tabernacle (after which the Temple was modelled, the tabernacle itself being but a copy of the heavenly tabernacle seen on the mount) was built, and again since God was acceptably worshipped in spots far removed from the land of Canaan, and Solomon, at the very moment of building the Temple, declared that God dwells not in 'houses made with hands' (Ac 7^{48}), it is at least possible that God may be worshipped, and worshipped acceptably, elsewhere than in the Temple. Thirdly, the speech ends with the warning to which all the earlier part—the fate of Joseph, the fate of Moses —had led up: 'Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do ye' (7^{51}). It was this last lesson so emphatically driven home that immediately produced that outbreak of rage in the Sanhedrin which brought about Stephen's death. Its members condemned him to be guilty of blasphemy: he had justified, not denied or even softened down, his previous utterances; they rushed upon him, and, when he stated that he saw the heavens opened and Jesus standing to welcome him on the right hand of God, the vision did, in this view, but increase the blasphemy, so they dragged him out of the city and stoned him. Saul, then a young man, presided at the stoning and gave hearty assent and approval to his death (7^{60} 8^{1}).

Two questions relating to this stoning have to be answered: (1) How did it take place at all, seeing that the Jews had not the power of life and death? (2) What was the date at which it occurred? As to the first point, the actual martyrdom of Stephen seems to have been something of the nature of a tumultuous outbreak. It was a sudden fit of rage that brought it about, similar to that through which St. Paul so nearly lost his life had he not been rescued by the Roman soldiers (22$^{23ff.}$). As to the second question, it has been suggested that this outbreak took place during a temporary vacancy in the provincial authority, which will not, however, fix the date, as the Roman governors were frequently changed during this period; or, as some have thought, it may have occurred during a vacancy in the Imperial throne. Tiberius died and Caius became Emperor early in A.D. 37, and Stephen's martyrdom has been put at this time. This is almost the latest date assigned, and there is more, perhaps, to be said for an earlier date such as Ramsay suggests—A.D. 32 or 33 (*St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, p. 376). All that we can gather with fair certainty is that St. Paul's conversion followed soon after; but the date of this event is itself involved in much obscurity, depending, as it does, on whether we identify the visit to Jerusalem mentioned in Gal 1^{1} with the visit of Paul and Barnabas described in Ac 11 and 12 or with that described in Ac 15. As Harnack, *The Acts of the Apostles*, p. 29, concludes, it is impossible to settle this point with certainty, because St. Luke, probably having himself no exact date to rely upon, has left the chronology of this section of the Acts in intentional obscurity.

LITERATURE.—J. P. Norris, *Key to Narrative of the Acts of the Apostles*, London, 1885; R. B. Rackham, *The Acts of the Apostles*, do., 1901; W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, do., 1895; A. Harnack, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Eng. tr., do., 1909, *Luke the Physician*, Eng. tr., do., 1907.

W. A. SPOONER.

STEWARD.—'Steward' in English may be taken to represent two Greek words, *ἐπίτροπος* and *οἰκονόμος*, the former being rather steward of an estate (as in Mt 20^{8} and Lk 8^{3}; see W. A. Becker, *Charicles*, Eng. tr., London, 1895, p. 363), and the latter of a household. *ἐπίτροπος*, however, occurs only once in the NT outside the Gospels, and there it is joined with *οἰκονόμος*: *ὁ κληρονόμος* [while still *νήπιος*, 'an infant'] *ὑπὸ ἐπιτρόπους ἐστὶ καὶ οἰκονόμους* ('sub tutoribus et actoribus' [Vulg.] Gal 4^{2}); this Lightfoot in his commentary translates 'under controllers of his person and property,' taking *ἐπιτρόπους* as the boy's legal representatives (so Vulg.) and *οἰκονόμους* as stewards or bailiffs to manage either his household or his property. No doubt *οἰκονόμος* was often used as a general term for one who acted in either capacity.

The first instance we adduce is that of a public official: *ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς Ἔραστος ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως*, Ro 16^{23} ('arcarius civitatis' [Vulg.]). The city here is apparently Corinth, where St. Paul was at the time of writing (the Erastus mentioned in Ac 19^{22} as a messenger of the Apostle from Asia to Macedonia can hardly be the same person; and even the one mentioned in 2 Ti 4^{20} as still at Corinth is perhaps more likely to be the same as the latter than the former). The office held by Erastus was doubtless that of city-treasurer or something similar; cf. 1 Es 4$^{47.\,49}$, where the same title occurs. All the other instances of *οἰκονόμος* and *οἰκονομία* are in the Epistles and occur by way of comparison or simile.

(1) *General*, with further description: *εἰ γὰρ ἑκὼν τοῦτο πράσσω* (=*εὐαγγελίζομαι*), *μισθὸν ἔχω· εἰ δὲ ἄκων, οἰκονομίαν πεπίστευμαι* ('I have to bear in mind that I am charged with a stewardship and must carry it out') (1 Co 9^{17}). In 1 Co 4^{2}, *ζητεῖται ἐν τοῖς οἰκονόμοις ἵνα πιστός τις εὑρεθῇ*, the faithfulness of stewards in general is spoken of; but the phrase follows directly upon a special kind of stewardship (*οἰκονόμους μυστηρίων θεοῦ*).

(2) *Special: stewards of God*, acting for Him: *δεῖ γὰρ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνέγκλητον εἶναι ὡς θεοῦ οἰκονόμον*, Tit 1^{7}; *διάκονος κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς*, Col 1^{25}; *ἐκζητήσεις . . . μᾶλλον ἢ οἰκονομίαν θεοῦ τὴν ἐν πίστει*, 1 Ti 1^{4} (here the sphere in which, or rather the method by which, stewardship is rightly exercised is added [*sc.* by faith]).

(3) *Stewards with the matter of stewardship described* (*sc.* of grace, of mystery, or of mysteries): *ἕκαστος καθὼς ἔλαβεν χάρισμα, εἰς ἑαυτοὺς αὐτὸ διακονοῦντες ὡς καλοὶ οἰκονόμοι ποικίλης χάριτος θεοῦ*, 1 P 4^{10}; *εἴ γε ἠκούσατε τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς*, Eph 3^{2}; *οὕτως ἡμᾶς λογιζέσθω ἄνθρωπος ὡς ὑπηρέτας Χριστοῦ καὶ οἰκονόμους μυστηρίων θεοῦ*, 1 Co 4^{1}; *τίς ἡ οἰκονομία* (*v.l.*, *κοινωνία*) *τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων ἐν τῷ θεῷ*, Eph 3^{9}.

(4) One very curious extension of the use of the word occurs in Eph 1^{10}, *εἰς οἰκονομίαν τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν*, which is well paraphrased and explained by W. Alexander (*Speaker's Commentary*, London, 1881, *in loc.*): 'The dispensation is the Divine arrangement of His household, or plan of government, which was to be carried out when the full time had come, which time had now arrived.' Here the idea of stewardship almost disappears, as it is the Master's own management that is referred to.

C. L. FELTOE.

STIGMATA.—See MARKS.

STOCKS.—The Gr. term (*τὸ ξύλον*, lit. 'the wood') tr. 'stocks' in AV and RV is used to denote a wooden framework containing holes, in which the feet of criminals were confined. This ancient mode of punishment (cf. Job 13^{27} 33^{11}) survived in lands further west till a comparatively recent period. Among both Greeks and Romans it was employed in the case of freeborn malefactors as well as slaves. When Paul and Silas were thrown into the inner dungeon of the prison at Philippi, the jailer, who was charged by the Roman magistrates (known as the Duumviri) to keep the prisoners safely, for greater security took the precaution of enclosing their feet in the stocks (Ac 16^{24}). This infliction was part of the shameful treatment endured at Philippi to which the Apostle afterwards referred in his First Epistle to the Thessalonians (2^{2}).

W. S. MONTGOMERY.

STOICS (*οἱ Στωικοὶ φιλόσοφοι*).—The Stoics are mentioned by name only once in the NT (Ac 17^{18}), when St. Paul met with them and the Epicureans at Athens. For the circumstances of this encounter see art. EPICUREANS. Though the Stoics are not again mentioned, St. Paul's speech on the Areopagus seems framed with them in mind, and one of his sentences, 'for we are also his offspring' (v.^{28}), a quotation from Aratus, is almost identical with the words of Cleanthes, one of the founders of the sect. Moreover, several other passages in the NT, *e.g.* 2 P 3$^{5-7.\,10-13}$, He 4^{12}, suggest acquaintance with this system of philosophy. Among philosophies of this period Stoicism occupied an exalted position.

The teaching of Plato and Aristotle had waned in popularity, the Epicureans suffered from an evil reputation, while Stoicism claimed to enable men to endure the prevailing hardships of thought and life. Its cultivation of high ideals, the nobility of its foremost adherents, its repression of the coarser and insistence on the nobler elements in human nature, won esteem and admiration. Though its unrelenting severity prevented it from ever becoming the creed of the multitude and restricted it to the select few, Stoicism has always been a potent influence among serious men far beyond the limits of its actual disciples.

1. Circumstances which favoured its growth.—(*a*) *The disappearance of the city-States.*—Earlier Greeks had rejoiced in their citizen-life, and gladly identified their individual lives with the life of the city. But evil days arrived, and internal quarrels led to the intervention of the Macedonian power and the consequent loss of self-government. Later still came the all-conquering Romans, sweeping them all into the Imperial net. Now, bereft of all interest in civil affairs, the more serious-minded turned for relief to those deeper human considerations in which they could think as they would, and adulation and sycophancy would not be required. It was in part, therefore, a movement of despair.

(*b*) *Loss of faith in the traditional religion.*—The old mythologies and pagan practices had now lost their power over the Greek mind.

(*c*) *Influx of Oriental ideas.*—This was due to that intermingling of peoples which followed the Alexandrian conquests. Comparison with the beliefs of others showed how abstract, improbable, and unpractical were their own philosophies in face of the new needs.

2. The founders of Stoicism were not pure Greeks, although the chief centre of instruction was Athens, nor was the system a product of the true Greek spirit. As its later history shows, it was much more congenial to the sterner Roman temperament, and it was at Rome that it achieved its greatest triumphs. The earliest teachers came from Cyprus, Cilicia, Babylon, Palestine, Syria, and Phrygia, and the universities of Tarsus, Rhodes, and Alexandria were its strongholds. The founders of Stoicism were Zeno, Cleanthes, and Chrysippus. *Zeno* (*c.* 342–270 B.C.) came to Athens from Citium in Cyprus. He seems to have visited all the existing schools of philosophy before settling down among the Cynics. And even they did not entirely satisfy him. The Cynics banned speculation absolutely, despised all human delights, and welcomed hardships with open arms. In the end Zeno forsook them, and became a teacher himself in the 'painted porch' (ἡ ποικίλη στόα, hence the name 'Stoic'). Of his earnestness, poverty, and contentment there can be no doubt. *Cleanthes* (*c.* 300–220 B.C.), the master's successor, is known best for his famous *Hymn to Zeus*, a remarkable production. *Chrysippus* (*c.* 280–206 B.C.) is usually regarded as the second creator of this system. 'Had there been no Chrysippus, there had been no Porch' (Diog. Laertius, VII. vii. 183). He collected and systematized the earlier doctrines, but, while contributing to its logic, psychology, etc., made no addition to its ethics. At Rome Stoicism came to its own, and Seneca, Epictetus, and M. Aurelius Antoninus stand pre-eminent among its adherents. *Seneca* (4 B.C.–A.D. 65), a contemporary of St. Paul, was the tutor and later the counsellor of Nero. Between his professed devotion to placid Stoic principles and his actual life a strange contradiction exists (see T. B. Macaulay, *Lord Bacon*, London, 1852). An advocate of poverty and self-abnegation, he became wealthy and maintained his position at Court by abject flattery and perhaps worse. In *Epictetus* (fl. *c.* A.D. 100), the poor lame slave of Epaphroditus afterwards freed, we meet a kindlier, humbler, and altogether more beautiful character. He taught the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man. Laughing at misfortunes or even denying their very existence, he bore all hardships cheerfully and regarded even death as a mere incident to be left complacently in the hands of God. *M. Aurelius* (A.D. 121–180), the Stoic Emperor, would have been happier as a private citizen. Confronted with distasteful duties both without and within his Empire, he proved no great success as a monarch. Meditation was more to his liking than activity, and his literary remains are a treasure-house of fine sayings. The persecution of the Christians, to which he lent himself, must have appeared to him a political necessity.

3. The teaching of the Stoics may be divided into the following branches: Logic, Physics, Ethics, and Religion. Individual differences will here be ignored, and indeed they are not always easy to determine. On the whole, Stoicism laid emphasis on the requirements of practical life, and everything was subordinated to this aim.

(*a*) *Logic.*—This term was employed somewhat vaguely and included Dialectic, Rhetoric, and Logic properly so called. Its comparative unimportance in the system may be gathered from two well-known illustrations which were employed. Ethics was likened to the yoke of an egg, physics to the white, and logic to the shell. Again, physics was said to resemble the trees in a field, ethics the fruit which the trees produced, and logic the fence around the field. It need only be said, therefore, that the Stoics' chief aim was to reach a criterion of truth; and this they found in the feeling of certainty. The mind is at first a complete blank and depends on impressions received from the outside world. These impressions are either confirmed or rejected by the reaction of the mind's own reasoning powers. Certainty is reached when the impressions become distinct and overwhelming.

(*b*) *Physics.*—In this branch of their system the Stoics derived much from Heraclitus, as did their contemporaries the Epicureans from Democritus. They declared the primary element to be a fiery ether which, after assuming grosser forms such as fire, as we see it, air, water, and earth, finally resumes its original character. They also held that the only reality is matter; and in this substance they expressly included air, sky, and stars, the mind of man, including even his thoughts, passions, and virtues, and finally God. The novelty of their teaching lay in the idea of tension which they believed permeated all things. It was according to the variations of this quality that one substance differed from another. Yet even this is material or corporeal, differing only in its varying degrees of fineness or subtlety in different objects. Notwithstanding this materialistic view of things, the Stoic maintained that the whole world of men and things is under the government of reason, which permeates and harmonizes all. In this reason man participates, and may partly understand its larger operations and in his own degree co-operate therewith. Man's lower nature must be kept subordinate to these higher purposes, and in the end he will be re-absorbed into the Universal Reason.

(*c*) *Ethics.*—Here we reach that branch of Stoicism for which all the rest existed and to which it was only preliminary. It may be summed up in the well-known phrase, 'live in conformity with Nature.' But it is the Stoic interpretation of this formula that is significant. As against the Epicureans, who made pleasure the object of life, they insisted that virtue is the only Good. All those objects which are usually regarded as desirable they banned—position, honours, wealth, health, men's favour, etc. In this they differed from the

Cynics, their predecessors, only in being somewhat less harsh and severe. In opposition to the Epicureans, who held that pleasure was the motive power of animals and young children, they taught that these were guided rather by the instinct of self-preservation. And, though allowing that pleasure is often associated with virtue, they declared that it was too precarious a factor to be relied on and should be ignored altogether. The aim of this attitude was practical, viz. to set man free from all the varying chances and changes of fortune and to reach a condition of 'apathy.' Whether, therefore, civil and personal affairs were congenial or otherwise, a man must remain master of both his feelings and his actions.

> 'In the fell clutch of circumstance
> I have not winced nor cried aloud.
> Under the bludgeonings of chance
> My head is bloody, but unbow'd'
> (W. E. Henley, *Invictus*, 5–8).

Confronted with ordinary human affections and passions, whose disturbing influence is obvious to all, they declared them one and all to be wholly injurious. Even pity and compassion should be eschewed. No one suffers as much as we suppose. It is only just to note that in later times this general austerity was slightly modified. Some things might be preferred, others avoided, and the range of totally indifferent things was made narrower. But the underlying principle was never changed. Man must ignore or even laugh at circumstances and act quite independently of them. Emotion is only perverted reason. Further, Stoicism recognized no degrees or gradations of virtue or vice. A man was entirely virtuous or entirely vicious. The 'wise man' of the Stoics was perfect in every way. This extraordinary doctrine, modified later, was due in part to the emphasis laid on motive or intention. Right motives made an act virtuous, however unfortunate its effects. The tendency to suicide, so marked a feature among them, seems to contradict their theoretical indifference to pain. They explained this by saying that a man need live only as long as it was possible to do so with dignity and utility.

Cosmopolitanism was a striking element in the Stoic system. The only city to which they acknowledged fealty was the City of Zeus. All men being sons of God were brothers, and distinctions of race and country must be abolished. In theory friendships and the customary relations of home and State might not be prohibited, but in practice reasons for their neglect were invariably forthcoming.

(*d*) *Religion.*—This was materialistic pantheism. God, the ruler and upholder of all that exists, is identical with universal law, and like all else is material. Though believing in a First Cause and a Mind governing all, both are corporeal. The different parts of the universe may be finer or coarser, but they are only forms of the one primary force. Cleanthes' *Hymn to Zeus*, which includes both adoration and supplication, seems in strange conflict with all this. Perhaps it may be taken as the revolt of the devout spirit against the arbitrary theories of the reason. In regard to the traditional and often debasing ceremonies of religion then in vogue, the Stoic attitude was one of compromise. Essentially they could not but be opposed to them. Prayer was generally an error and by implication showed distrust in Divine goodness. Earthly temples were unworthy of God. Yet they tolerated the popular forms of worship, and explained them as a picturesque way of setting forth poor human ideas of the Deity. The age-long problems of Evil and Freedom proved insoluble on Stoic assumptions.

(*e*) *Relation to Christianity.*—Many facts make this an interesting subject of study. Even the OT, and Apocalyptic books such as Sirach, 4 Maccabees, and Wisdom of Solomon had been affected by Stoicism. And, with so many points of contact in their ethical teaching, it is small wonder that Stoicism and Christianity have been suspected of influencing each other. Again, Tarsus, the home of St. Paul, was likewise a great centre of Stoic teaching, and it is supposed that the great Apostle shows traces in his writings of this early association. In regard to Seneca, too, a tradition arose that he became a disciple of St. Paul and a Christian. A full discussion of the value and bearing of these facts is given in Lightfoot (see Literature). On the acquaintance of St. Paul with Stoic literature and ideas as shown in his speech on the Areopagus we have already remarked. Striking coincidences occur between the language of the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles and the sayings of Seneca and Aurelius. It may certainly be acknowledged that in these two pagan writers we reach the highwater mark of non-Christian ethics. For various reasons it is not possible to say certainly whether indebtedness exists on the one side or on the other. But in relation to fundamental principles many vital differences separate them. Each system starts from different premisses and reaches different conclusions.

(1) The Stoic conception of God was materialistic and pantheistic. Fatherhood in any real sense was thereby excluded. Divine love and paternal care were impossible and fellowship with the Father of our spirits was out of the question.

(2) Self-repression, with the object of attaining complete 'apathy,' was the fundamental demand of Stoicism, but how the ordinary man was to effect this it did not show. In any case, his resources were restricted to himself: there was no place for a Saviour, and the weak were left to fail.

(3) In regard to a future life, the Stoics leave us with a feeling of great uncertainty. One wonders, indeed, that they should have desired it. At most they thought of it as a bare possibility. Such continuance could only be an endless rotation, resulting probably in experiences as unpleasant as in this life. In the presence of such contrasts we are therefore obliged to conclude that, however many or close the resemblances between Christianity and Stoicism, they were in vital matters fundamentally different. That St. Paul should show some acquaintance with Stoic teaching was inevitable, and that he did not openly expose its weakness was probably due to the fact that the system was never likely to trouble those to whom he preached. As for Seneca, he would doubtless encounter Christians at Rome, but probably in circumstances that would leave him indifferent to their principles and beliefs.

LITERATURE.—The leading sources are: Diogenes Laertius, *de Vitis Philosophorum*, vii.; Cicero, *de Finibus*; Plutarch, *de Stoicorum Repugnantiis*, and *de Placitis Philosophorum*; works of Seneca, Epictetus, and M. Aurelius. Of modern authorities we may refer to E. Zeller, *Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics*, Eng. tr., London, 1880; H. Ritter, *History of Ancient Philosophy*, Eng. tr., iii. [Oxford, 1839]; A. Grant, *The Ethics of Aristotle*, 2 vols., London, 1866; W. W. Capes, *Stoicism*, London, 1880; W. L. Davidson, *The Stoic Creed*, Edinburgh, 1907; J. B. Lightfoot, *Philippians*^{4}, London, 1878, 'St. Paul and Seneca,' p. 270 ff.; artt. 'Stoics' in *EBr*^{11}, *HDB*, and *EBi*.

J. W. LIGHTLEY.

STONING.—The three Greek verbs in the NT tr. 'to stone' are λιθοβολέω, λιθάζω, and καταλιθάζω. The LXX almost invariably employs the first of these as the equivalent of the Heb. synonyms סָקַל and רָגַם, which mean (1) the pelting of stones by a mob at a person who has merited their ill-will (Ex 8^{26} 17^{4}, 2 Ch $24^{20ff.}$; cf. He 11^{37}, Ac 5^{26}); (2) the infliction of the death-penalty by stoning (Lv 20^{2}, Dt 13^{10}).

The method which an enraged crowd took of executing vengeance with the weapons lying readiest to their hand came to be employed afterwards as a regular and legal method of inflicting the death-sentence on a criminal. Stoning is the only form of capital punishment recognized in the Mosaic Law. To stone an offender with stones means the same thing as to put him to death, the two expressions being sometimes used together as synonymous (Lv 20^{2}). Wherever stoning is not explicitly stated to be the mode of execution, it is implied. The Pentateuch gives no details as to the manner in which the punishment was to be carried out. Certain restrictions, however, were specified, as that (1) the stoning should take place outside the city (Lv 24^{14}, Dt 17^{5}; cf. Ac 7^{58}), and that (2) the witnesses, of whom two or more were necessary to secure conviction, were to cast the first stone, and then all the people (Dt 13^{9} $17^{5ff.}$; cf. Ac 7^{58}). Death by stoning is the penalty prescribed in the Pentateuch for various offences against religion and morality. Blasphemy occupied a prominent place among the former (Lv 24^{16}; cf. 1 K 21^{13}, Ac 6^{13}).

For information as to the process of stoning in NT times, reference is necessary to the Rabbinic law, which lays down the rules and precautions to be observed in carrying it out (Mishna, *Sanh.* vi.). These were intended to secure (1) that the condemned person should have every opportunity of obtaining a reversal of his sentence on the way to execution, by the production by himself or others of fresh evidence in his favour; (2) that his sufferings should be shortened as much as was possible in the circumstances. After sentence was pronounced, the criminal, in the absence of further evidence sufficient to establish his innocence, was preceded by a herald or crier, whose function it was to announce, in terms of a prescribed formula, the name and parentage of the offender, and the nature of his offence, together with the names of the witnesses. The place of execution was outside the town. On his arrival there, he was divested of his clothing, apparently by the witnesses, a loincloth alone being left him. Failing a natural eminence somewhere in the vicinity, he was placed on a platform twice the height of a man. It was then the duty of one of the witnesses to precipitate him violently to the ground, in the hope that the force of the concussion would produce a fatal effect. In the event of this effect not being attained, the second witness was to cast a heavy stone on his chest. If he survived this treatment, the bystanders completed the dispatch of the unhappy victim by stoning him.

Two instances of stoning call for special consideration—that of the proto-martyr Stephen (Ac 7^{58-60}), and that of St. Paul at Lystra ($14^{19f.}$).

1. The stoning of Stephen.—In connexion with the stoning of the first Christian martyr, a much-debated question is whether it was (*a*) tumultuary, (*b*) legal, or (*c*) a blending of both.

(*a*) Baur maintains that the whole proceedings from first to last were tumultuary. Stephen was simply done to death by a fanatical mob without even the pretence of a hearing, and the idea of a trial before the Sanhedrin, followed by a regular Jewish stoning, must be summarily dismissed (*Paul: his Life and Works*, Eng. tr., 2 vols., London, 1873–75, i. 56). Modern criticism, following suit, rules out the references to the Sanhedrin in Ac $6^{12. 15}$, on the ground that they are editorial additions, or belong to an inferior source, and were introduced for the purpose of making out that a trial took place before that body. 'Stephen's arrest,' says Moffatt, 'was the result of a popular *émeute*, which restrained itself just long enough to allow him to defend himself before a suspicious and exasperated audience, which numbered—perhaps unofficially—several members of the Sanhedrin' (art. 'Stephen' in *EBi* iv. 4789). 'It is plain,' he adds, 'that Stephen died, not on the testimony of witnesses (6^{13} 7^{58b}), but on account of his own recent word and confession' (*ib.* 4794). But, if the occasion which led to Stephen's being put on his defence was the accusation of blasphemy brought against him by the witnesses (and the statement of 6^{13} can hardly be challenged), it is difficult to conceive of a self-constituted tribunal attempting to adjudicate upon a grave charge of the sort, involving the penalty of death, with which the supreme court of justice alone among the Jews had authority to deal. The presence of the witnesses from first to last (6^{13} 7^{58}; cf. 22^{20}) affords a strong presumption that the case was tried before the Sanhedrin, and that the martyrdom was not the result simply of foul play on the part of an excited mob who had lost all control of themselves.

(*b*) The view that the proceedings were quite regular and orderly throughout has also been advocated. 'Stephen was formally accused and brought to trial before the Sanhedrim; it is probable that he was formally condemned by that body, and that his death was not the result of a mere tumult, as the account of Luke might seem to imply. This probability is strengthened by the fact that his death was by the legal mode prescribed for the crime of blasphemy, and that the stoning was done not by the crowd in general, but by Stephen's accusers in the orderly Jewish way' (A. C. McGiffert, *A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, Edinburgh, 1897, p. 90). There is no reason to suppose, however, that the historian of the Acts sought to aggravate the crime of Stephen's death by leaving the impression that it was the result of a popular tumult rather than of a fair trial conducted to an orderly conclusion. Some of the formalities, moreover, in connexion with legal stoning, were necessarily dispensed with. If the accused was condemned on his own confession, further evidence to attest his innocence would not be admissible.

(*c*) There is no reason to question the reality of the scene depicted in the narrative, in which, after the utterance that excited the fury of the hearers ('Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God'), the court was at once transformed into an infuriated mob, and hurried the alleged blasphemer, now judged out of his own mouth, without further ceremony to the place of execution ($7^{57f.}$). As regards the subsequent stoning, the narrative places it beyond doubt that the witnesses were present (7^{58}; cf. 22^{20}), and discharged the functions customary on such an occasion. F. C. Conybeare suggests (*Exp*, 8th ser., vi. [1913] 466) that 'it was Stephen's garments which were ceremonially laid at the feet of Paul' (by the witnesses [p. 469]), 'and that the true reading in ver. 58 is *αὐτοῦ*, and not *αὐτῶν*.' But the feelings of horror with which St. Paul recalled the scene in later years were due to the fact that he kept, not the raiment of Stephen (although his may also have been there), but 'the raiment of them that slew him' (22^{20}). It is probable that the Apostle was present, not as a mere inactive spectator, but in an official capacity, perhaps that of herald, as Conybeare suggests (*op. cit.*, p. 468). If not the prime mover in bringing about the martyrdom, he was undoubtedly one of the active spirits participating in it, and it was not at haphazard that the witnesses laid down their clothes at his feet. Some special significance attaches to the circumstance, although it hardly justifies the assumption that he was a member of the Sanhedrin at the time.

2. The stoning of St. Paul at Lystra.—In the catalogue of hardships and sufferings endured by the Apostle in the course of his missionary labours and journeys, he mentions the fact that in one instance he was stoned (2 Co 11^{25}). This is probably identical with the stoning to which he was subjected at Lystra during his first visit to Galatia (Ac 14$^{19f.}$). He had left Iconium not long before to avoid similar treatment, which some of the inhabitants of that city, both Jewish and Gentile, were planning to mete out to him and Barnabas (14^{5}). The same good fortune did not attend him at Lystra. His Jewish opponents in Antioch and Iconium appeared upon the scene, and so wrought upon the passions of the superstitious townspeople that a riot was created, in which the Apostle was stoned. Although Jews were a party to the outbreak of violence, the stoning was simply the method by which the fanatical mob of a heathen city vented their rage upon an advocate of the Christian faith. The attempt on the Apostle's life proved unsuccessful. Stunned for a time by the blows of the missiles, he was dragged by his assailants outside the city, and left there for dead. But, as the disciples stood around his prostrate body, he recovered consciousness, and returned with them to the city. The injuries sustained were not sufficiently serious to prevent his leaving Lystra for Derbe next day.

Although the life of the Apostle was not seriously imperilled, he bore ever afterwards the scars left by the encounter. Writing at a later date to the members of the Galatian Church, he closes his Epistle with these solemn words: 'From henceforth let no man trouble me: for I bear branded on my body the marks of Jesus' (Gal 6^{17} RV). Ramsay conjectures that these marks were caused—some of them at least—by the stoning at Lystra. 'Obviously, it must appeal,' he says, 'to something that lay deep in the hearts and memories of the Galatians' (*Historical Commentary on the Galatians*, London, 1899, p. 473). Less probable is the conjecture of T. W. Crafer (*Exp*, 8th ser., vi. 375–384) that the ἀσθένεια τῆς σαρκός, on account of which he first preached the gospel in Galatia, was caused by the stoning at Lystra. There is no reason to suppose that the maltreatment, however painful for a time, was attended by permanent, or even lengthened, physical disability. The 'infirmity of the flesh' in Gal 4^{13} and the 'thorn in the flesh' in 2 Co 12^{7}, are identical, and are best explained as caused by periodical attacks of a painful sort to which the Apostle was subject.

LITERATURE.—T. H. Weir, art. 'Stoning,' in *DCG* ii. 679; McClintock and Strong, *Cyclopædia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*, New York, 1881; E. König, 'Stoning, Hebrew Use of,' in Schaff-Herzog, xi. 105; J. Poucher, 'Crimes and Punishments,' in *HDB* i. 527^{a}; S. Mendelsohn, 'Capital Punishment,' in *JE* iii. 557^{a}; I. Benzinger, 'Law and Justice,' in *EBi* iii. 2722; F. W. Farrar, *Life and Work of St. Paul*, London, 1879, vol. i., Excursus vi.

W. S. MONTGOMERY.

STRANGER, ALIEN, FOREIGNER.—The word 'stranger' (from *extraneus*) has been so long in possession as the rendering of several distinct words in the Hebrew and Greek texts that it is difficult to introduce changes in translation that appear desirable in order to distinguish those words from each other, and doubtful in some instances whether an exact rendering would be tolerable to the ear of English readers.* Take an instance from the OT, and one from the NT. In Gn 23^{4} and Ps 39^{12}, 'I am a stranger and a sojourner' could not well be changed for 'I am a sojourner and a settler' (or 'dweller'). In Jn 10^{5}, 'A stranger (ἀλλοτρίῳ) will they not follow . . . for they know not the voice of strangers (τῶν ἀλλοτρίων),' we should not welcome the substitution of 'alien' for 'stranger' in order to distinguish ἀλλότριος from ξένος. 'Aliens,' however, might fitly have been put in RVm in Mt 17^{25}, 'From their sons, or from strangers (ἀπὸ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων)?' Cf. Lk 17^{18}, 'Were there none found that returned to give glory to God, save this stranger?' where the rendering of ἀλλογενής in RVm by 'alien' heightens the contrast to which our Lord draws attention.

In the numerous NT passages in which changes of a more considerable kind were called for by fidelity to the true meaning of the text, those changes have been judiciously and consistently made by the RV. In Lk 24^{18} the question σὺ μόνος παροικεῖς Ἰερουσαλήμ cannot mean 'Art thou only a stranger?' and is rightly changed for 'Dost thou alone sojourn?' (marg. 'Dost thou sojourn alone in Jerusalem?'), Cleopas implying that none but a solitary sojourner, who had not come in contact with other sojourners at the Passover season, could be ignorant of the death of Jesus. In Ac 2^{10} οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες Ῥωμαῖοι are mentioned in the list of nations present at Pentecost. Here the inadequate rendering 'strangers of Rome' becomes 'sojourners from Rome,' those meant being 'Romans who had migrated to Jerusalem and had settled in that city' (Overbeck, quoted by A. Harnack, *The Acts of the Apostles* [*NT Studies*, iii.], Eng. tr., London, 1909, p. 67). In the speech of St. Stephen (Ac 7^{29}, ἐγένετο πάροικος), we should read 'became a sojourner,' and in that of St. Paul (13^{17}, ἐν τῇ παροικίᾳ) 'when they sojourned.' Read also in 17^{21} (Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ πάντες καὶ οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες ξένοι), 'Now all the Athenians and the strangers sojourning there': 'the large number of foreign residents . . . was always a distinguishing feature of Athens' (J. B. Lightfoot in Smith's *DB*^{2}, vol. i. pt. i. p. 36^{a}).

The Christian communities addressed in 1 P 1^{1} are called ἐκλεκτοὶ παρεπίδημοι διασπορᾶς. AV loosely translates 'to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus,' and wrongly transfers ἐκλεκτοῖς to the verse following. Read with RV 'to the elect who are sojourners of the Dispersion,' or simply 'to the elect sojourners of the Dispersion.' It is now generally agreed that 'St. Peter had in his mind predominantly, though probably not exclusively, *Gentile* readers,' and that διασπορᾶς, like the preceding παρεπίδημοι, is used to describe their *religious* condition, both words being 'taken from the vocabulary created by Jewish history and afterwards transferred to the Christian Church' (F. H. Chase in *HDB* iii. 783^{a}; T. Zahn, *Introduction to NT*, Eng. tr., Edinburgh, 1909, ii. 141, 153, n. 5). In 1 P 2^{11} a strong moral appeal is made to Christians as πάροικοι καὶ παρεπίδημοι: here, πάροικοι having the first claim to 'sojourners,' it was necessary that παρεπίδημοι should be translated by a different word, and 'pilgrims,' which, in its Latin form *peregrini*, is used by the Vulgate in this verse, at once suggested itself. It is to be noticed that the rendering 'sojourners' for 'strangers' in 1 P 2^{11} connects the appeal made with the exhortation given in 1^{17}, ἐν φόβῳ τὸν τῆς παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον ἀναστράφητε.*

'**Alien**' occurs twice in the NT (AV). In He 11^{34} the fine rendering 'armies of the aliens' (ἀλλοτρίων) could not be improved upon. In Eph 2^{12} RV rightly substitutes the verb for the noun, as required by the Greek text, ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς πολιτείας, 'alienated from the commonwealth of Israel' (cf. 4^{18}, Col 1^{21}).

'**Foreigner**' (from *foraneus*) was not a word in common use when the AV was made, and in the NT is found only in Eph 2^{19} (οὐκέτι ἐστὲ ξένοι καὶ πάροικοι). We regret the disappearance of the inspiriting words 'no more strangers and foreigners,' but must admit the consistency of RV in translating ‘no more strangers and sojourners.’

---

* 'St. Augustine, in a well-known story, tells us that, when a bishop, reading the chapter about Jonah's gourd, ventured to substitute St. Jerome's "hedera" for the established "cucurbita," such a tumult was raised, that if the bishop had persevered he would have been left without a congregation' (G. Salmon, *Introduction to NT*^{4}, London, 1889, p. 126).

* Note on ἐπιδημεῖν, παρεπίδημος.—'In distinction from ἐπιδημεῖν, it [παρεπίδημος] emphasises more definitely the merely temporary character of the residence' (Zahn, ii. 139).

In what follows, this study of words is supplemented by some reflexions of a devotional and practical nature.

1. Christ and the stranger.—Kindness to the stranger-guest has always been one of the most attractive features of Eastern life and manners. ‘From the earliest times of Semitic life the lawlessness of the desert . . . has been tempered by the principle that the guest is inviolable’ (W. R. Smith, *RS*^{2}, London, 1894, p. 76). The description in Gn 18^{2-8} of Abraham’s entertainment of his three mysterious visitors ‘presents a perfect picture of the manner in which a modern Bedawee sheykh receives travellers arriving at his encampment’ (E. W. Lane, *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*^{5}, London, 1871, i. 364). The humanitarian laws enjoined on Israel included the following: ‘A stranger shalt thou not wrong, neither shalt thou oppress him; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt’ (Ex 22^{21}; cf. 23^9, Lv $19^{33.\,34}$, Dt $10^{18.\,19}$). The stranger, who is to be made welcome, and whose rights are to be respected, often comes into view, *e.g.* in Ru 2^{10}, Ps 94^6 146^9, Mal 3^5. In Greece, *Ζεὺς ἀγοραῖος*, the Protector of the assembly of the people, was also *Ζεὺς ξένιος*, the Protector of strangers. The beautiful story of Philemon and Baucis, the aged Phrygian couple who received Zeus and Hermes into their hut when others had refused to take them in (cf. J. B. Lightfoot, *Colossians and Philemon*, London, 1875, p. 370, who uses the legend to illustrate the scene at Lystra, Ac 14^{11}), must have had its origin in some mind which had conceived it possible that the gods might put men to the proof by visiting them in human form. The truth thus dimly shadowed forth was realized in Jesus Christ. He, when ‘found in fashion as a man,’ accepted the title of ‘Prophet’ as one which, ‘so far as it went, . . . was a true description of His work’ (H. B. Swete, *The Ascended Christ*, London, 1910, p. 53), and, in His preaching ministry, was dependent for food and lodging on those who ‘received him’ (Lk 10^{38} $19^{5.\,6}$; cf. 2 K $4^{9.\,10}$). In one of His last discourses He taught that the stranger was, along with others whom He named, one of His ‘brethren’ or next of kin, who had the right to the same ministering love which had been shown toward Himself, and solemnly said that men’s final acceptance before Him as their Judge depended upon their recognizing and doing justice to that right. His authoritative and affecting words *ξένος ἤμην καὶ συνηγάγετέ με* (Mt 25^{35}) impressed it for ever on the heart of the Church that in receiving the stranger she fed and sheltered her Lord.* They made care for the stranger a standing rule of Christian life (cf. J. R. Seeley, *Ecce Homo*^{11}, London, 1873, p. 194). Their effects are seen in Ro 12^{13}, 1 Ti 3^2 5^{10}, Tit 1^8, 3 Jn ^{5}, Clem. Rom. i. 1. 2, *Didache*, xi. 2. It is somewhat remarkable that in He 13^2 our Lord’s words are not referred to. The marked feature of apostolic Christianity presented to view in these passages pointed forward to the systematic provision which was made for the entertainment of strangers in the *ξενοδοχία* of post-apostolic times. ‘A “saint,” *i.e.* a Christian, provided with a letter of recommendation from his church, could travel from one end of the Roman Empire to the other without having any anxiety about a home. Wherever there was a Christian Church he was sure of receiving food and shelter, and attention in case of illness’ (G. Bonet-Maury in *ERE* vi. 804^b; cf. Sanday-Headlam, *ICC*, ‘Romans’^{5}, Edinburgh, 1902, p. 363; W. E. H. Lecky, *History of European Morals*^{8}, London, 1888, ii. 80). It is not necessary to do more than allude to the countless forms of helpful assistance and benevolence which Christ’s compassion for the stranger has prompted in recent times (cf. T. von Haering, *Ethics of the Christian Life*, London, 1909, p. 402; H. L. Martensen, *Christian Ethics* [*Social*], Eng. tr., Edinburgh, 1882, ii. 71, 72).

2. The sheep and strangers.—Neither AV nor RV gives the proper emphasis to *δὲ οὐ μή* in Jn 10^5. These words enrich the comparison between the two voices. We should read ‘*But* a stranger will they *by no means* follow,’ or ‘will they *certainly not* follow.’ Christ speaks with confident expectation of how His sheep will act. They will assuredly not follow a stranger: ‘on the contrary (*ἀλλά*) they will flee from him.’ ‘Fleeing’ implies a feeling of danger and alarm. The voice of the stranger whom they know not scares the sheep (cf. W. M. Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, London, 1864, p. 203; F. Godet, *Com. on St. John’s Gospel*, Edinburgh, 1876–77, ii. 382). The words may be applied to the Church of the Apostolic Age in a variety of ways. They who ‘knew that the Son of God was come’ (1 Jn 5^{20}) were not led astray by false Messiahs. They were gifted with a quickness of apprehension and a sharpness of penetration that enabled them to see the tendency and temper of false teaching. They accounted as strangers those teachers who came ‘to act as spies on the liberty which they had in Christ’ (Gal 2^4), as well as others, still more dangerous, who sought to lead them into the thicket of Gnostic speculation in which they would have lost sight altogether of the nature and work of their Redeemer (Col 2^8). The same faculty of discrimination, created and guided by the Spirit of Christ, enabled them to take the first steps in sifting the writings of the Apostolic Age, and setting apart those which spoke to them with the voice and authority of the Chief Shepherd.

3. Christians not ξένοι but πάροικοι.—It is worthy of attention that Christians are not called *ξένοι* in the NT. The Gentile believers addressed in Ephesians had once been *ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας* (2^{12}), but are now *συνπολῖται τῶν ἁγίων καὶ οἰκεῖοι τοῦ θεοῦ* (v.^{19}), fellow-citizens with full rights (cf. Ph 3^{20}), and in household fellowship with the family of God. When Christians are described as *ξένοι* in early Christian literature, the word is used in a typical or metaphorical sense—as in the *Epistle to Diognetus*, v. 5: *πάνθ’ ὑπομένουσιν ὡς ξένοι· πᾶσα ξένη πατρὶς ἐστιν αὐτῶν, καὶ πᾶσα πατρὶς ξένη.* St. Peter’s impressive adaptation of Hos 2^{23} to the Gentile Christians of Asia Minor, *οἵ ποτὲ οὐ λαὸς νῦν δὲ λαὸς θεοῦ* (1 P 2^{10}), is immediately followed by his appeal to them as *πάροικοι καὶ παρεπίδημοι.* They are thus reminded that they are sojourners on earth, dependent on the protection of God, whose property the earth is, and to whom it belongs to determine the length of their sojourn and what mercies they shall receive. Such seems to be the force of the words ‘with thee’ in Ps 39^{12} (cf. A. F. Kirkpatrick, *Book of Psalms*, Cambridge, 1902, p. 207). In the Church the Christian finds ‘a home for the lonely’ (J. H. Newman, *Parochial Sermons*, new ed., London, 1868, iv. 196): but ‘so long as we are still at home (*ἐνδημοῦντες*) in the body, we are in a sort of exile from our home (*ἐκδημοῦμεν*) in the Lord’ (2 Co 5^6; cf. A. Plummer, *ICC*, ‘2 Corinthians,’ Edinburgh, 1915, pp. 124, 151). ‘Exilium vita est’ was the inscription carved above the doorway in Victor Hugo’s room at Hauteville, Guernsey.

---

* Cf. A. H. McNeile, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew*, London, 1915, p. 370^b: ‘After the Resurrection, and helped by the influence of Greek thought, Christians were divinely led to the conception of the mystical oneness of an immanent Christ with humanity. *εἶδες γαρ, φησίν, τὸν ἀδελφόν σου, εἶδες τὸν θεόν σου* (Clem. *Strom.* I. xix. 94, II. xv. 71). “Vidisti, inquit, fratrem, vidisti dominum tuum” (Tert. *De Orat.* xxvi.).’

LITERATURE.—To the works cited throughout the art. may be added: S. R. Driver, *The Book of Exodus*, Cambridge, 1911, p. 231, *ICC*, 'Deuteronomy' ^{2}, Edinburgh, 1896, p. 165; C. L. W. Grimm, *Lexicon in Libros NT*, Leipzig, 1868, *s.v.* *ξένος, πάροικος, παρεπίδημος*; J. A. Selbie, artt. 'Foreigner,' 'Ger,' and 'Strange, Stranger' in *HDB*.

JAMES DONALD.

STRANGLED (Ac $15^{20.\ 29}$ 21^{25}).—The interpretation of this word has been a difficulty almost from the beginning. Western texts substitute for it: 'not to do unto others what you would not they should do unto you.' They thereby turn all the prohibitions into moral ones. 'Blood' means murder, 'fornication' adultery, and for 'things strangled' is substituted harmfulness. This of course misses the whole point of the Council, which had to decide not on moral (except indirectly) but on ceremonial distinctions. The Council wishes Gentile Christians of Syria and Cilicia to keep from heathendom, *i.e.* idolatry and its accompaniment, fornication; blood; things strangled. Now blood-offerings and strangled offerings are mentioned in the OT as found among idolatrous Jews (Ezk 33^{25}, Is 65^4 $66^{3.\ 17}$). St. James fears these offerings among idolatrous Christians. To eat blood in any form is contrary to the teaching of the OT. But strangled things are specially mentioned because they have a peculiar efficacy in heathen eyes. They do not shed the blood, and it does not therefore call for vengeance from the ground. Thus they have a magical influence, and have been so used in N. America and Japan and are still used in India. The word may therefore stand here as a well-known allusion to magical rites in Syria, and the prohibition may become equivalent to 'Keep yourselves from magic.'

LITERATURE.—F. J. A. Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, 1894, p. 73; W. R. Smith, *RS*^{2}, 1894, pp. 343, 417; J. G. Frazer, *Golden Bough*^{2}, 1900, ii. 319, 416; J. B. Lightfoot, *Colossians and Philemon*, new ed., 1879, pp. 88–90. For another view, W. J. Conybeare and J. S. Howson, *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, new ed., 1889, p. 172.

SHERWIN SMITH.

STREET.—The only street referred to by name in the apostolic writings is the street in Damascus which is called 'Straight' (Ac 9^{11}). The word employed (*ῥύμη*, 'lane' or 'alley') hardly applies to this instance, for it was a broad, straight street on the Greek model, flanked by colonnades, on the further side of which foot-paths extended. The modern equivalent, which still retains the name, and forms the principal thoroughfare of the city, is in reality only the northern foot-way of the ancient street. The proof of this is given by the East Gate, the central and southern archways of which are now closed up; also by fragments of columns, found in houses and courtyards contiguous to the present street.

The same word is found in 12^{10}, applied to one of the streets or lanes of Jerusalem, probably in the heart of the city, to which it appears to be appropriate (cf. art. GATE). The use of *πλατεῖα* in 5^{15} is somewhat surprising; if taken in conjunction with *κατὰ* followed by acc. plur. it forcibly suggests alleys or lanes in which it was necessary to arrange the sick in lines. But it has to be noted that *καὶ εἰς* is now read, following ℵABD, which seems to correspond better with the likely situation. The sick were brought from narrow ways into the 'broad places.' A comparison with Mk 6^{56} (*ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς*; D reads *πλατείαις*) is instructive: applied to villages and country, no less than to cities, this would seem to denote no more than 'open spaces,' perhaps as opposed to courtyards. Such open spaces in cities came to be used as business centres, and were put to other uses (see especially Ac 17^{17}).

If we keep in view the smallness and the extreme irregularity of ancient cities, as revealed by recent excavation in Palestine, it seems best to equate *ῥύμη* to 'street,' and *πλατεῖα* to 'square,' in the modern city. The difference is greater than the similarity, however, for the average Hebrew city could boast of only one 'broad place,' and that was at the gate. An exception must be made for the Apostolic Age in favour of recent cities, built according to Græco-Roman designs (cf. Damascus above). Whether a city was ancient or modern would have an important bearing on its plan.

πλατεῖα alone is used in Rev., notably always in the singular (11^8 21^{21} 22^1). The Græco-Roman model seems to be before the writer's eye. Here *πλατεῖα* is not a broad place or square, but rather a broad street running from gate to gate. Had the symmetry been detailed there would have been found a corresponding *πλατεῖα* intersecting the first at right angles. Within the walls the city would thus be divided into four segments which were built over, whose streets and lanes would be dwarfed by the spaciousness of the two *πλατεῖαι*. This principle is carried further in the description of the Holy City, New Jerusalem, in correspondence with the number of gates (twelve).

H. B. Swete (*The Apocalypse of St. John*^{2}, London, 1907, p. 299) takes exception to the division of the verses in $22^{1.\ 2}$ RV, and follows AV and RVm. 'The picture presented is that of a river flowing through the broad street which intersects the city, a row of trees being on either bank.' In 11^8 the corpses cast out into the principal street (now generally understood of the earthly Jerusalem), and left without burial, were a purposed insult to the martyred witnesses, which was speedily avenged (vv.$^{11-13}$). Such defilement stands in marked contrast to the later picture of purity and life (water and tree).

W. CRUICKSHANK.

STRIFE.—It was not unnatural that strongly marked varieties of character and opinion should appear in the living Apostolic Church, for the proverb 'many men, many minds' had its application there as elsewhere.

1. Party-spirit (*ἔρις, ἐριθεία*), which was stimulated by the free institutions of the Hellenic city-States, soon invaded the equally democratic Christian communities. The result was a species of religious warfare which no doubt afforded a certain evidence of the vitality of the primitive faith; but the last thing which St. Paul, Apollos, and Cephas desired was that they should be constituted leaders of rival sects and acclaimed by eager partisans. In his First Letter to the Corinthian church St. Paul gravely rebukes a divisive, quarrelsome spirit, and endeavours to divert the strong currents of religious life into better channels (1 Co 1^{10-13}).

2. But St. Paul himself was compelled, like Jeremiah (15^{10}), to be a man of strife. Against Jews and Judaizers he had to fight the battle of spiritual freedom. His gospel inevitably created antagonisms wherever he preached it. 'Fightings (*μάχαι*) without' as well as 'fears within' were his appointed lot (2 Co 7^5). In things indifferent he was the most yielding of men (1 Co 9^{19-22}), but on matters of principle he would not give place to any one for an hour (Gal 2^5). He withstood even St. Peter to the face (2^{11}). And, when he had largely succeeded in exorcizing the legal spirit from the Church, he was obliged, in his old age, to sharpen his weapons once more, and begin an entirely new battle with an incipient Gnosticism (see COLOSSIANS).

3. Whilst St. Paul was a keen controversialist, he never wrote a letter that did not contain the word 'peace.' He pleaded with his fellow-workers (*e.g.* Euodia and Syntyche, Ph 4^2; cf. Ro 12^{16} 15^5, 2 Co 13^{11}) to be of one mind; and he urged the Christians of Rome to be at peace, if possible, with all men (Ro 12^{18}). His dispute with Barnabas is described as a *παροξυσμός*, a sharp contention

(Ac 15^{39}). Human frailty mingled in both these apostles with what was very noble and honourable. Their quarrel was one of which only good men were capable. It was essentially a conflict of ideals, a strife between justice on the one hand and generosity on the other. ὁ Παῦλος ἐξήτει τὸ δίκαιον, ὁ Βαρνάβας τὸ φιλάνθρωπον (Chrysostom, *Hom. in Acta Apost.* xxxiv.).

4. The infection of the sub-Apostolic Church by the subtleties of the full-blown Gnostic system led to a widespread, barren warfare of words (λογομαχία, 1 Ti 6^{4}), far removed from the realities of the Christian conflict with sin. This condition of things is reflected in the Pastoral Letters, which charge all believers 'that they strive not about words, to no profit' (2 Ti 2^{14}). Empty discussions merely engendered strifes (μάχας, v.^{23}), and the bond-servant of Christ must not strive (οὐ δεῖ μάχεσθαι, v.^{24}).

5. There is, however, an altogether different kind of strife, which at once commends itself to the Christian heart and conscience. St. Paul indicates its nature by two words of the arena—ἀγωνίζομαι and ἀθλέω, with their compounds. To strive for the incorruptible crown (1 Co 9^{25}); to labour and strive as a servant of God, cheered by a sense of His own mighty working in us (Col 1^{29}); to invite others to strive with us in their prayers (Ro 15^{30}); and, again, to strive for Christ's sake in the spirit of a soldier or an athlete, and to do it lawfully (2 Ti 2^{5}); to strive, in spiritual fellowship with others, for the faith of the gospel (Ph 1^{27})—all this seems to the Apostle to be of the very essence of the Christian life. In that life, as the writer to the Hebrews indicates (12^{4}), men may at last have to resist unto blood, striving against (antagonizing) sin.

JAMES STRAHAN.

STRIPES.—See BEATING, SCOURGING.

SUBSTANCE (Gr. ὑπόστασις, Lat. *substantia*).—It is only in the Epistle to the Hebrews that the term 'substance' is used with anything approaching a philosophical connotation. The meaning of the word in this Epistle is of unusual interest owing to the crucial place which it came to occupy in the Trinitarian controversies of later times. The history of its use as a theological term is given by T. B. Strong in *JThSt* iii. [1901–02] 22 ff.

In AV the word 'substance' is used to translate both ὕπαρξις and ὑπόστασις. The former is better rendered 'possession' (RV), as in the passage, 'Ye have in heaven a better possession (ὕπαρξιν) and an abiding' (He 10^{34}; cf. Ac 2^{45}). Interest centres then in the word ὑπόστασις, which occurs only five times in the NT. In two passages it means 'confidence' (2 Co 9^{4} 11^{17}). But in the remaining three, all of which are in Hebrews, a philosophical conception is probably involved. (1) He 3^{14}: 'We are become partakers of Christ, if we hold fast the beginning of our confidence (τῆς ὑποστάσεως) firm unto the end.' Both AV and RV render ὑπόστασις as 'confidence.' Most modern commentators concur in this subjective reference. The Vulgate renders it objectively (*substantiæ ejus*), and many Patristic commentators take this view—*e.g.* it is 'the faith,' τὴν πίστιν (Chrysostom, Theodoret) or *fidem Christi* (Primasius). This rendering is improbable. There is yet a third possible explanation in view of what is said under (2) and (3). If in He 11^{1} ὑπόστασις is 'the giving substance' (RVm) to unseen realities, the beginning of our ὑπόστασις may well be the beginning of that progressive spiritual state of realizing, or 'giving substance to,' in actual Christian experience, those eternal verities which Judaism only dimly adumbrated. As Christ (He 1^{3}) is the χαρακτήρ ('perfect expression') of the Divine ὑπόστασις (or 'essence'), Christians, as 'partakers of Christ,' may in some measure embody (hypostasize, substantiate) the Divine reality eternally existing in Christ. The word of exhortation in this verse is then to 'hold fast the beginning' of that process of actualizing in Christian experience eternal spiritual realities. That such experience should lead to 'confidence' is inevitable. (2) In He 11^{1} faith is described as 'the substance (ὑπόστασις) of things hoped for.' In RV ὑπόστασις is rendered 'assurance' or 'confidence' (as in 2 Co 9^{4} 11^{17}, He 3^{14}). But in the margin RV suggests 'the giving substance to' (favoured by Westcott, Davidson, Peake, Wickham). Both meanings may well have been in the mind of the writer; for, if faith enables the believer to 'give substance' to spiritual experience and embody the objective realities of his religious hopes, it naturally affords him a ground of assured confidence in them. The use of the antithesis 'substance' and 'shadow' (see art. SHADOW) found in this Epistle (8^{5} 10^{1}) shows that the writer is familiar with the Platonic and Philonic conception that the things seen are but shadows cast in time and space by eternal archetypal realities. The latter are the truly 'substantial,' and he asserts that faith is that state of mind, or experience, which actualizes the things as yet unseen and which proves that they alone have 'substance' or reality. (3) In He 1^{3} there is contained the metaphysical embryo of later theological speculation. Christ is spoken of in relation to God as the 'very image of his substance' (χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως). In AV ὑπόστασις is translated 'person,' but the rendering is inappropriate and misleading. The philosophical conception of personality did not emerge until long after the Apostolic Age, and then largely through the contentions of the Greek and Latin Fathers over the question as to whether there was one *hypostasis* in the Godhead or whether there were three *hypostaseis* (or 'persons'). The writer of Hebrews does not say that Christ is the express image of the Person of God. The substance (ὑπόστασις) of the Godhead, of which Christ is the 'express image' (χαρακτήρ), is the Divine 'essence' or 'nature.' 'Substance' (Lat. *substantia*) etymologically is 'that which stands under' (as a foundation or pedestal). Then it came to mean that in a thing which makes it what it is (its 'essence'), the substratum beneath all its qualities. In its more modern philosophical meaning 'substance' is the reality which exists behind all phenomena. The theological and metaphysical associations of the word, as a technical term, cause most recent commentators to prefer the translation 'essence' or 'nature' in this passage as best interpreting the view of the writer as to Christ and His relation to the Godhead. He is the perfect expression in human life and history of the essential nature of God. In harmony with the teaching of the Fourth Gospel Christ is the Divine Logos, and He alone can assert, 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father' (Jn 14^{9}).

M. SCOTT FLETCHER.

SUFFERING.—'Suffering' is the usual translation of πάθημα (found in sing. only in He 2^{9}) in AV and RV. In AV the Gr. word is also tr. 'afflictions' (3 times; RV 'sufferings'), 'affections' (Gal 5^{24}; RV 'passions'), and 'emotions' (Ro 7^{5}; RV 'passions'). The cognate verb πάσχω is always tr. 'suffer' in AV and RV, with two exceptions (Ac 1^{3}, 'passion,' AV and RV; 28^{5}, AV 'feel,' RV 'took'). The same verb appears in compound forms in 'suffer before' (1 Th 2^{2}, AV and RV) and 'suffer with' (Ro 8^{17}, 1 Co 12^{26}, AV and RV). In RV κακοπάθεια is rendered 'suffering' (Ja 5^{10}; AV 'suffering affliction'); κακοπαθέω, 'suffer hardship' (2 Ti 4^{5}, AV 'endure afflictions'; 2 Ti 2^{9}, AV 'suffer trouble'), 'be suffering'

(Ja 5^{13}; AV 'be afflicted'); *συγκακοπαθέω*, 'suffer hardship with' (2 Ti 1^{8}, AV 'be partaker of the afflictions of'; and 2 Ti 2^{3}, AV 'endure hardness'). In AV *παθητός* is rendered 'should suffer,' in RV 'must suffer,' in RVm 'subject to suffering' (Ac 26^{23}).

Other words rendered by 'suffer' are *ἀτιμάζω* (Ac 5^{41}; AV 'suffer shame,' RV 'suffer dishonour'); *ζημιόω* (pass.), 'suffer loss' (1 Co 3^{15}, Ph 3^{8} AV and RV; 2 Co 7^{9} RV; AV 'receive damage'); *κακουχέομαι* (He 13^{3}; AV 'suffer adversity,' RV 'be evil entreated'); *μακροθυμέω* (1 Co 13^{4}, AV and RV, 'suffer long'; 2 P 3^{9}, AV and RV, 1 Th 5^{14} RV, 'be longsuffering,' elsewhere 'be patient,' 1 Th 5^{14} AV, Ja 5$^{7f.}$ AV, Ja 5$^{7f.}$ RV, or 'patiently endure,' He 6^{15}, AV and RV); *ναυαγέω*, 'suffer shipwreck' (2 Co 11^{25}, AV and RV); *ὀνειδίζω* (pass.), 'suffer reproach' (1 Ti 4^{10} AV; RV 'strive'); *στέγω* (1 Co 9^{12}; AV 'suffer,' RV 'bear'; also tr. 'bear' 1 Co 13^{7}, AV and RV, and 'forbear,' 1 Th 3$^{1.5}$, AV and RV); *συγκακουχέομαι* (He 11^{25}; AV 'suffer affliction with,' RV 'be evil entreated with'); *ὑπέχω* (Jude ^{7}, 'suffer,' AV and RV); *ὑπομένω* (2 Ti 2^{12}; AV 'suffer,' RV 'endure'; usually rendered 'endure' in AV and RV, but also 'be patient,' Ro 12^{12}, AV and RV, 'take patiently,' 1 P 2$^{20\text{bis}}$, AV and RV).

1. The sufferings of Christ.—The sufferings of Christ were foretold (Ac 3^{18} 26$^{22f.}$, 1 P 1^{11}). 'It behoved the Christ to suffer' (Ac 17^{3}; cf. He 9^{26}). Moses and the prophets showed how that must be (Ac 26^{23}; cf. 17^{3}). He suffered throughout His earthly life, 'in the flesh' (1 P 4^{1}). He suffered, being tempted (He 2^{18}). On the Cross His sufferings culminated. He suffered for sins once (1 P 3^{18}), suffered without the gate (He 13^{12}; cf. Ac 1^{3}). His sufferings revealed His character, and had a reflex influence on His own nature. 'When he suffered, he threatened not' (1 P 2^{23}). 'He learned obedience by the things which he suffered' (He 5^{8}). Of these sufferings St. Peter was one of the chief witnesses (1 P 5^{1}), and he points out Christ as the great example (2^{21}). It was for His followers that He suffered (*ib.*).

2. The sufferings of Christ shared by Christians.—Though Christ suffered, His disciples are not saved from suffering. Rather does their relationship to Him cause them to suffer also. If they are faithful to Him, the enmity and opposition He met with will also to some extent fall to their lot. Hence St. Paul, who endured so much on behalf of the gospel, could with reason speak of sharing the sufferings of Christ. 'The sufferings of Christ abound unto us,' he says (2 Co 1^{5}). He longs to know 'the fellowship of his sufferings' (Ph 3^{10}). Others who belong to Christ also suffer with Him; and those who thus suffer will share His glory (Ro 8^{17}). 'Insomuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings, rejoice' (1 P 4^{13}). 'If we endure, we shall also reign with him' (2 Ti 2^{12}).

3. Suffering on behalf of the faith.—The suffering of the NT is almost entirely suffering in the cause of Christ. St. Paul is told that he is to suffer for the Lord's name's sake (Ac 9^{16}). He tells Timothy that he suffers because he is an apostle and a teacher (2 Ti 1^{12}), suffers hardship even unto bonds (2^{9}). He speaks of his sufferings in such a way as to show that they were chiefly persecutions (3^{11}). Accordingly, Timothy is exhorted to suffer hardship with him (2 Ti 2^{3}). 'Be not ashamed of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me his prisoner; but suffer hardship with the gospel' (1^{8}). 'Suffer hardship, do the work of an evangelist' (4^{5}). St. Paul suffered, and was shamefully entreated at Philippi (1 Th 2^{2}). There he endured stripes and imprisonment (Ac 16$^{19ff.}$, esp. v.^{23}). He also suffered because of the perverse ideas of his converts (1 Co 9^{12}, 2 Co 1^{6}). His converts, too, frequently suffered on account of the faith. The Galatians suffered many things (cf. Ac 14$^{2\text{-}5.\,19\text{-}22}$). The Philippians suffered on behalf of Christ (1^{29}). The Thessalonians suffered for the Kingdom of God (2 Th 1^{5}) at the hands of their fellow-countrymen, as the churches of Judæa did at the hands of the Jews (1 Th 2^{14}). The readers of 1 Pet. were also subjected to suffering. They suffered wrongfully when well-doing (2$^{19.\,20}$), for righteousness' sake (3^{14}; cf. v.^{17}), as Christians (4^{16}). St. Peter told them that those who are called to God's eternal Kingdom in Christ may nevertheless suffer (5^{10}), just as St. Paul had told Timothy that 'all that would live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution' (2 Ti 3^{12}). Among the things which the Christians of Smyrna have to suffer is imprisonment (Rev 2^{10}; cf. He 13^{3}). The Hebrews are reminded that after they were enlightened they 'endured a great conflict of sufferings; partly, being made a gazingstock both by reproaches and by afflictions; and partly, becoming partakers with them that were so used' (He 10^{32}). The heroes also suffered for their faithfulness. Moses preferred to suffer affliction with the people of God (He 11^{25}). The prophets gave an example of suffering (Ja 5^{10}). The early Christians seem to have concerned themselves little about what we call the problem of suffering, except perhaps in so far as their sufferings were ascribed to the activity of the devil (1 P 5^{9}). Their chief anxiety seems to have been that they should suffer according to the will of God (4^{19}), *i.e.* for well-doing (3^{17} 4^{19}).

4. The fruits of suffering.—Jesus because of the suffering of death was crowned with glory and honour (He 2^{9}). Glories followed His sufferings (1 P 1^{11}). Through them He was made perfect (He 2^{10}; cf. 5^{8}). In the case of His followers suffering has a similar result. Those who suffer for righteousness' sake are blessed (1 P 3^{14}). Those who are called to God's eternal glory in Christ and suffer a little while shall be perfected, established, and strengthened by God (5^{10}). One who suffers as a Christian has reason to glorify God (4^{16}). To do well and to suffer for it is acceptable with Him (2^{20}). 'Wherefore let them also that suffer according to the will of God commit their souls in well-doing unto a faithful Creator' (4^{19}).

There is a great mass of modern literature on the problem of pain or suffering, but how little of it is concerned with sorrow at the slow progress of righteousness or of the Kingdom of God! It was otherwise in the Apostolic Age. There is very little in the NT about purely personal suffering (Ac 28^{5}, 1 Co 12^{26}). In one case at least suffering is distinguished from sickness (Ja 5$^{13f.}$).

LITERATURE.—R. Winterbotham, *The Kingdom of Heaven Here and Hereafter*, London, 1898, pp. 234–240; J. Weiss, *Die Schriften des NT*, Göttingen, 1907, *s.v.* 'Leiden' in index; *Handkommentar zum NT*, Freiburg, 1892, *s.v.* 'Leiden' in indexes; Grimm-Thayer, *s.vv.*; *DCG*, *s.v.*; H. W. Beecher, *Sermons*, 2nd ser., London, 1870, pp. 271–297; A. B. Bruce, *The Providential Order of the World*, do., 1897, pp. 125 ff., 259 ff.; F. W. Robertson, *Expository Lectures on the Corinthians*, do., 1859, pp. 317 ff., 446 ff., *Sermons*, 5th ser., do., 1904, serms. i. and ii.

WILLIAM WATSON.

SUN.—Mention of the sun in the Apostolic Age is almost entirely confined to the book of Revelation. In the Heavenly Jerusalem the sun shall not light upon the blessed nor any heat (Rev 7^{16}). There will no longer be any need of the sun (21^{23}). Dread judgments are symbolized by the obscuring of the sun, *e.g.* 'The sun became black as sackcloth' (6^{12}); see also Rev 8^{12} 9^{2} 16^{8} and Ac 2^{20}, Joel's prophecy quoted by St. Peter. It is twice used in similes, *i.e.* in the description of the Vision of the Christ, 'His countenance was as the sun shineth in his strength' (1^{16}), and in the description of an angel, 'His face was as the sun' (10^{1}).

In Rev 12^{1} the woman in the vision is 'arrayed with the sun.' The idea may be taken from Ps 104^{2}, 'Who coverest thyself with light as with a garment.' The author may also have had in mind the description of the Bride in Ca 6^{10}, 'clear as the sun.' If, as some think, the woman represents the Jewish Church, then she appears in all the glory of the patriarchs (see Ro 9^{5}). But Semitic writers were apt to decorate representative persons with the heavenly bodies.

Lastly, in Rev 19^{17} the angel who is entrusted with the overthrow of the Beast and the false prophet is represented as 'standing in the sun'—probably that he may be able from his position in mid-heaven to summon the great birds of prey to feed on the flesh of the king's enemies lying on the battle-field. MORLEY STEVENSON.

SUPERSTITIOUS (Ac 17^{22}, *δεισιδαιμονεστέρους*, RV 'somewhat superstitious,' marg. 'somewhat religious').—The Greek word, derived from *δείδειν*, 'to fear' and *δαίμων*, 'demon,' was originally used in a good sense (Xenophon, *Cyrop*. III. iii. 58; Aristotle, *Pol*. V. xi. 25; Polybius, VI. lvi. 7) but underwent a change of meaning. It is used in a bad sense, for instance, by later writers, as Josephus (*Ant*. XV. viii. 2; Plutarch, *de Superstit*. 10). The authorities are divided as to the sense in which St. Paul used it, the majority at the present day being in favour of the rendering 'religious'; so Knowling, Ramsay, Verrall, Farrar, T. K. Abbott, Page, Rackham, Trench, Blass, Renan, Weiss, Holtzmann, Weizsäcker, and many others.

In favour of this view it is stated that St. Paul was hardly likely to have offended the audience at the opening of his apology. The prevailing practice of commencing a speech in an ingratiating tone is followed by him at Cæsarea. 'It was not St. Paul's habit to affront and by affronting to alienate his hearers, least of all at the outset of a discourse intended to win them to the truth' (R. C. Trench, *Synonyms of the NT*^{8}, London, 1876, p. 172). Further, the usual Greek word for 'piety' was *εὐσεβεία*, and he uses the cognate verb *εὐσεβεῖτε* in the next verse. Once more, *δεισιδαιμονία* is used of the Jewish religion in Ac 25^{19}, and must there have been intended in a good sense.

On the other hand, the philosophers, to whom St. Paul was addressing himself, at least in part, must have understood the word as meaning 'superstitious,' and they would have heartily concurred in such an epithet. A doubtful passage in the *Characters* of Theophrastus (xvi.) gives a picture of the *δεισιδαίμων* as one who had frequent recourse to soothsayers and was a strong believer in omens; while the Stoic emperor Marcus Aurelius (*Meditat*. i. 3) expresses his thankfulness that he takes after his mother in the matter of devotion (*θεοσεβής*), and that his father escaped the fate of a *δεισιδαίμων* (*ib*. i. 16). Nestle has pointed out (*ExpT* xi. [1899–1900] 378) that the ominous word 'demon' could never have conveyed anything but a bad sense to a Jew, which is borne out by Josephus' use of the word. The force of the comparative may be 'too,' 'very,' 'rather,' or 'somewhat.' We can certainly agree that St. Paul would never have commenced a speech with a studied insult, but he was a man who said what he thought, and the word was most applicable to the popular religion of the day. It is unlikely that he meant to convey the idea of reproof, but he certainly meant 'superstitious.' The philosophers would understand as much and would agree with him, while the populace would be merely interested and wait for an explanation, since for them the word did not contain the note of contempt that it held for the philosophers. Here are some of the renderings: Ramsay, 'more than others respectful of what is divine'; Renan, 'le plus religieux'; Holtzmann, 'Gottesfürchtige'; Zöckler and Weiss agree with the latter; Nestle and Moffatt, 'rather superstitious'; Chase, 'very superstitious.'

LITERATURE.—Besides the commentaries of those mentioned, see F. Field, *Notes on the Translation of the NT*, Cambridge, 1899; T. K. Abbott, in *CQR* xxix. [1890] 284; F. H. Chase, *Credibility of the Book of the Acts of the Apostles*, London, 1902; *ExpT* xviii. [1906–07] 485 f. F. W. WORSLEY.

SUPPER (*δεῖπνον*, 1 Co 11$^{20.21}$, Rev 19$^{9.17}$; cf. Mk 6^{21}, Lk 14$^{12.16.17.24}$, Jn 12^{2} 13$^{2.4}$ 21^{20}).—Of the two principal daily meals common to the Jews in NT times, 'supper' was the more important. It was usually taken about sunset or shortly after (Lk 14^{12} 17$^{7.8}$). 'Dinner' (*ἄριστον*) was a lighter meal, being taken about noon or a little before. Prayer was offered before eating (Ac 27^{35}, Mt 14^{19} 15^{36}, Lk 9^{16} 22^{17}, Jn 6^{11}), and the hands were scrupulously washed (Mt 15^{2}), sometimes also the feet (Lk 7^{44}).

There are really only two passages in apostolic history which fall within the scope of this article.

(1) 1 Co 11$^{20.21}$, 'When therefore ye assemble yourselves together, it is not possible to eat the Lord's supper (*κυριακὸν δεῖπνον*): for in your eating each one taketh before other his own supper; and one is hungry, and another is drunken.' This is the only passage in the entire NT which gives us the name 'Lord's supper,' and even here the name is not to be restricted to the Eucharist (*q.v.*) alone, for at this time it was not dissociated from the love-feasts (*q.v.*) or Agapæ (*ἀγάπαι*, Jude ^{12}; cf. 2 P 2^{13} RV) which preceded the ordinary evening services of the Church. Other passages of course refer to it, but not by name (cf. 1 Co 10$^{16.21}$). The emphasis of the passage is on 'Lord's.' St. Paul is here rebuking the Corinthians concerning their manners and worship. In the first instance he reminds them of the unbecoming boldness of their women, who, taking advantage of the freedom allowed by the gospel, appear in public unveiled. Only harlots were accustomed to do so in Corinth; therefore let women take heed not to abuse their liberty in Christ. He next addresses himself to their selfish, greedy, haphazard, disgraceful, even scandalous conduct in eating their supper in the sanctuary. Originally it seems to have been their custom to come together on the first day of the week to break bread together (Ac 20^{7}). The meal was what might be appropriately called a club or church supper, after which the religious service of worship took place. It was a kind of enlarged family meal (cf. 2^{46}), the object of which was primarily social. In keeping with Greek custom among certain gilds, each one brought with him his basket of provisions, and these were spread indiscriminately before, and partaken of by, the company present as a corporate body. But there had developed factions in the church at Corinth. A selfish spirit was manifesting itself. Instead of coming together as brethren in Christ, the worshippers came and hastily devoured that which they had brought themselves, not waiting to share it with the poor or others who had failed to supply themselves. The consequence was that social differences were accentuated, and the prayer of consecration was omitted. But, more shameful even than this, the indigent who had brought nothing had nothing wherewith to satisfy their hunger, while the rich ate and drank to satiety, becoming actually drunken. Such conduct was unbecoming in the Lord's house and unfitted the worshippers to celebrate in any sense worthily the 'Lord's Supper.' Against this manner of worship the Apostle vehemently protests. It was unbecoming for the followers of Christ; there was a want of love in the exercise; the corporate spirit was absent; the unity of the brother-

hood was destroyed; and, consequently, the Corinthian Christians were rapidly becoming 'weak and sickly' in a spiritual sense (1 Co 11^{30}). Not many years subsequently to this the Eucharist and the Agape were celebrated separately for the sake of greater decorum, until, finally, the latter so degenerated that it became extinct.

(2) The second passage contains a double picture: (*a*) Rev 19^{9}, 'And he saith unto me, Write, Blessed are they which are bidden to the marriage supper of the Lamb.' Here the bliss of the next world is depicted under the figure of a banquet. The Rabbis were accustomed to interpret Ex 24^{11} to mean that the sight of God was like meat and drink to the beholders. Here it is the picture of a marriage-feast. The Lamb has come to claim His bride, who has long been betrothed and waiting for the bridegroom. It is a vision of the final consummation of the Kingdom, including the overthrow of the kings of the earth, the binding and loosing again of Satan, and general judgment. With this picture the climax is reached in the imagery of the book. But out of it grows another picture of very different hue: (*b*) Rev $19^{17.\,18}$, 'And I saw an angel standing in the sun; and he cried with a loud voice, saying to all the birds that fly in mid heaven, Come and be gathered together unto *the great supper of God*; that ye may eat the flesh of kings, and the flesh of captains, and the flesh of mighty men, and the flesh of horses and of them that sit thereon, and the flesh of all men, both free and bond, and small and great.' This, then, is 'the great supper of God,' and the invitation is to the birds of prey. Most vividly the Apostle here sets forth the tragic contrast between the 'marriage supper' of the Lamb (v.^{9}) and the destruction of the slain, on whose carcasses the birds shall feed. To be left unburied and devoured by birds of prey the Orientals considered the worst misfortune possible for the dead. For example, the most awful penalty that could possibly be inflicted on the opponents of Zoroastrianism is that their corpses should be given over to the ravens. The symbolism here, which seems to us crude and ghastly, is based on Ezk $39^{17.\,18}$, 'Speak unto the birds of every sort, and to every beast of the field, Assemble yourselves, and come; gather yourselves on every side to my sacrifice . . . upon the mountains of Israel, that ye may eat flesh and drink blood,' etc. But, in this vision of the Messiah's final victory over His foes, it must be remembered that, though He is pictured as a silent and implacable conqueror, who has vanquished all His foes and disposed of them in huge masses, leaving them to their inexorable doom, yet He is not described as a merely human, vindictive conqueror. His garments are indeed sprinkled with blood, but it is His own blood, not that of others (v.^{13}); He smites the nations with a sword, but it is the sword of His Word which proceedeth out of His mouth; He has trodden the winepress of God's wrath, but He has trodden it alone (v.^{15}; cf. Is 63^{3}); and He is not pictured as gloating over the torments of His enemies (cf. Is 66^{24}).

LITERATURE.—Percy Gardner, *The Origin of the Lord's Supper*, 1893; F. Schultzen, *Das Abendmahl im NT*, 1895; J. C. Lambert, *The Sacraments in the NT*, 1903; R. M. Adamson, *The Christian Doctrine of the Lord's Supper*, 1905. Cf. the articles 'Supper,' 'Eucharist,' 'Lord's Supper,' 'Meals' in the various Bible Dictionaries and Religious Encyclopædias, notably Hastings', Piercy's, Cheyne-Black's, Herzog's, the Standard, and the Temple. See, further, Literature under art. EUCHARIST.

GEORGE L. ROBINSON.

SURNAME.—It seems probable, as indicated in the art. NAME, that originally a name was the designation of a stock or tribe—like the Grants or Howards—applied by outsiders to a group and subsequently adopted by it. When the stock increased, personal names seem to have been introduced to distinguish the different members. When the number of persons still further increased and intercourse became easier and more common, certain designations derived from some peculiarity were used to distinguish or designate different individuals. All varieties of these may be classed under the general designation 'surnames.'

An indication of something similar to this in the naming of deities is to be found in the Roman religion.[1] Royal personages use only their baptismal name, or the first of these when there are more than one. In Europe surnames became common in the Middle Ages, first of all among the land-owning nobles.[2] Surnames are of rare occurrence in the OT. In the NT when a person is referred to by only one name, especially if that be a common one, identification is difficult if not impossible. Thus of John mentioned in Ac 4^{6} we know nothing. At least five persons are called Alexander; and of these the Alexanders referred to in Ac 4^{6} 19^{33}, 1 Ti 1^{20} are names and nothing more.

1. Surnames are to be distinguished from—

(*a*) *New names*.—Apion, an Egyptian of the 2nd cent. A.D., on entering the Egyptian army, changed his name to Antonis Maximus.[3] Similar changes are recorded of Abram, Joseph, Jacob, Solomon, Daniel, Pashhur, Tophet, and even of Jahweh Himself.[4]

(*b*) *Explanatory descriptions to designate anyone more clearly*, derived from

(1) *Trade*.—In Nazareth Joseph was known as ὁ τέκτων,[5] and Jesus by the same appellation.[6] Alexander, as ὁ χαλκεύς,[7] occupied a similar position in the town in which he lived, while Simon's designation, βυρσεύς,[8] indicates that he was one of many who followed the occupation of a tanner.

(2) *Business*.—Manaen is designated as Ἡρώδου σύντροφος,[9] Matthew as ὁ τελώνης,[10] Chuza as ἐπίτροπος Ἡρώδου.[11]

(3) *A physical peculiarity*.—A certain Simon is differentiated as ὁ λεπρός,[12] another as ὁ καλούμενος Νίγερ,[13] while a third the Church has named ὁ μάγος,[14] though that surname is not given him either in the Acts or in Justin Martyr.

(4) *Some outstanding feature in a man's life*, as John ὁ βαπτιστής,[15] Thomas ὁ λεγόμενος Δίδυμος,[16] Simon who was, but is not surnamed, Φαρισαῖος.[17]

(5) *Names of places*.—Cases in which there is annexed to the name a phrase, compounded of ἀπό with the name of a place, forming a designation given to a person from another town or district to distinguish him from those of the same name in the town, much as we speak of 'Robertson of Brighton.' Examples of this are: Jesus ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ,[18] Joseph ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας,[19] Philip ἀπὸ Βηθσαϊδά,[20] Lazarus ἀπὸ Βηθανίας,[21] Nathanael ἀπὸ Κανὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας.[22]

(6) *Names of relatives*.—Cases in which one with a common name has annexed the name of another person with whom he is closely connected, as Ἰάκω-

---

[1] *ERE* vii. 413.

[2] H. Hallam, *View of the State of Europe during the Middle Ages*^{8}, London, 1841, pp. 112, 138; Thomas Carlyle, *Frederick the Great*, 10 vols., do., 1872–73, i. 67.

[3] G. A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, Eng. tr., London, 1911, pp. 169, 170.

[4] Gn $17^{5.\,15}$ 41^{45} 32^{28}, 2 S 12^{25}, Dn 1^{7}, Jer 7^{32} 20^{3}, Hos 2^{16}.

[5] Mt 13^{55}.

[6] Mk 6^{3}.

[7] 2 Ti 4^{14}.

[8] Ac 9^{43} $10^{6.\,32}$.

[9] Ac 13^{1}; for meaning see G. A. Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, Eng. tr., Edinburgh, 1901, p. 310, and Ramsay's criticism in *Exp*, 7th ser., vii. [1909] 364.

[10] Mt 10^{3}.

[11] Lk 8^{3}; *Exp*, 5th ser., ix. [1899] 118.

[12] Mt 26^{6}, Mk 14^{3}.

[13] Ac 13^{1}.

[14] Ac 8^{9}; Justin, *Apol.* i. 26, 56, ii. 15, *Dial.* 120.

[15] Mt 3^{1}.

[16] Jn 11^{16} 20^{24} 21^{2}.

[17] Lk $7^{40.\,43.\,44}$.

[18] Mt 21^{11}.

[19] Mt 27^{57}, Mk 15^{43}, Lk 23^{51}, Jn 19^{38}. May Arimathæa have been the name not of a town but of an estate or even a farm?

[20] Jn 1^{45} 12^{21}.

[21] Jn 11^{1}.

[22] Jn 21^{2}.

βος ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου,[1] Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου,[2] Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου,[3] Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ.[4] This, however, may, in some cases, be a mere explanatory note, more akin to those in which a relationship is actually stated, as James the brother of John,[5] Mark ὁ ἀνεψιὸς Βαρνάβα,[6] Mary the mother of James and Joses,[7] Mary the sister of Lazarus,[8] Mary the mother of Mark,[9] Mary the mother of Jesus.[10]

(*c*) *Names compounded with* בַּר.—Closely akin to the foregoing is a group of names whose first component is the Aramaic word בַּר, meaning 'son.' These are divisible into three classes:

(1) *Those in which only one name is given*, represented by Βαρτίμαιος, that is, 'the son of Timæus'—a word whose meaning and derivation are both uncertain.[11]

(2) *Those in which the name may be a surname.*—If Nathanael, mentioned only in the Fourth Gospel,[12] is the Bartholomew mentioned only by the Synoptists,[13] then Nathanael bore the surname 'son of Talmai.' Matthias the successor of Judas[14] is called by Aphraates חלמי, and in the Syriac translation of the *Church History* of Eusebius this is everywhere substituted for Matthias. Nestle therefore suggested that there were two Bartholomews, one known as Nathanael, and the other as Matthias.[15] But Burkitt[16] holds that the substitution of תולמי for Matthias 'is no mere palaeographical error, but that the Old Syriac Version of the Acts must have had תולמי also. This name occurs as Θολομαῖος in Josephus (*Ant.* XX. i.), and is, of course, the second part of the name Bartholomew. An obscure name חלמי does occur in Judges and Samuel, but תולמי is nothing more than Ptolemy in a Semitic disguise. . . . Why the Old Syriac of Acts should have represented Matthias by this name cannot now be ascertained.' Considerable interest attaches to the name Bar-Jesus, a name variously spelt in the Western texts. In the Peshiṭta there is given as an equivalent ברשומא, Barshuma. This is an old family name in Edessa, but its meaning is quite unknown. The magician is also called Ἐλύμας, 'for so is his name translated.'[17] Elymas may be a Greek form of *alīmā*, an Aramaic word meaning 'strong,' or of *'alim*, an Arabic word meaning 'wise,'[18] but it cannot be a translation of Bar-Jesus. Codex D reads, instead of Elymas, Ἑτοιμᾶς, meaning 'son of the ready,' a reading adopted by Ramsay and Blass. Elymas is somewhat akin to Ἀτόμου, the reading of the Ambrosian MS A in a well known passage of Josephus.[19]

(3) The third class carries us into—

2. Genuine surnames.—Among these are (*a*) *patronymics*, as those in which there is added to the name another name compounded with בַּר. Joseph the Cyprian Levite is ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Βαρνάβας by the apostles, that is, 'son of Nebo.'[20] It has been suggested that this surname was given to distinguish him from Joseph ὁ καλούμενος Βαρσαββᾶς, a name meaning most probably 'Saturday's child.' He had also, according to a common custom, adopted the Roman name of Justus.[1] He may have been a brother of Judas ὁ καλούμενος Βαρσαββᾶς.[2] In this connexion the name Barabbas deserves notice. The Sinaitic (and Palestinian) Syriac version, some good minuscules, and MSS known to Origen read: 'Whom will ye that I release unto you? Jesus Barabbas, or Jesus which is called Christ?'[3]

(*b*) *Additional names.*—From the want of surnames arises the difficulty of identifying different individuals having the same name, as the various Symeons and Simons mentioned in the NT. שִׁמְעוֹן is translated in the LXX[4] and the NT by Συμεών. There was a genuine Greek name closely resembling it, Σίμων, and this was often substituted for Συμεών.[5] It was one of the commonest names among the Jews, twelve being mentioned in the NT. Of these, we know nothing of Symeon of Lk 3^{30}, of Simon the brother of our Lord,[6] or, except one incident, of Symeon of Jerusalem,[7] Simon the Cyrenian,[8] or Simon the Pharisee.[9] We have already noticed Simon the tanner, and Simon Magus, but by far the most outstanding bearer of the name was the Apostle. His father was called Ἰωνᾶς or Ἰωάνης.[10] The former may have been a contraction of the latter, or he may have borne a double name, Ἰωνᾶς-Ἰωάνης. The Apostle himself would seem originally to have borne the common Jewish name as transliterated into Greek Συμεών. This is the reading of Ac 15^{14}; and 2 P 1^{1} opens with the words Συμεὼν Πέτρος, which is the reading of ℵAKLP, Σίμων being found in B^{5}. 'The name of Simon Magus is spelt סימון (*Sīmōn*) in Syriac, as distinguished from Simon Peter and Simon the Tanner, who are given the same name as Simeon (שמעון, *Shim'ōn*) the Patriarch,'[11] but owing to Greek influence there is little doubt that Σίμων would be frequently, if not commonly, used. He seems to have been distinguished from other Simons by the name Σίμων ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωάννου,[12] or, more shortly, Σίμων Ἰωάννου.[13] In Mt 16^{17} he is called Σίμων Βαριωνᾶ. This form may be either a contraction of the former or an instance of a double name, the Apostle's father, in accordance with the custom of the time, having added the Greek name Ἰωνᾶς, as being similar to his own proper name Ἰωάννης.[14] According to the Fourth Gospel, Jesus on His first meeting with Simeon said to him: 'Your name is to be Κηφᾶς,' the Evangelist adding ὃ ἑρμηνεύεται Πέτρος.[15] The Hebrew כֵּף, Chald. כֵּיפָא, is in Greek Πέτρος, but neither of these names is borne by any other person in the NT save the Apostle. The Syriac 'כאפא is not a transliteration at all, but the Syriac for "stone": the translator, or possibly Syriac Church custom, recognized that S. Peter's name was *Simon Stone*, and they called him, where necessary, by this appellative.'[16] The name Κηφᾶς is not used in the Gospels or the Acts. It is used alone by St. Paul in his First Epistle to the Corinthians,[1] and in Galatians.[2] Hort was of opinion that Κηφᾶs was a form of Καϊάφας, but that is not the case.[3] In the list of the Twelve the Apostle is called *Σίμων ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος*,[4] *ἐπέθηκεν ὄνομα τῷ Σίμωνι Πέτρον*,[5] *Σίμωνα ὃν καὶ ὠνόμασεν Πέτρον*.[6] We find, then, six distinct appellations—Simon,[7] Simeon,[8] Simon Barjona,[9] Peter,[10] Simon called Peter,[11] Simon Peter.[12]

---

[1] Mt 10^{3}.
[2] Mt 10^{2}.
[3] Lk 6^{16}, Ac 1^{3} (Jn 14^{22}, Jude ^{1}).
[4] Jn 19^{25}.
[5] Ac 12^{2}.
[6] Col 4^{10}.
[7] Mt 27^{56}, Mk $15^{40.\,47}$ 16^{1}.
[8] Jn 11^{1}.
[9] Ac 12^{12}.
[10] Ac 1^{14}. It is noticeable that neither as a title nor as a surname is the word παρθένος ever applied to her. Another Mary is mentioned in Ro 16^{6}.
[11] Mk 10^{46}; *HDB* i. 248.
[12] Jn 1^{45} 21^{2}.
[13] Mt 10^{3}, Mk 3^{18}, Lk 6^{14}, Ac 1^{13}.
[14] Ac $1^{23.\,26}$.
[15] *ExpT* ix. [1897–98] 566; see also Ramsay, *Exp*, 6th ser., vi. [1902] 291.
[16] F. C. Burkitt, *The Syriac Forms of NT Proper Names*, London, 1912, p. 23.
[17] Ac $13^{6.\,8}$.
[18] See E. Renan, *Saint Paul*, Eng. tr., New York, 1869, p. 54.
[19] Burkitt, p. 22; *HDB* i. 247^{a}; W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, London, 1895, p. 73; J. Rendel Harris, *Exp*, 6th ser., v. [1902] 192; Jos. *Ant.* xx. vii. 2.
[20] Ac 4^{36}; Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, pp. 187 ff., 307 ff.; *ExpT* x. [1898–99] 233.

[1] Ac 1^{23}; *HDB* i. 247; *Exp*, 6th ser., v. 414, n. 3; Burkitt, p. 6.
[2] Ac 15^{22-33}; ℵABCDEL read καλούμενον, but HP ἐπικαλούμενον.
[3] Mt 27^{16-17}; *HDB* i. 245. This reading, which is supported by v.^{22}, is adopted by R. C. Trench, *Studies in the Gospels*^{4}, London, 1878, p. 306; E. Renan, *Life of Jesus*, Eng. tr., do., 1873, p. 279 (who thinks that the correct reading is Bar-Abba, or Bar-Rabban); and J. Moffatt, *The NT: A New Translation*^{3}, do., 1914. Note the use made of this by J. M. Robertson, *Christianity and Mythology*^{2}, do., 1910, p. 367, and the reply of C. Clemen, *Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources*, Edinburgh, 1912, p. 185, and J. G. Frazer, *GB*^{3}, pt. vi., *The Scapegoat*, London, 1913, p. 419.
[4] Gn 29^{35}.
[5] Sir 50^{1}.
[6] Mt 13^{55}, Mk 6^{3}.
[7] Lk 2^{25}.
[8] Mt 27^{32}, Mk 15^{21}, Lk 23^{26}.
[9] Lk $7^{36.\,40}$.
[10] Mt 16^{17}, Jn 1^{42} 21^{15-17}.
[11] Burkitt, p. 6.
[12] Jn 1^{43}.
[13] Jn 21^{15-17}.
[14] *HDB* ii. 676.
[15] Jn $1^{43(42)}$.
[16] Burkitt, p. 5.

(*c*) *Adjectival names.*—These may be still further divided into—

(1) *Those derived from the name of a place.*—In the NT seven persons bear the name of Ἰούδας, the Greek equivalent of יְהוּדָה. Among these are an ancestor of Jesus,[13] Judas of Damascus,[14] Judas or Jude, a brother of Jesus,[15] Judas distinguished as 'not Iscariot,'[16] probably the same as Judas Ἰακώβου,[17] and Judas Barsabbas, who has already been noticed. But of the seven the most notable is Judas the traitor. In regard to his surname, scholars are now practically agreed that the term translated 'Iscariot' is the Greek for אִישׁקְרִיּוֹת.[18] The reading *ἀπὸ Καρυώτου*[19] clearly indicates a place. If a place be meant, what is its correct designation? The MSS oscillate between *Σκαρυώθ*,[20] *Ἰσκαριώθ*,[21] *Σκαριώτης*,[22] and *Ἰσκαριώτης*,[23] but the reading *Ἰσκαριώτης* seems clearly preferable.[24] Kerioth can scarcely be קְרִיּוֹת of Moab,[25] and is much more likely to be קְחֶצְרוֹן of Judah,[26] meaning the twin cities or twin fortresses. It is identified with a place variously spelt Kuryetein,[27] Kuryezein,[28] and Karjetein,[29] 4½ miles to the N.W. of Arad. Conder, indeed, founding upon the reading in D of Jn 12^{4}, etc., *ἀπὸ Καρυώτου*, thinks that the place indicated is Ischar, which (according to the *Samaritan Chronicle*) was the old name of the present Askar, near Jacob's well, the Sychar of Jn 4^{5}. In that case Judas most probably was a Samaritan.[30] The reference to the Traitor in the Fourth Gospel[31] would indicate that his father bore the surname *Ἰσκαριώτης*, which he transmitted to his son.

Another of the disciples of Jesus is designated *Σίμων ὁ Καναναῖος*,[32] or *Κανανίτην*,[33] and the same person is designated by Luke[34] *Σίμωνα τὸν καλούμενον Ζηλωτήν* and *Σίμων ὁ ζηλωτής*. *Καναναῖος* is the transliteration of the Hebrew קַנְאָנָא, 'the Cananæan,' and is to be distinguished from, though it may be connected with, the geographical term 'Canaanite.' In Syriac this surname 'is rendered קנניא, and so is properly distinguished from the Canaanite woman (*Χαναναία*), who is כנעניתא.'[1] The Cananæans or Zealots were a well-known Jewish sect.[2]

The name Mary, in Hebrew מִרְיָם, in Greek *Μαρία* or *Μαρίαμ*, seems to be used in the NT of eight persons.[3] Of these Mary the mother of James, Mary of Clopas, 'the other Mary,' are generally admitted to be the same person indicated by different designations. Mary the sister of Lazarus, Mary the mother of Mark, Mary saluted by St. Paul, Mary the mother of Jesus, have been already referred to. There remains the eighth, Mary of Magdala, *Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή*. This is the form found in Mt.,[4] Mk.,[5] and Jn.,[6] while Lk. uses the form *Μαρία ἡ καλουμένη Μαγδαληνή*,[7] and *ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ Μαρία*.[8] Most probably she got this surname from being a native or resident in Magdala, or Magadan, now Mejdel, a short distance from Tiberias.[9]

Mention is made in Ac 5^{37} of *Ἰούδας ὁ Γαλιλαῖος*, Judas the Galilæan, a surname derived from the fact that he was a native of that province,[10] though Josephus in one passage rather indicates that he came from Gamala, which lies east of Galilee.[11]

In Ac 13^{1} among the teachers and prophets of Antioch mention is made of *Λούκιος ὁ Κυρναῖος*. He may or may not have been the same person as is mentioned in Ro 16^{21}, but at any rate he was a fellow-countryman of *Σίμων Κυρηναῖος*.[12]

The purple-seller whom St. Paul met at Philippi was named *Λυδία*.[13] That may have been the woman's proper name, but was most probably, as Ramsay hints, a designation from the district of Lydia, of which Thyatira was an important town. If this be so, it accounts for the fact that in his Epistle to the Philippians St. Paul does not mention her, though it is possible that she was Euodia or Syntyche.[14]

(2) *Those derived from other sources.*—Various explanations have been given of a surname Boanerges given by our Lord to James and John, and applied to them but once.[15] None of these is very satisfactory, but by far the most likely is that the two were not merely brothers but twins, and that, since the superstitions attached to twins and the worship of the Dioscuri were well known, something in character, conduct, or appearance caused Jesus to give them the surname 'Sons of the Sky.'[16] The strange ideas associated with twins remind us of another disciple whose name we do not know, though we know his surname. In three passages in the Fourth Gospel[17] reference is made to an apostle *Θωμᾶς ὁ λεγόμενος Δίδυμος*. Thomas is not, as it has become, a personal name; it is simply the Aramaic word for twin. תְּאוֹם is transliterated into Greek as *Θωμᾶς*, and *Δίδυμος* is a Greek translation of the word. In the *Acta Thomæ* he is called Judas Thomas, and very early[18] a legend arose that he was the twin brother of Jesus.

---

[1] 1 Co 1^{12} 3^{22} 9^{5} 15^{5}.

[2] Gal 1^{18}, but ℵDEFGKLP read *Πέτρον*; 2^{9}, but DEFG read *Πέτρος*; 2^{11}, but DEFGKL read *Πέτρος*; 2^{14}, but DEFGKLP read *Πέτρῳ*.

[3] *ExpT* x. 185

[4] Mt 10^{2}.

[5] Mk 3^{16}.

[6] Lk 6^{14}.

[7] Mt 17^{25}.

[8] Ac 15^{14}.

[9] Mt 16^{17}.

[10] Mt 8^{14}.

[11] Mt 4^{18}.

[12] Mt 16^{16}.

[13] Lk 3^{30}.

[14] Ac 9^{11}.

[15] Mt 13^{55}, Mk 6^{3}.

[16] Jn 14^{22}.

[17] Lk 6^{16}, Ac 1^{13}.

[18] But see W. B. Smith, in *HJ* ix. [1911] 531, 892.

[19] Jn 6^{71} ℵ* 12^{4} 13$^{2.\,26}$ 14^{22}, all of D.

[20] Mk 3^{9}, Lk 6^{16}, both in D, and Jn 6^{71} in BCGL.

[21] Mk 3^{9} in BCL, Lk 6^{16} in BL, Mt 10^{4} in C.

[22] Mt 10^{4} in D.

[23] Mt 10^{4}, etc., also the readings in ℵ* and D noted under [19].

[24] E. Nestle and F. H. Chase, *ExpT* ix. 140, 189, 240, 285.

[25] Jer 48$^{24.\,41}$, Am 2^{2}.

[26] Jos 15^{25}; *HJ* ix. 531.

[27] E. Robinson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine*, 3 vols., London, 1841, ii. 472.

[28] E. H. Palmer, *The Desert of the Exodus*, 2 vols., Cambridge, 1871, map to vol. ii.

[29] *HDB* ii. 836.

[30] *PEFSt*, April 1905, p. 157; *HDB* iv. 635.

[31] Jn 6^{71} in ℵBCGL, 12^{4} A(E)IKM, 13$^{2.\,26}$ BLM.

[32] Mt 10^{4} BCDL, Mk 3^{18} ℵABCDL.

[33] Mk 3^{18} AΓH.

[34] Lk 6^{15}, Ac 1^{13}.

[1] Burkitt, p. 5.

[2] Schürer, *HJP* I. [Edinburgh, 1890] ii. 80, 177, 229; *HDB* i. 348; Jos. *BJ* IV. iii. 9, 13, 14, iv. 5, v. 1, vi., vii.; *ExpT* xxvi. [1914–15] 341 f.

[3] *Exp*, 7th ser., viii. [1909] 58, 307; *HDB* iii. 278.

[4] Mt 27$^{56.\,61}$ 28^{1}.

[5] Mk 15$^{40.\,47}$ 16$^{1\text{-}9}$.

[6] Jn 19^{25} 20$^{1.\,18}$.

[7] Lk 8^{2}.

[8] Lk 24^{10}; there is a difference in the MSS, some reading *Μαρία*, others *Μαρίαμ*; some also read *Μαγδαλίνη*.

[9] But see *HDB* iii. 202.

[10] Jos. *Ant.* XVIII. i. 1–6, XX. v. 2, *BJ* II. viii. 1, xvii. 8, 9, VII. viii. 1.

[11] Jos. *Ant.* XVIII. i. 1; Schürer, *HJP* I. ii. 4, 80.

[12] Mt 27^{32}, Mk 15^{21}, Lk 23^{26}; some MSS have in the latter case *Κυρηναίου*; R. C. Trench, *Studies in the Gospels*^{4}, p. 144.

[13] Ac 16$^{14.\,40}$.

[14] *HDB* iii. 176 f.

[15] Mk 3^{17}.

[16] *Exp*, 7th ser., iii. [1907] 146; *ExpT* xxv. [1913–14] 100 f., xxvi. 45 f., 236 f.

[17] Jn 11^{16} 20^{24} 21^{2}.

[18] In the Sinaitic Syriac Gospels, discovered by Mrs. Lewis, Judas, the brother of our Lord, and Thomas are identified in Jn 14^{22}; *HDB* iv. 753; *Exp*, 7th ser., iii. 381; *ExpT* xiv. [1902–03] 397 ff., xvii. [1905–06] 338.

In Mt 10^{3} a disciple is named Θαδδαῖος according to ℵB, but C²EFGHKLM have Λεββαῖος ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Θαδδαῖος. Mk 3^{18} has Θαδδαῖον, D reading Λεββαῖον. Lk 6^{16}, Ac 1^{13} have Ἰούδαν Ἰακώβου. There seems, from a collocation of these passages, to be only one person meant, but, the meaning of the two names being at present quite doubtful, the reason of the triple name is impossible to determine. He may be the 'Judas not Iscariot' of Jn 14^{22}.[1]

3. The surnames of our Lord.—These are of special interest and of special difficulty. (*a*) *Those derived from some word like Nazar.*—(1) One theory connects this word with the place-name variously spelt Ναζαρὰ, Ναζαράτ, Ναζαράθ, Ναζαρέτ, Ναζαρέθ. Mt 4^{13} and Lk 4^{16}, where Ναζαρά has the support of ℵB, are not in Mk., and therefore are most probably taken from Q. If that be so, Ναζαρά was most probably the spelling of Q. The note of universality in our Lord's teaching and His freedom from the restrictions of Jewish legalism have naturally raised questions as to His nationality and descent. Renan, in pointing out that the Galilæans were a mixed race, declares it impossible 'to ascertain what blood flowed in his veins,'[2] while Gwatkin cautiously says, 'The Gospel sprang up on Jewish soil, its Founder was a Jew, though only a Jew of Galilee.'[3] It has been suggested that Nazareth, or, better, some name which underlies that corrupt form, is an old synonym of *Gālîl*, *i.e.* Galilee, but that supposition is contradicted by the fact that it is clearly stated that Nazareth was a town in Galilee, situated on a hill.[4] The effort to find a more probable solution has led to a discussion of the connexion of Jesus with Nazareth, along two lines. One set of scholars, anxious to prove Jesus an Aryan, insist that He was born in Nazareth.[5] That He was not a Jew was argued by Emile Burnouf.[6] Ihering says, 'From the very commencement there is a touch of the Aryan in him. Some have tried to account for this link between him and the Aryans by accepting his descent from an Aryan father.'[7] Cheyne quotes with approval the words of Percy Gardner, 'According to all historical probability, Jesus of Nazareth was born at Nazareth.'[8] Very strong support has been given to this in various papers by Paul Haupt.[9] Evidence in its favour is found in the fact that on one occasion, we are told, Jesus went and preached εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῦ.[10] This is rendered in AV and RV, English and American, 'into his own country'; in the *20th Century NT* (²London, 1904), 'his own part of the country'; in R. F. Weymouth's translation (*The NT in Modern Speech*, London, 1903), 'His own country,' with this added note, 'literally, "fatherland"'; while J. Moffatt in his *Historical NT* (²Edinburgh, 1901) translates accurately 'his own native place,' and in his translation of the NT 'his native place.' The words of Mk. are very significant, as in the Second Gospel no account is given of our Lord's birth, and no mention is made of Bethlehem; and this significance is intensified if the passage was taken by the writer of the First Gospel from Mark. If Jesus was born in Nazareth, His surname with ἀπό gains significance and force, as Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ.[1] But this connexion of Jesus and Nazareth must not be held as settled, for another group of scholars take quite a different view and carry on the discussion along another line. (See W. M. Ramsay, *Was Christ born at Bethlĕhem?*, London, 1898.)

One set are doubtful if any such place as Nazareth existed. They point out that no town bearing that name is mentioned in the OT or Josephus, and that, although the Talmud mentions sixty-three towns in Galilee, it mentions none bearing that name till as late as A.D. 900.[2] If there be left 'out of consideration the narrative of the address at the opening of the Ministry in the Synagogue at "Nazara," a narrative peculiar to S. Luke, and apparently composed by him out of Mk 6^{1-5} together with some very probably genuine sayings of our Lord which he took from another source, there is nothing whatever in the New Testament to individualize Nazareth at all beyond the mere letters of its name. . . . The fact is, that the identification of the Gospel Ναζαρέτ or Ναζαρά with a place spelt נצרת . . . is a piece of early Christian archaeology, rather than of primitive tradition.'[3] Burkitt further points out in regard to the woe pronounced on Chorazin, Bethsaida, Tyre and Sidon, and Capharnahum, that, while Bethsaida and Capharnahum were the centres of our Lord's ministry, no mention is made of any work in Khorazin, while in Nazara Jesus had actually been rejected; and 'with some misgivings' he ventures 'to suggest[4] that the name "Nazareth" . . . may have arisen from a literary error,' and that 'we ought to consider the possibility that the city of Joseph and Mary, the πατρίς of Jesus, was *Chorazin*.'

W. B. Smith, founding on the fact that the Tell el-Amarna tablets and the Annals of Tiglath-Pileser III. mention a town, Hinatuni, which means 'defence,' 'protection,' argues that to this ancient town a new name Nazareth, also meaning 'defence,' was given; and, as Nazareth did not, as we shall see, yield the requisite adjective, it was written Nazara.[5] Cheyne (who identifies Hinatuni with Hannathon) denies that either name means 'defence,' and Conder identifies Hannathon with Kefr 'Anân in Upper Galilee.[6] But from a place Ναζαρέθ or Ναζαρά the adjectival surnames of Jesus —Ναζαρηνός and Ναζωραῖος[7]—cannot be derived. Burkitt says,[8] 'it is not easy to understand the form Ναζωραῖος in any case, but the difficulty is greater if we have to make it an adjective denoting an inhabitant of Nazara or Nazareth.' The name of the place in the Syriac Texts is written נצרת, vocalized *Nāṣrath* in the Peshiṭta, the adjectives Ναζαρηνός and Ναζωραῖος being rendered by נצריא. Here it is to be noted that ζ stands for צ, but in hardly any other instance is this the case; the equivalent of ζ is not צ but ז.[9] If, then, the town was נצרת, the Greek should be Νασερέτ or Νασαρά.

(2) This fact has given rise to two theories.

(i.) The theory which connects the word with נָזִיר (from נָזַר, 'to separate,' 'consecrate,' 'purify'), meaning 'the consecrated one.' The Nazirites were a Jewish sect.[1] John the Baptist was a Nazirite; Jesus was not a full Nazirite.[2] Burkitt throws out the suggestion[3] 'that "Nazoræan" was a nickname, meaning possibly "this odd sort of Nazarite"—one who calls for repentance, and yet eats and drinks like other folk. . . . The true origin of nicknames is easily lost, and it may have been supposed that the name referred to some place in Galilee.' Abbott, while unable to support Burkitt's idea that ו is made to represent the Semitic צ, heartily agrees with his dictum that 'the ordinary view of Nazareth' is 'wholly unproved and unsatisfactory.'[4] He favours another solution—

---

[1] *HDB* iv. 741.

[2] Quoted by David Smith in *Religion and the Modern Mind*, London, 1908, p. 171.

[3] H. M. Gwatkin, *The Knowledge of God*², Edinburgh, 1908, ii. 55.

[4] Mt 2^{23}, Mk 4^{29}; cf. Jn $1^{45.46}$; *HJ* ix. 892; Burkitt, p. 17.

[5] *ExpT* xxii. [1910–11] 4, xx. [1908–09] 531. This was the view of Joseph Priestley; see H. McLachlan, *The NT in the Light of Modern Knowledge*, London, 1914, p. 229.

[6] *Transactions of the Third International Congress for the History of Religions*, Oxford, 1908, i. 304.

[7] Rudolph von Ihering, *The Evolution of the Aryan*, London, 1897, p. 241.

[8] *EBi* ii. 1631.

[9] *ExpT* xx. 531, xxii. 4; *Transactions*, p. 303.

[10] Mt $13^{54.57}$, Mk 6^{1}.

[1] Mt 21^{11} (cf. Jn 1^{45-46}), Ac 10^{38}; D omits ὁ, ℵBCDEHK read Ναζαρέθ, FGLM Ναζαρέτ, Δ Ναζαράθ.

[2] *HJ* ix. 867; *EBi* iii. 3360; *ExpT* xxii. 4.

[3] Burkitt, p. 17.

[4] Pp. 17–18; *HJ* ix. 892; Lk 10^{13-15}, Mt 11^{20-24}.

[5] *HJ* ix. 541, 865.

[6] *Ib.*, p. 892; *HDB* ii. 299.

[7] Ναζαρηνός in Mk 1^{24} 10^{47} (ℵAC read Ναζωραῖος) 14^{67} 16^{6} (LΔk read Ναζωραῖον), Lk 4^{34} 18^{37} (with D) 24^{19} (ADIP read Ναζωραίου), Jn 18^{5} (with D); Ναζωραῖος in Mt 2^{23} 26^{71}, Lk 18^{37} (D reads Ναζαρηνός), Jn 18^{5} (D reads Ναζαρηνόν) 18^{7} 19^{19}, Ac 2^{22} 3^{6} 4^{10} 6^{14} 22^{8} 26^{9}; cf. 9^{5} (with ACE) 24^{5}.

[8] Burkitt, pp. 18, 21, 24.

[9] Nestle says 'all examples for the transition of צ into ζ=ז . . . are not to the mark' (*ExpT* xix. [1907–08] 524); E. A Abbott (*The Fourfold Gospel: the Beginning*, Cambridge, 1914, p. 324) differs.

(ii.) The theory which connects the word with a root, נֵצֶר, meaning 'flowering,' 'growing.' Mt 2^{23} says that Joseph came and dwelt in a town called *Ναζαρέθ* that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet 'he shall be called *Ναζωραῖος*.' But *Ναζωραῖος* cannot be derived from *Ναζαρέθ*. Before the age of Jesus there was a belief that the Messiah would be נֵצֶר or Rod of Jesse of Is 11^1. The Targum paraphrases נֵצֶר, 'branch,' as Messiah, so that 'it need not surprise us if among the Messianic names in the first century the Branch of the Tree of Jesse became familiar and popular so that the Messiah might be hailed as *Nêtzer*.'[5] Hence when Jesus became famous as a healer the people began to play on the words Nazarene and Nazoræan, and His disciples, who felt His residence from childhood in Nazareth had been ordained to fulfil a Messianic prophecy that He should be called a Nazoræan, connected some form of Nazareth or Nazara with a form of *Nêtzer*, a word used in prophecy to indicate the Messiah. Thus Jesus the Nazarene, *i.e.* the man of Nazareth, became known as Jesus the Nazoræan, *i.e.* the *Nêtzer*, the Lifegiver and Healer.[6] Abbott supports this by several lines of evidence. Taking such passages as Mk 1^{24}=Lk 4^{34}, where the demoniac addresses our Lord as *Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ*, he contends that Nazoræan in a Messianic sense is much more appropriate than Nazarene, a name referring to an obscure place Nazareth, and that this was used by the demoniac, but wrongly rendered by Mark.[7] Mk 14^{67} reads *σὺ μετὰ τοῦ Ναζαρηνοῦ ἦσθα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.*[8] Mt 26^{71} reads *Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναζωραίου.*[9] Abbott argues: 'if "Nazoræan," meaning *Nêtzer*, was regularly used about Jesus by His Galilean followers in Jerusalem, it would naturally be repeated by the Roman soldiers, and afterwards by Gentiles in general, as a mere place-name — "Nazoræan" being regarded by Mark and other Greek writers as an inaccurate form of "Nazarene."'[10] Again, the Talmud calls Jesus or His followers *Nôtzri*. This does not resemble Nazara. But it closely resembles a form of 'branch' (*Nôtzer*) extant in the text of Ben Sira — 'the branch of violence shall not be unpunished.' And it is easy to believe that the Jews parodied a form of *Nêtzer*, to distinguish the Branch of the Christians from that true *Nêtzer* of Jesse which God might call 'the branch of my planting.' Thus the Talmud, as far as it goes, favours *Nêtzer*, not *Nazara.*[11] Again, while Jesse in Jewish mystical thought is typical of old age, the shoot growing up from the root of Jesse indicates life and vigour, and would suggest thoughts of strengthening, healing, vivification, resurrection; and it is most significant that the first proclamation of the gospel concerns *Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραῖον*, the first miracle is done *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Ναζωραίου*, and the title which our Lord used when He spoke to St. Paul on the Damascus road was *Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος.*[1] 'Most readers—if they approach these stirring announcements with a desire to realize them as if hearing them for the first time—will feel (I think) that there would be something flat in the mention of "the Nazoræan" if it only meant "born at Nazara,"—a name suggesting "Where is it?"—but that it would sound an inspiriting and stirring note if it also alluded to "the ever-living Prince of Life, the Nêtzer, the Branch of the Lord's Planting."'[2] Finally, Abbott argues that, when *Nazara*, *Nêtzer*, *Nazîr* were transliterated into Greek in Mark's Gospel, they were inevitably confused. Eusebius did confuse them, Jerome actually indicates that 'Nazirite' was an early interpretation of Matthew's 'Nazoræan,' while Tertullian takes *Ναζαρηνέ* as applied to Jesus in Lk 4^{34} to mean Nazirite and then applies that term, in this sense, to the Christians.[3] In this connexion the words of the demoniac (Mk 1^{24}, *ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ*) are significant. The Holy One of God (Jg 13^7 16^{17}) is rendered *ἅγιος Θεοῦ*. The words of the demoniac may 'indicate a tradition that called Jesus Nazir instead of Nêtzer and that took Nazir to mean "holy one of God,"' and in recording the words 'Mark might naturally add—in accordance with his frequent habit of combining two interpretations—"thou *Nazirite of God*" in the sense of "thou *holy one of God*."'[4]

A consideration of the evidence for and against these two theories shows at least the need of a thorough philological and historical investigation of the terms and their use before an answer can be given to the question which Nestle propounded, 'Did not the whole tradition of Jesus living at Nazareth, and being called after that town, arise from a misunderstanding of this designation "Nazarene"?'[5]

(*b*) *Χριστός.*—Another surname of our Lord is that of *Χριστός*. Throughout His earthly life our Lord bore the simple name *Ἰησοῦς*. But in His time there was a general feeling of the approach of the Messiah: a Hebrew official title meaning one anointed for a special office, the Greek equivalent of which was *Χριστός*. Whether any person was *Χριστός* was a question the answer to which depended on evidence. It was disputed whether or not John the Baptist was *Χριστός*.[6] Whether or not Jesus was *Χριστός* was also disputed. His disciples came to believe that He was;[7] His enemies ridiculed the idea.[8] But by the time the Gospels were written His followers had come to call Him *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*,[9] and to describe Him as *Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός*.[10] In this way *Χριστός* became a surname, and finally passed into a distinct personal name.[11]

Other two names applied to our Lord may be either surname or title—

(*c*) *υἱὸς ὑψίστου.*—The primitive Semitic conception of God was embodied in אֵל, and the different aspects of אֵל were expressed by additions, one of which was אֵל אֶלְיוֹן.[12] The assertion[13] that 'there must have been a Western Semitic deity who was known by this name' lacks proof, but the incident in Gn 14 indicates the worship of a god bearing that title, to which further support is given by a statement of Philo of Byblus.[1] The title would seem to have been assimilated by יְהֹוָה, and the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews[2] practically identifies this deity with יְהֹוָה. '"God the Highest" was a widespread pagan expression.'[3] In the NT God is named Ὕψιστος,[4] John the Baptist was designated *προφήτης ὑψίστου*,[5] the beneficent and helpful are called *υἱοὶ ὑψίστου*,[6] Stephen in his speech before the Sanhedrin emphasized the omnipresence of יְהֹוָה, His superiority to Jewish conceptions of Him, and His exaltation over the gods of paganism by naming Him *ὁ ὕψιστος*.[7] The slave girl of Philippi describes St. Paul and Silas as servants *τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου*.[8] In the Annunciation the angel, while instructing Mary to name her child Ἰησοῦς, announces that He will be called *υἱὸς ὑψίστου*.[9] He is, however, never so called, the only approach to it being the words of the Gergesene demoniac, who salutes Him as Ἰησοῦ *υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ*.[10]

---

[1] *HDB* iii. 497 ff.; Nu 6^{1-21}; Jos. *BJ* II. xv. 1; W. R. Smith, *RS*², London, 1894, pp 332, 482; H. Schultz, *OT Theology*, Edinburgh, 1892, i. 161, 401; Abbott, p. 311.

[2] Mt 11^{19}, Lk 7^{34}, a passage not in Mk.

[3] P. 18.

[4] Burkitt, p. 18; Abbott, p. 324.

[5] Abbott, pp. 309, 315.

[6] *Ib.*, p. 309.

[7] P. 310.

[8] Mt 26^{69} reads Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Γαλιλαίου.

[9] Mk 14^{69} reads *οὗτος ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐστιν.*

[10] Abbott, p. 314.

[11] *Ib.*, p. 318.

[1] Abbott, pp. 315, 320; Ac 2^{22} 3^6 4^{10} 22^8.

[2] *Ib.*, p. 320.

[3] *Ib.*, p. 311.

[4] *Ib.*, p. 313.

[5] *ExpT* xix. 524.

[6] Lk $3^{15.16}$.

[7] Mt 16^{16}.

[8] Mt 27^{17}, Jn 9^{22}.

[9] Mt $1^{1.18}$, Mk 1^1, Jn 1^{17} 17^3; in Mt 23^{10} the reference is impersonal.

[10] Mt 1^{16}; in Mk 1^{34} the reading of ℵBCGLM is clearly an addition, and in Mt 23^8 ὁ *Χριστός* is a gloss.

[11] As in Mk 9^{41}.

[12] *ERE* i. 664; *HDB* ii. 198; Schultz, *OT Theology*, ii. 128.

[13] F. Hommel, *Ancient Hebrew Tradition as illustrated by the Monuments*, Eng. tr., London, 1897, p. 157.

(*d*) Ἐμμανουήλ.—This name is mentioned in a passage in the First Gospel[11] where the writer quotes a prediction from Is 7^{14}, and applies the words 'his name will be called Ἐμμανουήλ,' as indicating that the name and what was said of the child there was true and would be fulfilled in Mary's son; but so far as the Gospels go this name was never given to Jesus.

4. Roman surnames.—The conquest of Palestine by the Romans and the dispersion of the Jews throughout the Empire caused a considerable number of them to adopt Gentile names. Thus a certain Jesus adopted the surname Justus.[12] If Levi[13] be Matthew, then it would seem that the tax collector dropped his name of Levi and assumed that of Matthew on his becoming an apostle. A companion of St. Paul named John seems to have assumed the Roman name Marcus.[14] At Corinth St. Paul lodged with one Titus or Titius Justus, about whose name there is very much variation in the MSS.[15] The most distinguished personage who adopted a Roman name was the Apostle to the Gentiles. Deissmann has shown that the alteration in the name in Ac 13^{9} is due to the writer of the Acts, and that it had no reference to the proconsul but simply indicated that Saul, like many Jews and Egyptians of his time, had a double name chosen by him very probably because of resemblance in sound.[16]

LITERATURE.—This has been sufficiently indicated throughout the article. P. A. GORDON CLARK.

SWEARING.—See OATH.

SWORD.—See ARMOUR.

SYCHEM.—See SHECHEM.

SYMEON.—See PETER.

SYMEON (SIMEON) called **NIGER.**—Symeon is mentioned second in the list of prophets and teachers at Antioch (Ac 13^{1}). His sobriquet of 'Niger' has led some to suppose that he was African by descent and, if so, may have been one of those men of Cyprus and Cyrene by whom the Gentile Church at Antioch was founded (11^{20}). The suggestion, however, is a doubtful one, resting on a doubtful foundation. W. A. SPOONER.

SYNAGOGUE.—1. The name.—The name 'synagogue' (*συναγωγή*, Aram. כְּנִישְׁתָּא, Heb. כְּנֶסֶת, 'assembly,' like *ἐκκλησία*, LXX for either עֵדָה or קָהָל, 'congregation') denotes primarily the religious community of Jews (Sir 24^{23}, Lk 12^{11}, Ac 9^{2} 26^{11}; also used by the Judæo-Christians [Epiphan. *Hær.* xxx. 18; Harnack, *ad Hermas Mand.* xi. 9]) but became afterwards the regular term for the Jewish place of worship. Aram. בְּכְנִישְׁתָּא (see E. Levy, *Neuhebr. und chald. Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim*, Leipzig, 1876–89, *s.v.*)=Heb. בֵּית הַכְּנֶסֶת, 'the house of the congregation' (Mishna throughout); so Philo, ed. Mangey, ii. 458; Jos. *Ant.* XIX. vi. 3, *BJ* II. xiv. 4–5, VII. iii. 3; *Cod. Theodos.* xvi. 8. Often *προσευχή* is used for *οἶκος προσευχῆς*, 'house of prayer' (LXX to Is 56^{7} and 60^{7}; Philo, ed. Mangey, ii. 523, 535, 568, 596, 600; Jos. *Vita*, 54; Ac 16^{13}), for *προσευκτήριον* (Philo, ed. Mangey, ii. 168), and for *σαββατεῖον*='Sabbath place' in an edict of Augustus (Jos. *Ant.* XVI. vi. 2). Through the Pauline writings *ἐκκλησία* (Fr. *église*) became the exclusive name for the Christian Church in the double sense of congregation and house of worship (Schürer, *GJV* ii.^{3} [Leipzig, 1898] 433, 443; but cf. F. Spitta, *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristentums*, ii. [Göttingen, 1896] 343).

2. Origin.—Like the beginnings of all great movements in history, the origin of the institution is wrapped in obscurity. The ancients ascribed it to Moses (Philo, ed. Mangey, ii. 168; Jos. *c. Apion.* ii. 17; Ac 15^{21}, Targ. Ex 18^{20}; cf. Targ. Jg 5^{2}, 1 Ch 16^{39}, Is 1^{13}, Am 5^{12}). But the Mosaic system of sacrifices had no provision made for regular prayers; and so the identification of 'the house of the people' (Jer 39^{8} [see Rashi and Ḳimḥi]) with the synagogue is without foundation. The synagogue is a new creation for which the Exile alone offered the conditions (see Wellhausen, *Isr. und jüd. Gesch.*^{6}, pp. 149, 194). As the prescribed sacrifices could not be offered on foreign soil, which was regarded as 'unclean' (Am 7^{17}, Ezk 4^{13}), another organized form of worship became an imperative necessity. In place of the priesthood, whose exclusive domain was the Temple with its sacrificial cult, a new class of men in the Exile voiced the needs of the people, accentuating the significance of prayer and song as the more spiritual elements of the Divine service, and at the same time appealed to the people, like the prophets of old, by words of warning and consolation, offering public instruction through the Word of God, whether spoken or read. Such a class of men were the *'anāvîm*, 'the meek ones,' *ḥasîdîm*, 'the godly ones,' or *ḳ^edôshîm*, 'the holy ones,' of the Psalms; they had devotional assemblies of their own (Ps 1^{5} 26^{12} 89^{7} 107^{32} 111^{1} 149^{1}). To them, in fact, the Psalm literature owes in the main its origin, and they coined the language of prayer (see I. Loeb, *La Littérature des pauvres dans la Bible*, Paris, 1892); hence the abundance of prayers in the post-Exilic literature (1 Ch 17^{16-27} 29^{10-19}, 2 Ch 6^{14-42} 14^{11} 20^{6-12}, Ezr 9^{6-15}, Neh 9^{6-38}, Dn 2^{20-23} 9^{4-19}, also Is 36^{15-20}), not to mention the apocryphal books such as the Maccabees, Enoch, Judith, etc. Music and song likewise occupy a prominent place in the Chronicles and the Psalms, while they are ignored in the Priestly Code. The very fact that the Exilic seer speaks of 'an house of prayer for all peoples' (Is 56^{7}; cf. LXX to Is 60^{7}) indicates the existence of places for devotional assemblies of the people in the Exile. King Solomon's dedication prayer, which was composed in the Exile (1 K $8^{46ff.}$), also shows that the exiled Jews prayed 'in the land of the enemy' with their faces turned towards Jerusalem, exactly as did Daniel (Dn 6^{10}). Such devotional assemblies were held on the banks of rivers (Ps 137^{1}; cf. Ezk 1^{3}, Dn 8^{2}), the Sabbath, which assumed a higher meaning in the Exile (see Wellhausen, *loc. cit.*), as well as the feast and fast days offering the incentives to the same (Is $58^{4.\,13}$, Zec 7^{5}; cf. 2 K 4^{23}). To such assemblies the writings of Deutero-Isaiah were in all likelihood addressed (cf. L. Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Leipzig, 1871, i. 132); and the composition of the prophetical books in their present shape, with the message of comfort at the end of each portion or book, if not also that of the Pentateuch (cf., for instance, Lv 27^{34} as the conclusion of the Holiness Code), seems to have been made with such devotional assemblies in view. Whether the new religious spirit which emanated from Persia under Cyrus exerted a re-awakening influence on Judaism, as E. Meyer (*Geschichte des Alterthums*, Stuttgart, 1884–1901, iii. 122–200) asserts, or not, it is certain that Parsiism had a large share in the shaping of the synagogal liturgy, as pointed out by Graetz (*Geschichte der Juden*, ii. [1876] 409–418, note 14) and J. H. Schorr (*He-Ḥālûṣ*, vii. [1865], viii. [1869]).

---

[1] *HDB* iii. 450.
[2] He 14^{18}.
[3] Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 215.
[4] Lk 1^{35}.
[5] Lk 1^{76}.
[6] Lk 6^{35}.
[7] Ac 7^{48}.
[8] Ac 16^{17}.
[9] Lk 1^{32}.
[10] Mk 5^{7}, Lk 8^{28}.
[11] Mt 1^{23}.
[12] Col 4^{11}.
[13] Mk 2^{14}, Lk $5^{27.29}$.
[14] Ac $12^{12.25}$ $13^{5.13}$ $15^{37.39}$ etc.; *ExpT* xxvi. 372.
[15] Ac 18^{7}; *HDB* ii. 829; Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 256.
[16] Ac 13^{9}; Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, p. 313, with the references therein to 1 and 2 Mac. and Jos.; Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 81; *HDB* iii. 697.

3. History.—The words of Ezk 11^{16} (see Targ. *Meg.* 29*a*), 'To Israel scattered among the nations I shall be a little sanctuary,' were actually verified through the synagogue, as Bacher (see art. 'Synagogue' in *HDB*) states. It is noteworthy that the synagogue at Shāf Yāthīb near Nahardea in Babylonia was in the 2nd cent. taken to be the work of King Jehoiachin, who was said to have had the stones and the earth brought from Jerusalem; and it was claimed to be the seat of the Shekinah like the Temple of yore, the statue erected there (against the Jewish Law) being probably a Persian symbol of the Divine Presence (*Meg.* 29*a*; *Rôsh hash.* 24*b*; Kohler, *MGWJ* xxxviii. [1893] 442). The claim of being the seat of the Shekinah was also raised for another old synagogue at *Hūzāl* (*Meg.* 29*a*). Another one was ascribed to Daniel (*'Ērūb.* 21*a*).

The earliest testimony for the existence of the synagogue in Palestine is found in Ps 74^{8}: 'They have burned up all the synagogues of God in the land' (so Symmachus and Aquila for מוֹעֲדֵי־אֵל). Most commentators refer the psalm to the Maccabæan time, though it seems strange that the destruction of the synagogues should not have been mentioned in the Maccabæan books. H. L. Strack (*PRE*^{3} xix. 224) refers the psalm to the war of Artaxerxes Ochus (359–333 B.C.). Wellhausen (*loc. cit.*) thinks that the synagogue took the place of the ancient *bāmôth* ('high places')—a view which seems to be confirmed by Targ. on 1 Ch 16^{39} and 1 Mac 3^{46}; cf. Ḳimḥi on Jg 20^{1}. Possibly the rule to have the synagogue in the heights of the city (*Tôs. Meg.* iv. 23; cf. *Tanḥ. Beḥuḳḳothai*, ed. S. Buber, Wilna, 1885, p. 4; *Shabb.* 11*a*; Epiphan. *Hær.* lxxx. 1) has some connexion with this ancient practice. On the other hand, the site of the synagogue was, on account of the necessary ablutions, preferably chosen near some flowing water or at the seaside, as is shown by the Halicarnassus decree (Jos. *Ant.* XIV. x. 23: 'They may make their proseuches at the seaside, following the customs of their fathers'; cf. Ac 16^{13}). Hence also the interpretation of 'the well in the field' (Gn 29^{2}), that is the synagogue (*Ber. R.* lxx. 8). Owing to this, the synagogue was frequently outside the city (*Ḳid.* 73*b*, *Shab.* 24*b*, Rashi; *Tanḥ. Ḥayē Śārāh*, ed. Buber, p. 7; *Ṭūr. Ô. Ḥ.* 236; cf. *Mekilta Bô*, 1; *Shᵉmôṭh R.* on Ex 9^{29}; Philo, ed. Mangey, ii. 298). There being no special provision made for a synagogue within the Temple, the Hall of the Hewn Stones was used for the daily prayer (*Tāmîd* iv.–v.), but Rabbi Joshua of the 1st cent. (*Tôs. Suk.* iv. 5) speaks of a synagogue and a school-house on the Temple hill near by. The term מְלֵאֲתִי (=481, being the numerical value of the letters) in Is 1^{21} causes the Haggādist to speak of 480 synagogues which Jerusalem had besides the Temple (*Jer. Meg.* 73*d*, *Keth B.* 35*c*, *'Êkāh R.* Introd. 12; *Babl. Keth.* has erroneously 394). It is certain that the number was quite large, as may be seen from Ac 6^{9} (cf. 2^{5-11}), according to which each settlement of foreign Jews had a synagogue of its own—Alexandrians (cf. *Tôs. Meg.* iii. 6, iv. 13), Cyrenians, Cilicians, and Asiatics. Epiphanius (*de Mensuris*, 14) speaks of seven on Zion. Josephus (*Vita*, 54) mentions the Great Synagogue at Tiberias, where during the Roman war political meetings took place (see also *'Ērūb.* x. 10). In the 5th cent. Tiberias had thirteen synagogues (*Ber.* 8*a*), one in the village of Tiberias (*Pesiḳ. R.* 196*b*). The synagogue at Cæsarea, where the revolt against Rome was started (*BJ* II. xiv. 4–5), continued its existence under the name of the synagogue of the revolution to the 4th cent. (*Jer. Bik.* iii. 65*d*), and was probably the one in which Rabbi Abbahu had his frequent disputes with the Church Fathers (H. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, iv.^{3} [1893] 288). The Gospels mention the synagogues of Capernaum (Mk 1^{21} and ‖s) and Nazareth (Lk 4^{16} and ‖) wherein Jesus taught. The former was built for the Jews by the Roman centurion, a proselyte (Lk $7^{5.\,6}$). About the interesting ruins discovered in recent times of many synagogues in Galilee from the 1st and 2nd centuries, possibly even that of Capernaum, see Schürer, *GJV* ii.^{4} [1901] 517, note 59. At Sepphoris, the seat of the academy of Rabbi Judah, the prince, of the 2nd cent., one synagogue was called 'the great Synagogue' (*Pesiḳ.* 136*b*); another one, probably after an engraved symbol, 'the Synagogue of the Vine' (*Jer. Nāzîr*, vii. 56*a*). The wealth spent on the synagogue at Lydda gave the Rabbis cause for complaint (*Jer. Shekālîm*, v. 49*b*). As Philo (ed. Mangey, ii. 168) says, each city inhabited by Jews had its synagogue 'for instruction in virtue and piety' (cf. *Tôs. B.M.* xi. 23 and *Sanh.* 17*b*).

The oldest synagogue on record is that built in Alexandria under Ptolemy III. (247–221 B.C.) and dedicated to him and his sister Berenice according to the inscription discovered in 1902 (Schürer, *GJV* ii.^{4} 497, iii.^{4} [1909] 41). The large Jewish population had many synagogues in the different quarters of the city (Philo, ed. Mangey, ii. 568), the largest and most famous of which was the one built in the shape of a basilica and described in glowing colours (*Tôs. Suk.* iv. 6, *Jer. Suk.* v. 55*a*, *Babl. Suk.* 51*a*); it was totally destroyed under Trajan (Graetz, *Gesch. der Juden*, iv.^{3} 117). The legendary narrative 3 Mac 7^{17-20} tells of the founding of a synagogue at Ptolemais in Southern Egypt under Ptolemy IV. In Syria the most famous was the Great Synagogue at Antioch, to which the brazen vessels carried off from the Temple at Jerusalem by Antiochus Epiphanes were presented by his successors (*BJ* VII. iii. 3). Damascus also had a number of synagogues; in these Paul the Apostle preached (Ac $9^{2.\,20}$). Throughout Asia Minor, Macedonia, Greece and its islands, in cities such as Ephesus, Philippi, Thessalonica, Athens, and Corinth, the synagogues, being the gathering-places for Jews and 'God-fearing' half-proselytes (Ac $13^{16.\,26.\,43}$ 17^{17}), offered a sphere of activity to St. Paul and his fellow-workers (Ac $13^{5.\,14}$ 14^{1} 16^{13} $17^{1.\,10.\,17}$ $18^{4.\,7}$). In Rome there were quite a number of synagogues at the time of Augustus (Philo, ed. Mangey, ii. 569), and the inscriptions discovered in recent times mention nine different ones named either after persons, such as Augustus, Agrippa, and Volumnus, or after places, such as Campus (Martius) and the Subura, or after the language of the members, Hebraic or the vernacular, one after the trade 'lime burners,' and another after an engraved symbol 'the Synagogue of the Olive Tree.' A synagogue of Severus is mentioned in *Ber. R.* ix. 5

quoted by Ḳimḥi on Gn 1^{3} (Schürer, *GJV* iii.^{4} 83*g*). On disputes held there by Palestinian masters with Romans and Christians under Domitian see H. Vogelstein and P. Rieger, *Geschichte der Juden in Rom*, i. [Berlin, 1896] 29.

4. Form and furniture of the synagogue.—Like the Alexandrian Great Synagogue and the Hall of Hewn Stones in the Temple (*Yômā*, 25*a*), the synagogue at Tiberias had the form of a basilica with a double row of pillars (*Midr. Tehillîm* on Ps 93 [end]). As to the style of the synagogue, as shown by the ruins in Galilee see Schürer, *GJV* ii.^{4} 446; their orientation, however, does not conform to the rule that they should be directed towards the East, corresponding with the tabernacle (Nu 3^{38}). However, the same was also the rule for the Church (*Apost. Const.* ii. 57. 3. 14; cf. Tylor, *PC*^{3}, London, 1891, ii. 426 ff.).

The chief furniture was the תֵּבָה, 'ark' (*Meg.* iii. 1, *Taʿan.* ii. 1), in which the scrolls were kept covered with cloth or put in a case, over which was spread a *baldachin* (*kilah*) or curtain (*pārôketh*, Ex 26^{31}; *Jer. Meg.* 73*d*, 75*b*). It was placed near the upper end of the synagogue, and in front of it stood the 'delegate of the congregation,' who offered the prayer (*Ber.* v. 3, 4 and elsewhere). In the centre was the *bēmāh* (=βῆμα, 'platform') made of wood (*Sôṭā*, vii. 8; *Suk.* 51*b*; cf. Neh 8^{4} AV, 'the pulpit of wood'), called in more modern times *almemar*, the Muhammadan *al-minbar* (*JE*, *s.v.* 'Almemar'); upon it stood or sat in a chair called 'the seat of Moses' (Mt 23^{2}; cf. art. 'China' in *JE* iv. 37^{a}) those who read from the scroll of the Law or other sacred books, which were placed upon the lectern, called after the Greek ἀναλογεῖον (see Levy, *Wörterbuch*, *s.vv.* אנלגין and בימה), or the tablets. There were also chairs set for the elders and the scribes (*Tôs. Suk.* iv. 6, Mt 23^{6} and ǁ). For the candelabra (*menôrāh*) see *Tôs. Meg.* iii. 3, *Jer. Meg.* 74*a*.

5. Organization of the synagogue.—The members of a religious community having a synagogue for its centre—and there were, as shown above, often many in the larger cities—were called *bᵉne hak-kᵉneseth*, 'sons of the synagogue' (*Meg.* ii. 5, iii. 1). The number required for the formation of a synagogue community was ten (*Bekôr.* v. 5, *Zābîm*, iii. 2, *Tôs. Meg.* iv. 3, *Sanh.* i. 6). At the head was a ruler, *rôsh hak-kᵉneseth* (*Yômā*, vii. 1, *Sôṭā*, vii. 7) =ἀρχισυνάγωγος (Mk 5^{22}, Lk 13^{14}, Ac 13^{15}; cf. Lk 8^{41}), whose function was to maintain order in the synagogue and to decide who should conduct the service. The subaltern officer, who had to carry out the orders of the former, assisting him in keeping order, hand the sacred scroll to the reader and return it to its place (*Sôṭā*, vii. 7, Lk 4^{20}), take charge of the palm branches of the *Sukkôth* feast (*Suk.* iv. 4), and give the signal for the service (*Tôs. Suk.* iv. 6, *Sifrē* Nu 39) and for the suspension from work on Sabbath and Holy-day Eve (*Tôs. Suk.* iv. 12), was called *ḥazzan hak-kᵉneseth*=ὑπηρέτης (Epiph. *Hær.* xxx. 11). He also assisted in the instruction of the school children by showing the passage that was to be read (*Shab.* 13) and acted as lictor of the synagogue court in scourging offenders (*Mak.* iii. 12, *Tôs. Mak.* v. 12). In the course of time, however, he rose in rank while officiating in smaller congregations as leader in prayer and as instructor (*Jer. Yeb.* xii. 13*a*, *Jer. Ber.* ix. 12, *Bablî Meg.* 23*h*, *Mas. Sôferîm* x. 8, xiv. 1; *Pirkē dᵉ R.E.* xii. [end]). For the various functions of the service itself no permanent official existed in the ancient time, and he who was to lead in prayer was selected by the congregation—mostly through its ruler—as the representative, or 'the delegate of the community,' *shᵉlîaḥ zîbbûr*, and upon being invited in the usual formula—at least in the Talmudic period—'Come and bring for us the offering,' he stepped in front of the ark to offer the prayer (*Ber.* v. 3–5, *Jer. Ber.* iv. 8*b*). In Mishnaic times it seems that the functions of reciting the *Shᵉmāʿ* (the proclamation of the Unity of God, Dt 6^{4-9}, and its corollaries Dt 11^{13-21} and Nu 15^{37-41}), with its accompanying benedictions, of reading from the Prophets, and of offering the Priestly Blessing at the close of the service were all preferably assigned to one person (*Meg.* iv. 5); but this was by no means the case originally (see below). For the reading from the Pentateuch different members of the congregation were called up, on Sabbath seven, on the Day of Atonement six, on festival days five, on New Moon and semi-festivals four, and on the second and fifth week-days and Sabbath afternoons three (*Meg.* iv. 1–2), and as a rule Aaronites first and Levites afterwards (*Giṭṭîn*, v. 5). The one who was to translate the text into the vernacular (Aramaic), called *metūrgemān* (*Meg.* iv. 4), was, however, permanently engaged. The more learned men of the congregation, and especially learned guests, were as a rule invited to read the last portion and some portion from the Prophets, which they afterwards expounded in a sermon. This prophetic portion was called in Aramaic *aphṭartā* (Heb. *haphthārāh*—word of dismissal; whence the name of the last reader, *maphṭîr* [see Levy, *Wörterbuch*, *s.v.* אפטרתא], *Tanḥ. Terūmāh*, 1; Lk $4^{16f.}$).

It was principally on Sabbath and festival days, when the people were at leisure, that the service was well attended, and accordingly the weekly lesson from the Torah was read in full (cf. Philo, ed. Mangey, ii. 282, 630, 458); wherefore the synagogue was called the 'Sabbath place' *par excellence* (Jos. *Ant.* XVI. vi. 2; cf. Bacher's quotation from Payne Smith, art. 'Synagogue,' in *HDB* iv. 636^{b}). On Monday and Thursday the villagers coming to the cities for the court or the market attended the synagogue in sufficient numbers to have a portion of the Torah read (*Tôs. Taʿan.* ii. 4). On week days only larger cities had the required 'ten men of leisure' (*baṭlānîm* ǁ *Meg.* i. 3, *Sanh.* 17*b*; see *JE*, art. 'Baṭlanim') for the daily service; later it became a fixed custom to engage 'ten men of leisure' for the holding of the daily service where the attendance was too small.

6. The service: its elements and its development.—The Divine service assumed at the very outset a two-fold character: it was to offer common devotion and public instruction. But the devotional part, again, consisted at the very beginning, as far as we can trace it, of two elements: (*a*) the confession of faith, (*b*) the real prayer (*tefillāh*).

(*a*) The confession of faith, termed in the Mishna 'the acceptance of the yoke of sovereignty of God,' *Ḳabbālath ʿôl Malkūt Shāmayim* (*Ber.* ii. 2), by the recital of the *Shᵉmaʿ* (Dt 6^{4-9} $11^{13.\ 21}$, Nu 15^{37-41}), was preceded by two benedictions, one containing the praise of the Lord as the Giver of light in view of the rising sun each morning, and of the Withdrawer of the light of day each evening, and another containing the praise of the Lord as Giver of the Law to Israel, His chosen people, and followed by one benediction beginning with a solemn attestation of the monotheistic truth proclaimed in the *Shᵉmāʿ*, and ending with the praise of God as the Redeemer of Israel with reference to the deliverance from Egypt mentioned in the closing verse of the *Shᵉmāʿ* chapters (Nu 15^{41}). That this part is very old is shown, not merely by the discussion of the oldest Rabbinical schools concerning the details of observing the commandment found in Dt 6^{7}: 'When thou liest down, and when thou risest up,' but by Josephus' source (*Ant.* IV. viii. 13), which ascribes to Moses the recital of the *Shᵉmāʿ* and of the benediction for Israel's redemption. But what Philo tells of the Therapeutes, that 'they prayed each morning and evening for the light of heaven' (ed. Mangey, ii. 475), and Josephus of the Essenes, that 'they offer prayers handed down from their fathers towards the rising sun as if supplicating for its rising,' that is to say, with hands outstretched towards the streaks of light coming forth (*BJ* II. viii. 5; cf. *Enoch* lxxxiii. 11, Wis 16^{28}, *Sib. Orac.* iii. 591 f.), which corresponds with what the Talmud says (*Ber.* 9*b*, *Jer. Ber.* i. 3*a*) of the *Vᵉthîḳîm*, 'the enduring, conscientiously pious' (another name for the Essenes), that 'they recited the *Shᵉmaʿ* at the time of the radiance of the morning sun,' points almost with certainty to Zoroastrian influence (see, besides Graetz, Schorr, and Kohler, also T. K. Cheyne, *The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter* [*BL*], London, 1891, pp. 283, 448), and thus indicates a time when these prayers were offered under the open sky.

(*b*) The real prayer (*tefillāh*) consisted of either eighteen benedictions or seven benedictions on Sabbath and festival days. In both cases the three opening and three concluding benedictions were the same. On week days, however, twelve specific prayers are offered between these, six concerning human life in general and five concerning the national life of the Jewish people, the twelfth containing the supplication that all the prayers offered either collectively or individually be heard, whereas on Sabbaths and festivals only one specific prayer with reference to the day is offered.

The three opening benedictions are: (1) *Birkath Ābôth*, 'the praise of the God of the fathers,' dwelling on the merits of the patriarchs and closing with the words 'Shield of Abraham'; (2) *Gebûrôth*, 'the praise of the Divine Omnipotence,' as manifested in cosmic life and in the future resurrection: it closes, 'Blessed be Thou who revivest the dead'; (3) *Ḳedûshāh*, 'the sanctification of the Lord by the heavenly hosts': it closes with, 'Blessed be Thou, the holy God.' The three concluding benedictions are: (1) *ʿAbôdāh*, prayer for the favourable acceptance of the Divine service in the Temple, which, since the destruction of the Temple, has been changed into a prayer for the restoration of the sacrificial cult: it now closes, 'Blessed be Thou who restorest Thy Shekinah to Zion'; (2) *Hôdāāh*, thanksgiving for all the bounties of life and the wondrous doings of Providence; (3) *Birkath Kôhanîm*, the benediction connected with the Priestly Blessing (Nu 6$^{24-27}$), which formed the conclusion of the service.

The twelve week-day benedictions are: (1) prayer for knowledge and wisdom; (2) for spiritual regeneration; (3) for Divine forgiveness; (4) for the redemption of those in bondage; (5) for the healing of the sick; (6) for the produce of the year; (7) for the gathering of the dispersed of Israel; (8) for the restoration of a reign of righteousness; (9) originally for the destruction of the kingdom of arrogancy (=the heathen powers): after the Bar Cochba war, however, it was changed into a curse of the heretics and (Christian) informers in the service of Rome; (10) prayer for the leading authorities, the Zaddîḳîm, the Ḥasîdîm, the elders, the remnant of the Sôfᵉrîm, and the proselytes; (11) originally a prayer for the restoration of the Davidic dynasty in Jerusalem, afterwards divided into a prayer for Jerusalem's restoration as the city of God and another for the Branch of David—hence arose nineteen instead of eighteen week-day prayers (cf. *Tôs. Ber.* ii. 25, *Jer. Ber.* ii. 4*d*–5*d*, iv. 8*ac*, *Rôsh hash.* iv. 49*c*; *Lekaḥ Tob Waëthhanan*; *Yalḳûṭ* on 1 S 2; *Ber.* 28*b* f.); (12) prayer for the acceptance of all petitions (see Schürer, *GJV* ii.^{4} 540). As to the age of these prayers in their original form, the mention of the Sanhedrin, elders, and the remnant of the Sôfᵉrîm in the 10th (*resp.* 13th) prayer indicates the Maccabæan, if not the pre-Maccabæan, time (cf. also Sir 51^{12} and Schürer, *GJV* ii.^{4} 542 n., 156). The three opening and three concluding benedictions have been preserved in a more elaborate and original form in the ancient Church liturgy that came down under the name of Clement (*Apost. Const.* vii. 33–35, 37–38, viii. 37), the opening and concluding formulas being almost identical (see art. 'Didascalia' in *JE* iv. 593 ff.). The Sabbath and Holy-day benediction (*Apost. Const.* vii. 36) has also the original Jewish character. All these prayers evidently originated in Hasidæan circles, and were only afterwards reduced in length to suit the people at large, as the synagogue became a common institution (see also L. Zunz, *Göttesdienstliche Vorträge der Juden*^{2}, Frankfort a.M., 1892, pp. 379–383, and G. Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, Leipzig, 1898, p. 299 ff.). As a matter of fact, the entire angelology of the first *Shᵉmaʿ* benediction and of the third of the eighteen benedictions is, like those in the ancient Church liturgy, altogether Essene in character, intended only for the initiated into the 'higher wisdom,' and the popularization of these prayers was as much the work of the synagogue as was the propagation of religious knowledge among the people—a work begun by the Levites (Neh 8^{7} 9^{5}, 2 Ch 19^{8} 31^{22} 35^{3}; *Test. Levi*, viii. 7; *Yômā*, 26*a*; *Tanḥ. Waëra*, 4; *Num. R.*, i., iii., v.) and achieved in the course of centuries through the synagogue by the Pharisees (see R. T. Herford, *Pharisaism*, London, 1912, pp. 80–83).

The reading from the Law introduced by Ezra (Neh 8^{5}) became soon afterwards a fixed custom for each Sabbath, and so the Pentateuch was completed at first in triennial (possibly originally septennial [cf. Dt 31^{10}]) and later in annual cycles (Zunz, *op. cit.*, p. 3 f.), it having been divided at first into 154 and afterwards into 54 sections accordingly. The seven men called up for public reading seem to have been originally identical with the seven leading men of each community (*Meg.* 26*a*; Jos. *Ant.* IV. viii. 14, *BJ* II. xx. 5), probably the *Ḥeber ʿÎr* (*Tôs. Bik.* iii. 12, *Ber.* iv. 7, and elsewhere), but were afterwards chosen from among all the members of the synagogue. The reading from the Prophets which followed that from the Pentateuch (Ac 13^{15}) is probably of an older origin than the latter; its selection was left to the preacher of the day (Lk 4^{17}), but afterwards the selection for each Sabbath and Holy-day was fixed so as to correspond with the character of the day or the Pentateuch section.

7. Women in the synagogue.—Women could not be members of the synagogue, though they seem to have performed synagogal functions of their own, and so prominent women were elected as mothers of the synagogue ('Mater Synagogæ' [Schürer, *GJV* iii.^{4} 88]). They attended the service (Ac 16^{13}, *Ab. Zārā* 38*b*, *Sôṭā* 22*a*), but could take no part in the common service (*Tôs. Meg.* iv. 11, *Bab. Meg.* 23*a*). They were without doubt at all times (*Tôs. Suk.* iv. 11, *Bab. Suk.* 51*b*; cf. Philo, ed. Mangey, ii. 482; *Ḳid.* 81*a*; Chrysos. *Hom. 74 in Matt.*, quoted by Loew) separated from the men by some sort of wall or barrier (against Loew, *Gesammelte Schriften*, iv. 62 f., and Bacher, *loc. cit.*). See also Schürer, *GJV* ii.^{4} 521, 527, where the emporium found in the ruins of the ancient synagogue is correctly assigned by him to the women.

8. Schoolhouse.—The synagogue was at the outset the place for public instruction (Philo, ed. Mangey, ii. 168: 'Their houses of worship are nothing but schools of wisdom and virtue'; and Jos. *c. Apion.* ii. 17–18), and at an early time elementary schools for the young were established therein, or near by (*Jer. Keth.* xiii. 35*c*; *M.Ḳ.*

iii. 31*d*; *Bab. Ḳid.* 30*a*; *Ber.* 17*a*; *Meg.* 28*b*; *B.B.* 21; *Giṭṭ.* 58*a*).

9. Other uses of the synagogue.—To eat, drink, or sleep in the synagogue was regarded as profanation, but it was used for funeral addresses (*Tôs. Meg.* iii. 7; *Bab. Meg.* 28*b*), for public announcement, especially of charity donations (*Lev. R.* xxxii. 6; Schürer's quotation of Mt 6^{2} refers to the Temple [see artt. 'Alms' in *JE* i. and 'Didascalia,' *ib.* iv. 591^{d}–592^{a}]). The ancient Ḥasîdîm or Essenes seem to have had their meals in, or near, the synagogue, and the poor were housed and fed in rooms adjoining it (*Pes.* 101*a*; Kohler, *MGWJ* xxxvii. 494). Punishment by scourging was inflicted in the synagogue (Mt 10^{17} 23^{34}, Ac 26^{11}).

10. The synagogue discipline.—The maintenance of the synagogue community required certain disciplinary measures to keep obnoxious or hostile elements out. The following were the different forms of exclusion or excommunication used against unsubmissive members.

(1) *Ḥerem*, anathema—a term used since 2 Es 10^{8} (see artt. 'Anathema' and 'Ban' in *JE*) in the sense of absolute exclusion from the congregation (*M.Ḳ.* 16*a*; 1 Co 16^{22}, where the Greek *ἀνάθεμα* is followed by the Aramaic formula Mārān athā ['thou art accursed'] Gal 1^{8}), for which also the term *ἀποσυνάγωγος* is used (Jn 9^{22} 12^{42} 16^{2}; *Apost. Const.* II. xliii. 1, III. viii. 3, IV. viii. 3; the Syrian *Didascalia* is less exact).

(2) *Niddūy*, conditional or temporary exclusion—a term used chiefly in Mishna (*Ta'an.* iii. 8, *M.Ḳ.* iii. 1–2; *'Edūy.* v. *c*; *Midd.* 112; *Jer. M.Ḳ.* 81*a*; *Bab. Ber.* 19*a*; *M.Ḳ.* 16–17; *B.Ḳ.* 112*b* ff.; *Ned.* 7*b*, and elsewhere). It corresponds with *ἀφορίζειν* (Lk 6^{22}; *Apost. Const.* II. xvi. 3, 4; xxi. 3, 7; xxviii. 2, 4; xl. 2; xlvi., xlvii. 3; xlviii. 1; III. viii. 2; VI. xliii. and VII. ii. 8; also in the later ecclesiastical rules [VIII. xxviii. 3, 7, 8; xxxii. 5; xlvii. 5, 8 ff.]); probably also with *ἐκβάλλειν ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας*, 3 Jn ^{10}.

(3) *Nezîphāh*, severe public reprimand implying a seven days' seclusion in accord with Nu 12^{14} (cf. *Sifrē, ad loc.*; *M.Ḳ.* 16*a*; *Shab.* 115*a*), found as early as the 1st cent. B.C. in *Apost. Const.* II. xvi. 3–4; cf. art. 'Didascalia' in *JE* iv. 589^{d}, against Hamburger, art. 'Bann,' p. 150.

(4) *Shammatā*, handing over to desolation (from *shammāh* = *shᵉmāmāh* = *παραδοῦναι τῷ Σατανᾷ*, 1 Co 5^{5}; cf. Jos. *BJ* II. viii. 8 and *JE* i. 561–562; *M.Ḳ.* 17*a*).

(5) *Lūṭ*, execration—a milder form of *shammatā* resorted to by the Talmudic leader in Babylonia (see art. לוט in Levy, *Wörterbuch*; *M.Ḳ.* 16*d*; cf. Jg 5^{23}, Dt 27^{15-26}).

(6) Corporal punishments such as the thirty-nine stripes for transgression of Mosaic commandments (Dt 25^{3}, 2 Co 11^{24}) or beating for rebelliousness against the Rabbinical authorities—*Makkath Mardūth* (*Nāzîr* iv. 3, 2 Co 11^{25}, Ac 16^{22}). The entire disciplinary system, which in the course of time became rather less severe in the same measure as heresy and antagonism ceased within the synagogue (*M.Ḳ.* 16*ab*), was no longer clearly understood in Talmudic times; it receives better light, however, from the Essene Church rules preserved in the *Apost. Const.* II. xl. 2–43 and 47, as shown above. It is from the ancient Hasidæan synagogue that the Christian Church adopted her own disciplinary system.

LITERATURE.—E. Schürer, *GJV* ii.^{4} [Leipzig, 1907] 497–541, where the entire literature is given; W. Bacher, art. 'Synagogue,' in *HDB*. Especially to be mentioned are L. Loew, *Der synagogale Ritus* (= *Gesammelte Schriften*, Szegedin, 1889–1900, iv. 1–71, v. 21–33); K. Kohler, 'Ueber die Ursprünge und Grundformen der synagogalen Liturgie,' in *MGWJ* xxxvii. [1893] 441–451, 489–497; W. O. E. Oesterley and G. H. Box, *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*, London, 1907; W. Bousset, *Religion des Judentums*^{2}, Berlin. 1906, pp. 83, 197 f., 197 ff.; J. Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*^{6}, do., 1907, pp. 193 f., 199 f.; I. Elbogen, *Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, Leipzig, 1913.

K. KOHLER.

SYNTYCHE (Συντύχη).—Syntyche was a Christian lady of Philippi who seems to have held a prominent place in the Church, and who, at the date of the Apostle's letter to the Philippians, had a difference of opinion with another lady called Euodia (*q.v.*). St. Paul exhorts them 'to be of the same mind in the Lord' (Ph 4^{2}). It is impossible to form any certain conclusions regarding the nature of the controversy between the two women, who may have been deaconesses, but who were more likely prominent female members of the Church, of the type of Lydia of Ac 16^{14-15}. In fact, the conjecture has been put forward that one of them may have been Lydia herself, as 'Lydia' may not be a personal but a racial or geographical designation signifying 'the Lydian' or the native of the province of Lydia, where the city of Thyatira, to which she belonged, was situated. This cannot of course be verified. Nor can we say whether the difference between the two partook of the nature of a religious controversy or of a personal quarrel. Before this date both had rendered signal service to the cause of the gospel in Philippi, and the Apostle adduces this as a reason why they should be helped towards a reconciliation. St. Paul expects that they will get help in their differences from one whom he describes as 'Synzygus' (AV 'true yokefellow,' but probably a proper name; cf. art. SYNZYGUS), probably a prominent official of the church of Philippi. The names of both Euodia and Syntyche are found frequently, and there is no reason for supposing them to be allegorical names for Jewish and Gentile Christianity, as is done so arbitrarily by the Tübingen school.

W. F. BOYD.

SYNZYGUS (*Σύνζυγος*, erroneously in TR *σύζυγος*, from *συνζεύγνυμι*, 'fasten or yoke together'—'yokefellow,' 'comrade,' 'consort,' 'partner,' 'colleague').—In the Epistle to the Philippians (4^{3}) the apostle Paul refers to a dispute that had arisen between two female members of the Church, Euodia and Syntyche, and entreats one whom he describes as Synzygus (AV 'true yokefellow') to assist the women to come to a reconciliation. Either the name is the proper name of a person or a description applied by the Apostle to one of his companions. If the name is a proper name, the bearer was a leader in the Christian Church at Philippi when the Epistle was written. The difficulty with regard to this—the natural explanation—is that Synzygus is a very unusual name and, in fact, does not seem to occur at all in extant literature, though C. von Weizsäcker (*Apostolic Age*, i.^{2} [London, 1897] 282) suggests that the name may have been assumed at baptism as a proper name. Meyer, who regards it as the name of a person, points out that many names occur only once, and that the adjective *γνήσιε*, 'real,' 'true,' 'genuine,' emphasizes the fact that the character of the man was well expressed by his name (cf. the use of Onesimus in Philem ^{11}). The meaning would thus be: 'I beseech thee, Synzygus, truly so named, a fellow-helper in very deed.' We may also compare Abigail's use of her husband's name 'Nabal,' to describe his character: 'Nabal [fool] is his name, and folly is with him' (1 S 25^{25}). It is to be assumed that Synzygus had done much for the progress of the gospel in Philippi, and the Apostle applies to himself and his friend the common biblical comparison of the pair of oxen ploughing or threshing together under the same yoke, as this was naturally suggested by his name (cf. 1 Co 9^{9}, 1 Ti 5^{18}).

The other view, that the word means 'yokefellow,' as in classical Greek, is far less probable and at once raises the question as to which of the Apostle's companions is to be understood by the term. Lightfoot (*Philippians*, p. 158) thinks it most probable that Epaphroditus, the bearer of the letter, is intended, as in this case there would be no danger of making the reference unintelligible by the suppression of the name. Others have suggested that Barnabas, Silas, Timothy, or Luke is to be thought of as the 'true yokefellow.' Ramsay (*St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, p. 358) says definitely: 'Luke is either the "true yokefellow" addressed in *Phil.* iv. 3, or was actually the bearer of the letter to Philippi.' If the name is not a proper name, the person addressed was one present with the Apostle when he wrote to Philippi—either Epaphroditus or some other.

The suggestion of some early commentators that the Apostle was addressing his wife is impossible, both historically, in the light of 1 Co 7^8, and grammatically, as the adjective is masculine. It is also improbable that the husband of one or other of the women is referred to, while the suggestion of Renan (*St. Paul*, Paris, 1869, p. 148) that the allusion is to Lydia, who, he assumes, had become the wife of the Apostle, is hardly to be taken seriously.

LITERATURE.—H. A. W. Meyer, *Kom. über die Briefe an die Philipper* . . .^{3}, Göttingen, 1865; J. B. Lightfoot, *Philippians*^{4}, London, 1878; W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, do., 1895; J. C. M. Laurent, 'Über Synzygus,' in *Zeitschrift für die luther. Theol. und Kirche*, xxvi. [Leipzig, 1865] 1 ff., *Neutestamentliche Studien*, Gotha, 1866; H. A. A. Kennedy, *EGT*, 'Philippians,' London, 1903, p. 465; J. Gibb, art. 'Synzygus,' in *HDB*; W. C. v. Manen, art. 'Synzygus,' in *EBi*; Grimm-Thayer, *s.v.*

W. F. BOYD.

SYRACUSE (Συράκουσαι, now *Siragosa*).—Syracuse was situated on the east coast of Sicily, about midway between the modern Catania and Cape Passaro, and was the wealthiest and most powerful of the Greek cities in the island. 'So great riches,' says Strabo (VI. ii. 4), 'have accrued to the Syracusans that their name is embodied in the proverb applied to those who have too great wealth, viz. that they have not yet attained to a tithe of the wealth of the Syracusans.' In the 4th cent. B.C. Syracuse defied Athens, when the latter was at the height of her power, and came off victorious. And Syracuse coveted a higher fame than that of warlike prowess. At the Court of her kings were to be found such men of letters as Pindar and Æschylus, while the splendid site which Nature had given her was adorned with some of the finest buildings in the world. There was that in Syracuse which led her admirers to exaggerate. Cicero (*in Verr.* II. iv. 52) calls her 'the greatest of Greek cities and the most beautiful of all cities.' But in the year of Cicero's death (43 B.C.) Syracuse, and indeed the whole of Sicily, suffered terribly at the hands of Sextus Pompeius; and, though Strabo (*loc. cit.*) praises Augustus for sending thither a colony and to a great extent restoring the city to its former importance, the geographer's other words scarcely bear out this flattering statement.

In the Greater or the Lesser Port of this city, under the citadel of Ortygia and close to the fountain of Arethusa, the Alexandrian corn-ship in which St. Paul was sailing from Melita to Puteoli had to tarry three days for a favourable wind. How the Apostle spent those days can only be conjectured. Conybeare and Howson not only suggest that Julius was probably courteous enough to let him go ashore, but have no difficulty in giving credit to the local tradition which makes St. Paul the first founder of the Sicilian Church (*The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, 1877, ii. 429 f.). W. M. Ramsay, on the other hand, holds that, as the ship was simply waiting a suitable wind, no prisoner was likely to be allowed leave of absence (*HDB* iv. 645^b). Between these theories of a fruitful activity and an enforced idleness there may be room for a *via media*. If St. Paul was permitted to go into the city, with a charge to note the wind and return the moment it veered to the right direction, he would probably find that there were many Jews and proselytes in that great centre of commerce, though no ancient writer seems to allude to a Jewish colony. And that he would redeem the time is certain. But as to the actual introduction of Christianity into Sicily, whether then or at a later date, history is silent, though the extensive catacombs in the Achradina quarter tell their own tale.

LITERATURE.—W. Smith, *DGRG*, 1868, art. 'Syracusæ'; J. Führer and V. Schultze, *Die altchristlichen Grabstätten Siziliens*, 1907; C. Baedeker, *Southern Italy and Sicily*^{15}, 1908, pp. 406–420.

JAMES STRAHAN.

SYRIA (Συρία).—This term is employed in the LXX as the equivalent of the Heb. *Arām*. It is probably the same word as the Babylonian *Suri*, which was applied to a N. Euphratean district. 'Syria' was distinct from 'Assyria,' though Herodotus (vii. 63) confounds Ἀσσύριοι and Σύριοι as barbarian and Greek forms of a single ethnic term. As defined by Strabo (XVI. ii. 1), who is followed by Pliny and Ptolemy, Syria was bounded on the W. by the Mediterranean, on the N. by the Tauric range of mountains, on the E. by the middle Euphrates and the *Hamād* or desert steppe, and on the S. by the Sinaitic peninsula. Its component parts (*ib.* XVI. ii. 2) were Commagene, Seleucis, Cœlesyria, Phœnicia, and Judæa. The whole country was about 400 miles from N. to S., with a mean breadth of 150 miles. But there was a special, and a still prevalent, usage, wherein Syria was restricted to that part of the wider area which lies N. of Palestine, exclusive of Phœnicia. Under the Ottoman system Syria denotes no more than the district of Damascus, for the vilayets of Aleppo and Beyrout, as well as the sanjaks of Lebanon and Jerusalem, form separate areas.

The most prominent physical features of Syria are two parallel mountain ranges trending N. and S. The western range, springing from Taurus, includes Mt. Casius and Lebanon, and broadens out into the table-land of Galilee, Samaria, and Judæa. The eastern system, which rises into Anti-Libanus and culminates in Hermon, may be traced in Jebel Hauran and the mountains of Moab as far as Horeb. Between Lebanon and the sea is the plain of Phœnicia, which has only a few torrent-streams. From the high lacustrine district of Cœlesyria, between Lebanon and Anti-Libanus, the Orontes flows northward, the Litâny and Jordan southward. To the east of Hermon, the Abana (or *Barada*), after creating the oasis of Damascus, loses itself in desert marshes. The district of Commagene has two river-basins, which belong respectively to the Cilician and the Euphratean river-systems.

Most of the nationalities which have settled in Syria have been of the Semitic stock. Separated from one another by great mountain barriers, they have never formed a political unity, but during the centuries in which their freedom was undisturbed by the military powers on the Nile and Euphrates valleys they developed types of civilization and culture which, through the commerce of Phœnicia and the religion of Judæa, have powerfully influenced mankind. The Arabs who founded the Nabatæan kingdom, with Petra as its centre, were largely affected by the manners and customs of their Aramæan neighbours.

The foundation of Greek cities in Syria after the time of Alexander the Great was of primary importance for the country. Antioch was built as the seat of the Seleucid dynasty, and became the third, if not the second, city in the world. The Græco-Syrian civilization extended far down both sides of Jordan, and, but for the crazy policy of Antiochus Epiphanes and the consequent Maccabæan revolt, might have absorbed Judæa itself. Syria was conquered for the Romans by Pompey in 63 B.C. The province of that name which he constituted did not embrace the whole country of Syria in the wider sense. It extended from the Gulf of Issus in the N. to a little beyond Damascus in the S. The rest of ancient Syria was to be found partly in the territories of numerous free cities, and partly in petty principalities subject to Rome, while Commagene had become an independent kingdom before the time of Pompey's conquest. Syria was geographically related to Cilicia, with which it easily communicated by the *Pylæ Syriæ* (Beilan Pass), and Augustus formed the great triple province of Syria-Cilicia-Phœnice, which subsisted throughout the 1st cent. A.D. Syria and Cilicia formed a single mission-field for the Apostolic Church, and are therefore several times named together in the NT (Ac $15^{23.41}$, Gal 1^{21}). Hadrian constituted the three provinces of Syria, Syria-Phœnice, and Syria-Palestina. Antioch remained the capital of Syria till the time of Septimius Severus, who gave the honour to Laodicea (now *Latakia*), making it a *colonia*. After the Muhammadan conquest (A.D. 636) the old Semitic capital, Damascus, regained its ascendancy. Syria suffered greatly at the hands of the Mongols (A.D. 1260), and never recovered its old prosperity.

LITERATURE.—J. L. Porter, *Five Years in Damascus*, 2 vols., 1855; G. A. Smith, *HGHL*^{4}, 1897; H. C. Butler, *Architecture and other Arts*, 1903; G. L. Bell, *The Desert and the Sown*, 1907.

JAMES STRAHAN.

SYRTIS (AV 'quicksands,' Ac 27^{17}).—The Great and the Little Syrtis (*Σύρτις μεγάλη καὶ μικρά*) were the eastern and western recesses of the great bay on the North African coast between Carthage and Cyrenaica. Drifting before an E.N.E. wind (see EURAQUILO), the crew of St. Paul's ship knew that they were being carried in the direction of the Greater Syrtis (now the *Gulf of Sidra*), 'the Goodwin Sands of the Mediterranean' (F. W. Farrar, *The Life and Work of St. Paul*, 1897, p. 568). The best comment on Luke's words is supplied by Strabo (XVII. iii. 20):

> 'The difficulty of navigating both this and the Lesser Syrtis arises from the soundings in many parts being soft mud. It sometimes happens, on the ebbing and flowing of the tide, that vessels are carried upon the shallows, settle down, and are seldom recovered. Sailors therefore, in coasting, keep at a distance from the shore, and are on their guard, lest they should be caught by a wind unprepared, and driven into these gulfs.'

The name 'Syrtis' may be derived from the sucking action of the treacherous tides—'Syrtes ab tractu nominatæ' (Sall. *Bell. Jug.* 77). But it is sometimes connected with the Arabic *sert*, 'a desert,' which would refer to the desolate and sandy shore that marked the neighbourhood of the Syrtes (W. Smith, *DGRG* ii. [1868] 1081). Virgil (*Æn.* iv. 41) speaks of the 'inhospita Syrtis,' and there were many ancient tales, probably not a little exaggerated, of armies on land and even ships at sea being overwhelmed by clouds of drifting sand (Diod. xx. 42; Sall. *Bell. Jug.* 78; Herod. iii. 25. 26, iv. 173; Lucan, ix. 294 f.).

The crew of the scudding ship avoided the foreseen danger by laying her to on the starboard tack, *i.e.* with her right side to the wind. Luke's phrase, *χαλάσαντες τὸ σκεῦος* ('lowered the gear,' Ac 27^{17} RV), only imperfectly describes this operation, as it leaves out an essential detail—the setting of the storm-sail. See J. Smith, *The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*, 1880, p. 110 f., and W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, 1895, p. 328 f.

JAMES STRAHAN.

T

TABERNACLE (*σκηνή*, *tabernaculum*).—Tabernacle is the name given in the English Bible, since the time of Wyclif, to the moving sanctuary which, according to the OT priestly writers, was prepared by Moses as the place of worship of the Israelites during their wanderings in the wilderness. This tabernacle, which is described with elaborate detail in Ex 25–31, and which supplies the writer of Hebrews with the premisses of his great argument, is now almost universally regarded as a post-Exilic product of the Hebrew religious imagination, working upon a foundation of historical fact. Suggested by the Divine promise to Israel, 'My dwelling shall be with them' (Ezk 37^{27})—where 'dwelling' (מִשְׁכָּן) gives the literal sense of the word usually rendered by 'tabernacle'—it was an attempt to give ideal expression, by outward and visible symbols, to a people's faith in the real presence of God. Realizing the double truth of the Divine nearness and mysterious unapproachableness, the priests in a manner materialized the conditions under which the right relation between God and His people could be renewed and maintained. Their sanctuary was evidently a development of the sketch of Ezekiel (40–48); but, whereas his ideal was a hope to be realized in the Messianic age, theirs was represented as a reminiscence of the Mosaic time. In some respects following, but in others widely diverging from, the arrangements of the first Temple, its ritual was in all essentials actualized in the second and third Temples. Various allusions to the tabernacle are found in the apostolic writings.

1. The writer of Hebrews delights, like Philo, in the typical and allegorical interpretation of the OT Scriptures, which seem to him pregnant with hidden spiritual meanings. His aim is to prove that the Christian has passed 'ex umbris et imaginibus in veritatem.' Never referring to the Temple, always to the tabernacle, he lingers over the description of 'the vessels of the ministry' (9^{21}), entering into details which would have been superfluous had he been writing merely to Jewish readers. While he recognizes the splendour of the old order, and reverently unfolds the significance of its ritual, he regards all the Levitical institutions as prophetic types which, having at length been fulfilled by Christ, may now be set aside without compunction or regret. His philosophical presupposition, or view of the world, is the Platonic and Philonic one, that heaven is the place of realities, while earth is the place of shadows; and his central doctrine is that Christ, having, as a 'minister of the true tabernacle (*ἡ σκηνὴ ἡ ἀληθινή*), which the Lord pitched, not man' (8^2), entered within the veil, has won for every Christian

the right of personal access to God. Holding, like the most enlightened Israelites before him, that the Mosaic ordinances were no more than Divinely appointed ceremonial forms, and asserting the spiritual ineffectiveness of the whole ritual, even of the supreme sacrifice of the Day of Atonement, he declares 'the first tabernacle' ($9^{6.8}$), though made in all things according to a heavenly pattern (*τύπον*, 8^5), to be superseded by 'a greater and more perfect tabernacle' (9^{11}), and the Levitical priesthood by 'a more excellent ministry' (*διαφορωτέρα λειτουργία*, 8^6).

2. The writer of the Fourth Gospel illustrates the Incarnation by saying that the Logos tabernacled (*ἐσκήνωσεν*) among us (Jn 1^{14}). As God once dwelt, in visible cloud and flame, among His people, so Christ has sojourned among men, who have beheld His glory, which in this instance is the spiritual glory of a perfect manhood.

3. The author of the Revelation depicts the final state of Messianic happiness in the words: 'Behold, the tabernacle (*σκηνή*) of God is with men, and he shall dwell (*σκηνώσει*) with them' (21^3). 'So closely does Shekinah resemble *σκηνή*, that the former has even been thought of as a transliteration of the latter' (C. Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*², Cambridge, 1897, p. 44). That was no more than a linguistic fancy, Shekinah being really derived from the same verb as *mishkan*, 'tabernacle.' But the Messianic promise is partially fulfilled in an intenser realization of the Divine Immanence in the world, where 'earth's crammed with heaven, and every common bush afire with God' (E. B. Browning, *Aurora Leigh*, bk. vii. line 844 f.), and a modern mystic declares that 'there is but one Temple in the world, and that is the Body of Man. Nothing is holier than this high form. Bending before men is a reverence done to this Revelation in the Flesh. We touch Heaven, when we lay our hand on a human body' (Novalis, *Carlyle's Critical and Miscellaneous Essays*, London, 1872, ii. 216). Cf. St. Paul's words, 'ye are a temple (*ναός*, from *ναίειν*, 'to dwell') of God . . . the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are' (1 Co $3^{16.17}$). But when a promise is to be fulfilled by Christ, the best is yet to be.

LITERATURE.—W. Nowack, *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Archäologie*, Freiburg i. B., 1894; I. Benzinger, *Hebräische Archäologie*, do., 1894; R. L. Ottley, *Aspects of the OT* (*BL*), London, 1897, pp. 226 ff., 261 ff.; A. R. S. Kennedy, artt. 'Tabernacle' in *HDB* and *EBr*¹¹.

JAMES STRAHAN.

TABITHA.—See DORCAS.

TABLE (*τράπεζα*).—This word is used in the NT in various senses. On a technical meaning which it has in the Gospels see art. 'Bank' in *DCG*.

1. In the primitive Church the apostles deemed it unfitting that they should turn aside from their proper task of preaching the Word of God and give themselves to that of serving tables (*διακονεῖν τραπέζαις*, Ac 6^2). They accordingly secured the appointment of the Seven, which left them free to give their undivided time and strength to the ministry of the Word (*τῇ διακονίᾳ τοῦ λόγου*, 6^4). Two kinds of 'service,' or 'deaconship,' are thus specified, both of them evangelical and honourable, but each so arduous and absorbing that a division of labour became imperative. The 'serving of tables' probably included not merely the literal provision of repasts for the poor, but the task of determining the fitness of applicants for relief and the allocation of a central fund.

2. It is in one of St. Paul's letters that we first find the Eucharist called 'the table of the Lord' (*τραπέζης Κυρίου*, 1 Co 10^{21}). It would be interesting to know whether he coined the phrase or found it already in use in the primitive Church (cf. Lk 22^{30}), but the point has to be left undetermined. Contrasting 'the Lord's table' with 'the tables of demons,' as he scornfully calls the riotous feasts of pagan idolatry, he urges the moral impossibility of passing from the pure atmosphere of Christian fellowship into the tainted air of heathen licence and debauchery.

3. Among the furniture of the Holy Place the writer of Hebrews names 'the table' (*ἡ τράπεζα*, 9^2), meaning the table of shewbread, for the construction and ornamentation of which directions are given in Ex 25^{23-30}. See SHEWBREAD.

Another word tr. 'table' is *πλάξ*, which is used in the LXX for לוּחַ. St. Paul contrasts the tables of stone on which the Ten Commandments were written by the 'finger of God' with the tables that are not of stone but are 'hearts of flesh,' whereon the Holy Spirit writes the laws of the New Covenant (2 Co 3^3). JAMES STRAHAN.

TALENT.—As a translation of the adjectival *ταλαντιαία* (fem. sing.), 'weighing a talent,' this word is found only in Rev 16^{21}. The reference is to weight, and not to money. Even with the recovery of a supposed actual specimen (see art. 'Weights and Measures' in *HDB* iv. 906) we are still dependent on an average estimate of the weight of a talent. This may be given as a little over 90 lb. avoirdupois (=125 *libræ*, Roman). This means that each hailstone was about as much as a man of average strength can lift. It is usual to compare Josephus, *BJ* v. vi. 3, where stones cast by engines of war are spoken of in similar terms.

W. CRUICKSHANK.

TANNER.—See SIMON (the Tanner).

TARSUS (*Ταρσός*).—This city is famous as the capital of Cilicia and the birthplace of St. Paul (Ac 22^3; cf. 9^{11} 21^{39}). It was built on both banks of the Cydnus, in a rich and extensive plain, about 10 miles N. of the coast and 30 miles S. of the vast mountain-wall of Taurus. The river descends swift and cold from the snow-clad heights—*ψυχρόν τε καὶ ταχὺ τὸ ῥεῦμα ἐστιν* (Strabo, XIV. v. 12)—and Alexander the Great almost lost his life from the effects of an imprudent bathe in its icy water (Plut. *Alex.* 19). Flowing, 200 ft. wide, through the heart of the city, it entered, some miles down, a lake called the Rhegma—now a fever-breeding marsh, 30 miles in circumference—which served as an excellent harbour for the shipping of the Mediterranean. But the Cydnus was navigable as far as the city itself, and all the world knows of Cleopatra's pageant on those waters (Plutarch, *Antony*, 25 f.; Shakespeare, *Antony and Cleopatra*, act II. sc. ii. line 192 ff.).

The great trade-route from the Euphrates by the Amanus Pass joined the one from Antioch by the Syrian Gates about 50 miles E. of Tarsus, and the single road, after traversing the city, turned sharply northward towards the Cilician Gates—a natural pass, 70 miles long, greatly improved by engineering perhaps about 1000 B.C.—which gave access in peace and war to the vast central plateau of Asia Minor. Highways of sea and land thus combined to make Tarsus one of the most important meeting-places of East and West.

The 1st cent. Tarsus, whose most famous son was a Jew, a Hellenist, and a Roman citizen, resembled a composite photograph, in which the Greek type had been superimposed upon the Oriental, and the Roman upon both.

Tarsus is mentioned in the 'Black Obelisk' inscription as one of the cities captured by the Assyrian Shalmaneser about 860 B.C. (*Records of the Past*, ed. A. H. Sayce, new ser., 6 vols., London, 1888–92, iv. 47). Under the Persian Empire it was governed sometimes by satraps, sometimes by subject kings. Xenophon (*c.* 400 B.C.) found it a *πόλιν μεγάλην καὶ εὐδαίμονα*, where Syennesis, king of Cilicia, had his residence (*Anab.* I. ii. 23). The victories of Alexander the Great changed the face of the East, and Tarsus was one of the many cities that were Hellenized by the Seleucids. Antiochus Epiphanes IV. visited Cilicia about 170 B.C. for the purpose of allaying discontent in Tarsus and the neighbouring town of Mallus (2 Mac 4$^{30f.}$), and Ramsay thinks it probable that this king reconstituted Tarsus as an autonomous Greek city, and that, according to the practice of the Seleucids, he planted a colony of Jews there, giving them equal rights of citizenship (*ἰσοτιμία*) with the Greeks (*The Cities of St. Paul*, London, 1907, pp. 165, 180). The citizens of Greek towns were divided into 'tribes' (*φυλαί*), each observing its own special religious rites; and, as the individual could not enjoy civic privileges except in his relation to the tribe, there must have been a *φυλή* of Jews in Tarsus, each member of which could boast of being 'a Tarsian of Cilicia, a citizen of no mean city' (Ac 21^{39}). The far-reaching change which this Antiochus, who was at first no enemy of the Jews, made in Tarsus was commemorated by the new name given to the city—'Antioch on the Cydnus'—which, however, was soon dropped, as there were already so many Antiochs, and as Tarsus was still essentially an Oriental city. When Pompey reconstituted the province of Cilicia (in 64 B.C.), Tarsus became the headquarters of the Roman governor, but it lost this honour when Augustus formed the great joint-province of Syria-Cilicia-Phœnice (probably in 27 B.C.). Tarsus took Cæsar's side in the Civil War, and in memory of a visit which the dictator paid it in his march from Egypt to Pontus it either received or assumed the name of Juliopolis. The republican Cassius plundered it on that account, but Mark Antony made it a *civitas libera et immunis*, and Augustus confirmed its privileges. Under a strong and just Roman government, Tarsus was left to the peaceful development of its great resources, and reached the zenith of its prosperity, while its Hellenization now went on apace. Inspired with an enthusiasm for learning and the arts, it established a university, which was not indeed so splendidly equipped as the older foundations of Athens and Alexandria, but, according to Strabo (XIV. v. 12), even surpassed them in zeal for knowledge. At the same time Tarsus developed a higher civic consciousness, and under the benign rule of Augustus' old preceptor, the Stoic Athenodorus, who received divine honours after his death, and of Nestor, the teacher of Marcellus and perhaps of Tiberius, it for a time realized the Platonic ideal of government by philosophers. T. Mommsen has called Asia Minor 'the promised land of municipal vanity' (*The Provinces of the Roman Empire*, Eng. tr., 2 vols., London, 1909, i. 328, n. 1), and it is curious to see how Tarsus, like so many other cities, arrogated such high-sounding titles as Metropolis, Neokoros, Free, First, Fairest, Best. But this was only the defect of her qualities, and all that was highest and worthiest in her life was associated with the intense local patriotism of her citizens.

We have not the means of accurately measuring the effect of such an intellectual environment on 'Saul of Tarsus' during his formative years. It cannot be proved that he received a liberal education in his native city before he went to study in Jerusalem. It is certain, however, that Tarsus was one of the great seats of Stoic philosophy, and 'it is not mere conjecture, that St. Paul had some acquaintance with the teachers or the writings of this school' (J. B. Lightfoot, *Philippians*^{4}, London, 1878, p. 304). It is equally evident that he obtained in Tarsus an insight into civic and Imperial politics, which exercised a profound influence upon his thought as a Christian. He learned to give full value to the words *πολίτης* (Ac 21^{39}), *συμπολίτης* (Eph 2^{19}), *πολιτεία* (Ac 22^{28}, Eph 2^{12}), *πολίτευμα* (Ph 3^{20}). He not only enjoyed, like all his compatriots in Tarsus (the *συγγενεῖς* of Ro 16$^{7.\ 11.\ 21}$), the freedom of his native city, but he had the far higher privilege, of which only few of them could boast, of being a Roman born (Ac 22^{28}). While his Tarsian citizenship availed him little outside the city, his *Ῥωμαῖός εἰμι*—*Civis Romanus sum*—was a talisman which afforded him protection almost everywhere. And his double citizenship not only was in itself a privilege, but became a fruitful ideal. The thought of a citizen-life worthy of a Tarsian and of a Roman early penetrated his mind, and reappeared by and by in the sublimated form of a civic conduct worthy of the gospel of Christ (*πολιτεύεσθε*, Ph 1^{27}), a conscientious citizen-life led always before God (*πεπολίτευμαι τῷ θεῷ*, Ac 23^1).

After his conversion St. Paul spent several years in Tarsus and other parts of Cilicia (Gal 1^{21}), labouring and learning there in unrecorded ways, and it was in his native city that he was found by Barnabas (Ac 11^{25}). At the beginning of his second missionary tour he was again in Cilicia, confirming the churches which he had probably founded (Ac 15^{41}), and he could not avoid Tarsus on his way through the Cilician Gates to Derbe and Lystra (Ac 16^1). His third tour also began with a journey from Syrian Antioch to the region of Phrygia and Galatia (Ac 18^{23}), no doubt *via* Tarsus, which he then probably saw for the last time.

Captured by the Arabs in the 7th, and by the Crusaders in the 11th cent., Tarsus ultimately fell into Ottoman hands in the 16th century. It has now a population of 25,000, a congeries of many nationalities.

LITERATURE.—W. J. Conybeare and J. S. Howson, *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, 2 vols., London, 1877, i. 26 f., 59 f.; A. Hausrath, *A History of the NT Times*, 4 vols., do., 1895, iii. 4 ff.; W. M. Ramsay, *The Cities of St. Paul*, do., 1907; C. Wilson, in Murray's *Handbook to Asia Minor*, do., 1895, p. 184 f.

JAMES STRAHAN.

TARTARUS.—See HELL.

TATTLERS.—'Tattlers' is the translation of *φλύαροι* in 1 Ti 5^{13}. As a noun the word is found only here in the NT. As a verb *φλυαρέω* occurs in 3 Jn ^{10}, where it stigmatizes Diotrephes. In 4 Mac 5^{10} it is used as an adjective, and applied to a worthless kind of philosophy (*ἀπὸ τῆς φλυάρου φιλοσοφίας*).

In classical Greek the word is in common use to denote 'foolery,' 'silly chatter,' and generally 'playing the fool'; and not infrequently with a tinge of moral blameworthiness. In 1 Ti 5^{13} the word *φλύαροι* ('trifling silly talkers') is applied to the baser sort among the order of widows, and especially to the younger women of that order: 'And withal they learn also to be idle, going about from house to house; and not only idle, but tattlers also and busybodies, speaking things which they ought not.' 'From leisure springs that curiosity which is the mother of garrulity' (Calvin). Bengel translates by *garrulæ*. 'The social intercourse of idle people is naturally characterised by silly chatter' (*EGT*, Edinburgh, 1910, *in loc.*).

We have here one of the vignettes of character, so abundant in the Pastorals, where one sees as in a mirror the frivolous side of the Greek temperament, its restlessness and curiosity, its 'itch' to hear or to tell some newer thing. In the land of gossips this propensity had invaded the Church, and threatened to become (as we can well believe) troublesome to good order, as well as hurtful to the grave and restrained life which was imperative on Christian women in the relaxed moral conditions of the cities of the Empire. Timothy is therefore warned to hold a tight rein over the troops of gadabout women with their prurient talk (λαλοῦσαι τὰ μὴ δέοντα). See BABBLER.

W. M. GRANT.

TAVERNS.—See THREE TAVERNS.

TEACHER.—Comparison of Ac 13^{1} with Ro 12^{7}, 2 Ti 1^{11} 4^{3}, Ja 3^{1} shows that 'teachers' (διδάσκαλοι) are not a separate order of officials, but a class of men endowed with a particular gift, which they exercised in congregations already established. As distinct from the ecstatic exhortations of 'prophets,' the instruction given by 'teachers' would be exposition of the OT and of the words and acts of Christ. 'Teachers' were inferior to 'apostles' and 'prophets,' and were connected with 'pastors' (1 Co $12^{28.\ 29}$, Eph 4^{11}). 'Apostles' always had the gift of teaching; 'prophets' and 'pastors' usually possessed it: but men might have it without belonging to any of these classes. See CHURCH GOVERNMENT, MINISTRY.

A. PLUMMER.

TEACHING (διδαχή, διδασκαλία).—The place and function of teaching in the establishment of Christianity are facts of great historical interest and practical importance. That its effectiveness, as an instrument for the diffusion of the Christian religion, was recognized by the Jewish rulers is apparent from the prohibitions and persecutions with which they sought to prevent the apostles teaching 'in the name of Jesus' (Ac 4^{18} 5^{28}). As in the ministry of Jesus teaching occupied a prominent place (together with preaching and healing), so also with His followers it was one of the main features of their evangelical work. It was a chosen instrument for the spread of the new religion, and it gradually tended to reduce the truths which expressed the faith of the early Church to a recognized body of doctrine.

A distinction is to be drawn between the process of teaching and the subject-matter of teaching. To speak of the 'teaching of St. Paul,' for example, is ambiguous, since 'teaching' may mean either 'instruction' (the act of imparting truth) or 'doctrine' (the body of truth imparted). Sometimes, indeed, the biblical usage includes both meanings. The NT employs two terms for 'teaching,' viz. διδαχή and διδασκαλία. Generally speaking, the former signifies the act and the latter the substance of teaching. This distinction is not made so apparent in the AV, where both διδαχή and διδασκαλία are usually rendered 'doctrine,' whereas in the RV διδαχή (which occurs 16 times) is always rendered 'teaching' (Ro 16^{17} RVm), and διδασκαλία (occurring 17 times) is rendered 'doctrine' (11 times), 'teaching' (5 times), and 'learning' (once). To render διδαχή by the somewhat ambiguous word 'teaching' is convenient, as it always signifies the act and in many instances both the act and the content of Christian instruction, whereas διδασκαλία more frequently denotes the content alone, and is well expressed by 'doctrine.' Literally διδασκαλία means 'that which belongs to a teacher' (διδάσκαλος), and, in the judgment of H. Cremer (*Bibl.-Theol. Lex. of NT Greek*^{3}, Edinburgh, 1880, p. 182), is used 'for the most part in the objective, and therefore passive sense, *that which is taught, the doctrine.*' That the content of teaching is suggested by this term is apparent from such phrases as 'precepts and doctrines' (Col 2^{22}), 'sound doctrine' (1 Ti 1^{10}, 2 Ti 4^{3}, Tit 1^{9}), and absolutely 'the doctrine' (1 Ti $6^{1.\ 3}$, Tit 2^{10}).

1. The work of teaching.—The ability to impart Christian truth was looked upon by the members of the early Church as a spiritual gift of Divine grace. Teaching was therefore numbered among the *charismata* (χαρίσματα) which resulted from the bestowal of the Holy Spirit, and which included such gifts as prophesying, healing, working of miracles, and 'tongues' (Ro 12^{6}, 1 Co $12^{10\text{f.}}$).

(1) *Teaching and preaching.*—While mentioned in close association with preaching, the gift of teaching was regarded as conferring on its recipient a distinct function in the ministry of the Word. As in the Gospels our Lord is described first as 'preaching' the glad tidings of the Kingdom (Mk 1^{14}) and then as 'teaching' His disciples the inner meaning and principles of the gospel (4^{1}), so, in the early Church, preaching was one thing and teaching another, although in both instances they were often combined (Mt 4^{23}, Ac 5^{42} 28^{31}). Preaching was primarily the proclamation of the good news of salvation through Jesus Christ, whereas teaching was the calmer and more systematic instruction in the details of Christian truth and duty which followed the summons to repentance and saving faith. While preaching and teaching were distinct as functions, they might, in some cases at least, be united in the ministry of one person (1 Ti 2^{7}, 2 Ti 1^{11}), especially as the content both of the preaching and of the more elaborated instruction was necessarily often the same (Ac 5^{42} 15^{35}, Col 1^{28}).

(2) *The position of teaching.*—In the two more formal lists of the spiritually endowed, given by St. Paul, 'teachers' are mentioned after apostles and prophets (1 Co $12^{28\text{f.}}$, Eph 4^{11}), and in a less formal list of spiritual functions 'teaching' is mentioned after 'prophecy' (Ro $12^{6\text{f.}}$), whereas in 1 Cor. the 'word of wisdom' and the 'word of knowledge,' which together constituted charismatic teaching, are placed before prophecy ($12^{8.\ 10}$), and 'a teaching' comes before 'a revelation' (14^{26}). Prophecy was a specialized form of teaching. 'The difference between the two,' says A. C. McGiffert, 'lay in the fact that while prophecy was the utterance of a revelation received directly from God, teaching, specifically so called, was the utterance of that which one had gained by thought and reflection. The teacher might be led and guided by the Spirit, —indeed, he must be, if he were to be a true teacher and his teaching truly spiritual,—but what he said was in a real sense his own' (*History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, Edinburgh, 1897, p. 529). Some prophets were able also to teach, but not all teachers were able to prophesy. The apostles might also teach. St. Paul speaks of himself as appointed to be both an apostle and a teacher (1 Ti 2^{7}, 2 Ti 1^{11}). Teachers, like apostles and prophets, travelled about from place to place, being greatly honoured (*Did.* iv. 1) and having the right to expect support (*ib.* xiii. 1–3). They were not officials appointed by any ecclesiastical body. Teaching was not a clerical office, for even as late as the 5th cent. laymen are mentioned as teachers (*Apostolic Constitutions*, VIII. xxxii.). But local congregations tested both the message and the moral character of these visiting instructors. Teachers were more likely than apostles and prophets to settle down in one place, and the reference to 'pastors and teachers' (Eph 4^{11}) shows this tendency at work. At a later stage it was one of the qualifications of a bishop that he should be 'apt to teach' (1 Ti 3^{2}).

(3) *Limitations and dangers.*—Women were not permitted to teach (1 Ti 2^{12})—at least in public—although, apparently in harmony with St. Paul's 'healthful teaching' (Tit 2^{1}), it was allowable for aged women to impart moral instruction (privately, it would seem) as part of the Christian training of young women in such duties as love of husband and children, sobriety, chastity, and kindness (Tit $2^{4\text{f.}}$). Warnings against 'false teachers' occur frequently in apostolic and sub-apostolic times. From the first, Judaizers dogged the footsteps of the apostles (Ac 15^{1} $21^{27\text{f.}}$, Gal 1^{7}) to pervert the

teaching of the gospel. Next, the existence of 'many teachers' within the Church (Ja 3^{1}) promoted an unhealthy spirit of rivalry and faction which could be eliminated only by a demand for a 'good life' in one who professed, as a teacher, to be 'wise and understanding' (v.^{13}). Then 'strange teachings' began to multiply (He 13^{9}). False teachers arose, encouraging 'lusts of the flesh' (2 P $2^{2.\,18}$), 'fornication' (Rev $2^{14.\,20}$), 'false doctrine' (1 Jn $2^{26\text{f.}}$ $4^{1\text{f.}}$, 1 Ti 1^{3}, 2 Ti $4^{3\text{f.}}$), being prompted, too often, by a covetous love of gain (2 P $2^{3.\,14}$, Tit 1^{11}).

(4) *Methods of teaching.*—Instruction was often given collectively, in public or in private, 'in the temple and at home' (Ac 5^{42}), in the Christian congregation (11^{26}), and more generally in the meeting for edification such as St. Paul describes in detail (1 Co 14). In the latter the teaching came between the 'psalm' (or hymn of praise) and the prophetic 'revelation' (v.^{26}). Supplementary teaching was given privately 'from house to house' (Ac 20^{20}) or to individuals (18^{26}). The imparting of Christian truth to catechumens, who were to contribute towards the support of their teacher (Gal 6^{6}), developed in the more settled churches of cities and even villages (Eusebius, *HE* VII. xxiv. 6). Many churches came to have regular schools for the teaching of catechumens, that of Alexandria being especially famous in later times.

The teaching was oral, as a rule, but it might be conveyed by means of didactic epistles, such as those contained in the NT or those of Clement of Rome and Ignatius, or works like the *Didache* and the *Shepherd of Hermas*. In addition to a recital of the facts concerning the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ (Ro $1^{3\text{f.}}$, 1 Co $15^{1\text{ff.}}$, Gal $4^{4\text{f.}}$), there would be doctrinal explanations of these facts, such as those contained in Acts and the Epistles. Then there were authoritative accounts of such institutions as the Christian sacrament (1 Co $11^{23\text{f.}}$). Instruction was also conveyed in 'hymns and spiritual songs' (Col 3^{16}) and would include 'admonition' (1^{28}), exhortation (1 Ti 4^{13} 6^{2}), and even reproof and rebuke (2 Ti 4^{2}), the administration of which called for patience and longsuffering on the part of the teacher.

(5) *Historical development.*—The place of teaching in the early Church underwent modification in process of time. In the earliest stage it was somewhat overshadowed by the supernatural gifts of prophecy and tongues. To the ordinary listener, the presence and influence of the Spirit were more evident in the revelations of prophecy or the ecstatic utterances of tongues than in the calmer discourse of teaching. Against the tendency to ascribe undue importance to *glossolalia* St. Paul had early to make protest in the interest of prophecy (1 Co 14). A second stage was reached when the early enthusiasm roused by prophetic and ecstatic speech cooled down and greater attention was given to the more systematic utterance of the teacher. The prophetic gift was sporadic, that of teaching was continuous; the former came by momentary inspiration, the latter was the outcome of long experience; and in the long run teaching won the day. The effect of stricter oversight and completer organization tended (up to a certain point) to encourage it. The very directions given by St. Paul to the Corinthians for the orderly conduct of their edification meetings gave to teaching a growing importance in the process of spiritual upbuilding. In the third stage (noticeable in the 2nd cent.) the function of teaching became absorbed in the office of administration and leadership. The teacher outlasted both the apostle and the prophet, but was eventually subordinated to the bishop, who combined in his office the functions of ruling and teaching. In earlier times the apostles, prophets, and teachers had authority because they possessed gifts of insight and knowledge qualifying them to give directions in belief and practice. But, as the need for organization and discipline increased *pari passu* with the decline of inspired utterance, teaching, at first overshadowed by prophecy, now became absorbed by leadership, although it remained a permanent function in the Church.

2. The content of Christian teaching.—The NT Epistles and the specimens of instruction preserved in Acts embody the content of Christian teaching during the 1st century. The amplification and modification of this primitive norm of belief and practice can be traced in the *Didache*, the Epistles of Clement and Ignatius, and the *Shepherd of Hermas* in the immediately succeeding years.

The detailed exposition and co-ordination of the contents of Christian teaching will be found in the various articles dealing with the subjects concerned. All that can be attempted here is to characterize broadly the early Christian teaching as a body of truth. Compared with the varied literature of the ancient world it was exclusively religious in character, and in contrast with the philosophic speculations of the Greek and Hellenistic schools it claimed to be a body of revealed truth. The Christian teacher did not so much unfold a philosophy of religion as expound and apply the truths embodied and revealed in Christ. He taught 'in the name of Jesus' (Ac 4^{18} 5^{28}), he used the doctrines of the OT inasmuch as they bore witness of Christ, he repeated the teaching given by Christ with the formula 'Remember the words of the Lord Jesus' (20^{35}), he continued 'in the apostles' doctrine' (2^{42}), and as occasion arose he applied the principles underlying the teaching of Jesus to the doctrinal and ethical problems that arose within the Church. In the later Epistles a conservative tendency is noticeable. The content of Christian teaching came to be fixed and authoritative. It was called 'the teaching' (1 Ti 6^{1}, 2 Jn ^{9}; cf. Rev $22^{18\text{f.}}$) or the 'sound doctrine' (2 Ti 4^{3}). St. Paul early utters a warning to the Romans against departing from 'the doctrine which ye learned' (Ro 16^{17}), and later Timothy is called a good minister because he had been 'nourished in the words of the faith, and of the good doctrine' (1 Ti 4^{6}), and in which he had continued.

The general character of the content of the teaching may be inferred from the fact that it is described (1 Co 12^{8}) as the 'word of wisdom' (λόγος σοφίας) and as the 'word of knowledge' (λόγος γνώσεως). The message of the teacher consisted of a discourse in which either 'wisdom' or 'knowledge' (γνῶσις) would predominate according to the special nature of the gift of teaching bestowed. A difference is to be noted between wisdom and gnosis. The former consisted in an acquaintance with 'God's wisdom' (1 Co 1^{21}), or the Divine plan of redemption, which St. Paul calls elsewhere 'the mystery of God' (2^{1}). O. Pfleiderer describes it as 'the knowledge of elementary Christian truths in the simplest and most direct form of actual fact' (*Paulinism*, Eng. tr., 2 vols., London, 1877, i. 235). On the other hand, knowledge (gnosis) came by intuition and consisted of insight into truth through spiritual illumination. In Christian wisdom the truth was arrived at by the teacher's powers of observation and reasoning; in the Christian gnosis the truth was bestowed as an immediate gift of the Spirit. The first enabled the teacher to explain the truth, the latter qualified him to interpret it. The knowledge of the teacher was largely an experimental acquaintance with the process of human redemption through Christ (Ph 3^{10}).

The continuity of NT with OT teaching must not be overlooked. The teacher began with such truths as were common to Judaism and Christianity. The fundamental doctrine of the existence, unity, and holiness of God he would learn from the OT. He appropriated the Jewish beliefs as to the creation of the world and the nature and sinfulness of man. He insisted on the primary demands of the Moral Law.

After allowing for what was taken over from the OT and embodied in the NT, the remaining subject-matter of specifically Christian teaching consists of two elements—doctrinal and ethical.

(1) *Doctrinal content.*—The outstanding and ever-recurring subject in Christian instruction was the Person and Work of Christ. St. Paul's declaration to the Corinthians that he determined not to know anything among them 'save Jesus Christ and him crucified' (1 Co 2^{2}) was true of himself not only as a preacher, but also as a teacher. The teaching of apostolic times, whether soteriological, eschatological, or practical, was essentially Christocentric. While the preacher, as a herald (κῆρυξ), made his proclamation that Jesus was the Christ of God, and the Saviour of mankind, the teacher, in the meeting for edification or to individual listeners, had to unfold and explain the deep truths involved in this momentous fact.

The story of the events of the earthly life of Jesus, together with an account of His sinless character and His death and resurrection, had to be told (1 Co $15^{1ff.}$, 2 Co 8^{9}, Gal $4^{4f.}$) much in the same way as it has been preserved for us in the Four Gospels. But the doctrinal and theological implications of these historical facts had to be made explicit by appeal both to Scripture and to spiritual experience. The gospel concerning Jesus Christ needed much exposition. In order that men should intelligently believe that Jesus was the promised Christ, as proved by His resurrection 'according to the scriptures' (1 Co 15^{4}), that He was the Saviour of sinful men through His expiatory death upon the Cross (Ro $5^{6.8}$, 2 Co $5^{18.21}$), that He was the redeeming head of the human race (Ro 5^{15}, 2 Co 15^{22}), that, moreover, He was the eternal Son of God and the creative ideal of the whole universe (Eph 1^{10}, Col $1^{16f.}$ 2^{9}), time was needed, and methods of explanation which were not at the disposal of the preacher. To the teacher was allotted the important task of expounding and co-ordinating the truths proclaimed in the preaching of the gospel.

The experiences of salvation, which came to believers through their faith in Christ, required reflective consideration; hence the prominence given in Christian teaching to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. The historic gift of the Day of Pentecost proved to be also the indwelling principle of the new Divine life in redeemed men (Ro 5^{5} 8^{14}, 1 Co 2^{12}, Gal 4^{5}, Eph 3^{16}). Although the dogma of the Divine Trinity was the outcome of much later reflexion, the elements of a doctrine of the three-fold nature of the Divine existence emerged in the teaching of the 1st century.

The preacher having summoned men to repentance and saving faith in Christ, the teacher exhibited the resultant state of salvation in many aspects. The legal aspect required the teacher to present the truth as evangelical justification; its regenerative results enabled him to speak of it as a 'new creation.' The family life illustrated the blessing as adoption and the possession of filial consciousness. The Jewish Dispensation supplied such ideas as the 'New Covenant' and 'royal priesthood,' by which the Christian's new relationship to God could be understood. Religious and ceremonial observances in the ancient world afforded the basis for a fresh and more ethical conception of salvation as mystical union with a dying and risen Saviour or as sanctification through the indwelling Holy Spirit.

Moreover, 'things to come' occupied a large place, not only in the teaching of Jesus, but in the more developed doctrine of the apostles. The preacher heralded an impending Parousia; he exhorted his hearers to repentance in view of the certain approach of Christ as Judge; he proclaimed the sure and certain hope of resurrection. The teacher, on the other hand, while including these great truths in his doctrinal instruction, had many questions to face in view of the apocalyptic fancies and hopes so rife in contemporary Judaism and the Greek speculations concerning immortality so widely propagated through the Hellenistic schools of religious philosophy. The very lapse of time brought its problems. The hope and belief of the primitive Church that Christ was immediately to appear called for explanation in view of what would appear to some a disappointing postponement. This drew from the teacher a deeper and more spiritual interpretation of eschatological truth. 2 Thessalonians shows St. Paul, as teacher, correcting the hopes roused in his hearers by the eschatological message of St. Paul, as preacher (Ac 17^{3}, 1 Th 1^{10} $4^{13f.}$). In Corinthians the Apostle deals with problems of individual immortality raised through the grim fact of death among believers. In his later Epistles the cosmical aspect of 'things to come' emerges as implicated in his maturer and final teaching concerning Christ as the eternal Son of God, who existed before the visible universe and in whom all created things are recapitulated (Eph $1^{10f.}$) and will find their final consummation in glory (Ph $3^{20f.}$, Col $1^{13ff.}$).

(2) *Ethical content.*—In speaking of the 'teaching of Jesus' or the 'apostles' teaching,' it is usually the doctrinal or theological content that is primarily thought of, to the exclusion of the practical and moral. But a careful study of the records and specimens of our Lord's instruction and that of His followers shows that the proportion of ethical teaching is very great. The historic interest in apostolic doctrine aroused through centuries of controversy has overshadowed the moral teaching. While it may be straining the niceties of philosophical terminology to speak of the 'ethics of the NT' as though it constituted a system of moral principles and precepts based on human reason, yet no one can be blind to the substantial body of ethical teaching contained in the NT. In the apostolic and sub-apostolic literature this teaching receives full and explicit exposition. Nor again can any one overlook the influence of such moral teaching upon the subsequent developments of human civilization.

The teacher in apostolic times based his moral commands as to conduct upon the requirements of the Moral Law. But there was a distinctively Christian 'way' (Ac 9^{2}) or mode of life, which was taught and applied by the Christian teacher much in the same manner as the Jewish Rabbis dealt with their Halakha. The authoritative norm of such teaching was the moral teaching of Jesus as Lord. Hence St. Paul speaks of 'my ways which be in Christ, even as I teach everywhere in every church' (1 Co 4^{17}). In warning the Ephesians against their former Gentile vices, the Apostle says, 'Ye did not so learn Christ; if so be that ye heard him, and were taught in him' (Eph 4^{20}). The various precepts, however, were all applications of the central principle of love, thus 'fulfilling the law of Christ' (Gal 5^{14} 6^{2}). Negatively, the Christian ethic prohibited open vice, such as fornication and drunkenness; it exposed the sinfulness of spiritual errors, such as pride and covetousness; positively, it enjoined purity, self-control, humility, and above all Christian love (ἀγάπη). The supreme end of moral perfection, of holiness, was set before believers by the apostles and teachers, whom we see not only instructing converts in doctrine, but also 'admonishing every man and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ' (Col 1^{28}).

LITERATURE.—In addition to the works quoted above, see W. F. Adeney, art. 'Teacher, Teaching,' in *HDB*; T. M. Lindsay, *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries*^{2}, London, 1903; E. von Dobschütz, *Christian Life in the Primitive Church*, Eng. tr., do., 1904; C. von Weizsäcker, *The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church*^{2}, do., 1897–99.

M. SCOTT FLETCHER.

TEMPERANCE (ἐγκράτεια).—The aim of the present article is to determine the meaning of ἐγκράτεια in the NT. Our word 'temperance' is in popular speech limited to moderation in the use of intoxicants or total abstinence therefrom. This limitation of the word indicates the seriousness of the drink question in modern times; but temperance in the NT is not so restricted, so that the discussion of temperance in the modern sense can be touched on here only in so far as it is included in the more general question of ἐγκράτεια.

1. Temperance synthetically viewed as one of a catalogue of moral virtues or graces.—In the four cardinal virtues of Greek ethics and also the seven of scholastic and modern times temperance has a place, and its meaning is determined not only analytically but also synthetically, *i.e.* its relation in the moral life to other virtues is exhibited. Is there any synthetic treatment of it in the NT?

In Gal 5^{19-23} it occurs at the end of a group of graces, and some have found in its position here a proof that it forms, as it were, the key-stone of the moral structure—the culminating point of a climax (A. B. D. Alexander, *Ethics of St. Paul*, Glasgow, 1910, p. 184 ff.); but this is not the case. St. Paul may be opposing it to 'drunkennesses and revellings' in the corresponding list of vices, in which case the word would approach in meaning our own 'temperance'; but in all likelihood its position in the list is in no way regulative of its meaning, and so we are compelled to take it in its ordinary sense of self-control in food, drink, and especially in sexual indulgence. These ethical lists in St. Paul are not constructed logically. The lack of uniformity in them is a sufficient proof of this. Thus in Ac 24^{25} temperance is associated with righteousness (not in the specific Pauline sense), and both are enforced in the light of the judgment to come. The reason for the association of the two is simply that Felix was notoriously deficient in both these points (Tac. *Ann.* xii. 54; Suet. *Claud.* 28). Here 'temperance' primarily, perhaps exclusively, means 'continence'—the περὶ τῶν ἀφροδισίων ἐγκράτεια of Xenophon (*Ag.* v. 4)—a restricted meaning which the verb has in 1 Co 7^{9}. Indeed the word tended towards this limited sense in later literature as our own word 'temperance' is restricted to the matter of drink. The reason is obvious. Immorality was even a graver sin for the Church than gluttony or drunkenness.

In Mt 23^{25} our Lord condemns the scribes and Pharisees for ἁρπαγή and ἀκρασία, and if with Grotius (see Commentaries) we could explain the latter of sensual indulgence we would have exact opposites of righteousness and temperance as here used by St. Paul (cf. Jos. *Ant.* VIII. vii. 5 for this meaning of ἀκρασία). The context, however, is more in favour of taking ἀκρασία as meaning over-indulgence in eating and drinking.

In Tit 1^{8} we have righteousness (among other virtues) joined with temperance as virtues necessary for a bishop or presbyter (δίκαιον . . . ἐγκρατῆ). Here 'temperate' ought naturally to be taken in its ordinary meaning as control of bodily desires. It is not so comprehensive as σώφρων, a term which implies rational balance as well as moral self-control. The one (σώφρων) is a genus of which the other (ἐγκρατής) is a species. It is impossible, therefore, to arrange the terms of these Pauline catalogues genetically. The arrangement is often a matter of rhythm, not of moral nexus (see 2 Co $6^{5ff.}$), and therefore it is pedantic to see any immanent ethical connexion between the members of these lists.

To Tit 2^{12} we owe the tripartite division of duties into duties to oneself (σωφρόνως), duties to others (δικαίως), and duties to God (εὐσεβῶς)—'sobrie erga nos, juste erga proximum, pie erga Deum' (Bernard, quoted by Alford, *in loc.*). Our virtue of temperance would fall under the first of these as a species under a genus, but it is questionable if this division was in the writer's mind. 'Σωφρόνως can with as little propriety be referred merely to one's self as δικαίως merely to others, and by εὐσεβῶς is also denoted the whole sphere of the Christian life' (A. Wiesinger, Eng. tr., Edinburgh, 1851, *in loc.*). Lucian has the same virtues together and calls them the pure world of the soul (see Alford, *in loc.*). The fact that in the Pastoral Epistles we have so many lists of virtues—similar yet never identical—is a proof that the Apostle did not write with a fixed system of ethics in the background of his mind.

In 2 P 1^{5-8} there appears on the other hand an inner psychological connexion between the various virtues mentioned. These are not thrown together at haphazard; there is a distinct moral progress, an advance like the Stoic προκοπή from a lower to a higher stage. Faith furnishes moral energy (ἀρετή), it knowledge, and it in turn ἐγκράτεια, till we are led up to love. Here undoubtedly its place in the list throws light on its meaning. It springs out of faith, which supplies the moral energy for and the practical acquaintance with the conduct that ought to be pursued and avoided. It is the mastery of self over its own internal hostile forces, just as ὑπομονή, 'endurance,' is mastery of the self in face of outward enemies. Temperance and endurance are indeed closely akin. When the struggle is against one's own lusts, the necessary virtue is temperance; when it is against hostile forces from without, then endurance—a military word—is the virtue required. The placing of knowledge and energy before it in the list shows that temperance needs both strength and insight as elements. The Christian Church, however, has never looked on this list in 2 Peter as an infallible norm. In Hermas ἐγκράτεια is made directly the daughter of faith—virtue and knowledge are omitted—and opposed to ἀκρασία (*Vis.* III. viii. 7, *Sim.* IX. xv. 2). The fact is that the general literature of the period is full of such lists, and this one in 2 Pet. can be paralleled in parts from inscriptions (see Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, Tübingen, 1908, p. 239, Eng. tr., *Light from the Ancient East*, London, 1911, p. 322). We have a literary parallel in the *Tabula* of Cebes (xx. 3), and E. von Dobschütz quotes from Iamblichus, *de vita Pythag.*, the vices that spring out of ἀκρασία—'lawless marriages and corruptions and drunkennesses, and unnatural pleasures and certain violent lusts.' For a discussion of the origin of these catalogues of vices (καταβάσεις) and virtues (ἀναβάσεις) the reader is referred to his excursus in *Christian Life in the Primitive Church*, p. 406 ff.

Before leaving this division of the subject the question which is raised by C. Bigg (*ICC*, 'St. Peter and St. Jude,' Edinburgh, 1901, *in loc.*) has to be faced. He considers that St. Peter regards temperance and the other virtues (except faith) as acquired by native moral effort working on the Divinely given deposit of faith, whereas St. Paul overlooks the human effort. Virtue was to St. Paul the result of Divine grace, not of ethical endeavour, to use Aristotle's distinction (*Eth. Nic.* i. 9), whereas to St. Peter the 'flame' was from God, but the oil to feed the flame came from man's own zeal and fidelity (Bigg, p. 257, quoting Bengel on 2 P 1^{4}). The fact is, however, that St. Paul never forgets moral effort. Whether virtue is obtained *φύσει* or *ἔθει* or *διδαχῇ* (Arist. *Eth.* x. ix. 6; cf. *φύσεως, μαθήσεως, ἀσκήσεως* [Diog. Laert. v. 18]) was not consciously before his mind or before the mind of the writer of 2 Peter, but in his writings he acknowledges each mode. He writes in one place of the Gentiles doing good by nature (Ro 2^{14}). He compares the Christian life with the athletic and the military. Moral growth is expressed by him as the gradual acquisition of virtues, as the Roman soldier puts on his armour piece by piece. The question as to the distinction between the work of God and the work of man in the Christian soul is not regarded in the NT in this antagonistic fashion. Both are recognized and emphasized without any feeling of opposition. To read into the NT our later synergistic difficulties is an anachronism.

The notion of a double morality came into Christianity very early. It is possibly found in the *Didache*, vi. 2, and in Hermas (see C. E. Luthardt, *History of Christian Ethics*, tr. W. Hastie, Edinburgh, 1889, p. 126), but not in the NT. The NT ethics is of a piece, having a definite origin and a single aim. What is distinctive of the NT is not the precise determination of the sphere of different virtues or their place in a fixed catalogue—that is after all a scholastic problem—but rather the emphasis on their origin in the action of the Spirit of God in the soul (they are the fruit of the Spirit) and consequently on their inwardness and pervasiveness, thoughts and desires, aims and intentions, as well as actions being seriously taken into consideration. The influence on temperance of the doctrine of the Resurrection, *e.g.*, is so profound that this virtue like all the rest is totally transformed, and, though often we may describe it as Plato or Aristotle would, we feel that we are in a new world, where virtues have new meanings and new values. We are in a realm where Divine grace and the hope of Christ's appearing are distinctly operative (Tit $2^{12f.}$). We cannot therefore fix the meaning of these virtues by reference to these lists; they must be explained in the light of the whole Christian life. The aim of such lists is practical, and in practice now one virtue and now another has to be emphasized, one virtue may now be the cause and now the effect of another. Christianity deals with the personality as a whole, not in parts.

2. Ἐγκράτεια viewed analytically—its sphere and contents described.—Ἐγκράτεια had a long ethical history behind it in St. Paul's time. The non-ethical meaning does not concern us here.* Aristotle (*Eudem. Eth.* vii.) gives us the prevalent notions concerning it in his own day and tries to fix its intension and extension by criticizing these notions. According to him, the word was sometimes used vaguely in a wide sense so as to include control of all passions, emotions, and actions. He points out, however, that as a rule in these cases the word was not used *simpliciter*, but with the sphere indicated by the presence of a defining substantive, *e.g.* 'temperate as regards fame,' etc. The ambiguity as to the range of the word, however, is due to the fact that this was not always done. Ordinary speech is notoriously inexact. For this reason we cannot be sure how much the Apostle means to cover by it in Tit 1^{8}. The Greek commentators took it in the wide sense—control of the tongue, the hand, and the eyes, the not being dragged down by any passion; but it is safer to regard it as referring mainly to self-control in the matters of eating and drinking and lust. In the OT, however, the verb is used *simpliciter* in the wide sense. Joseph, in order to control his emotion before his brethren, went into his chamber and wept there; then he came out and had control over himself (*ἐξελθὼν ἐνεκρατεύσατο*, Gn 43^{31}). It is to be noted that here the term is used for control over generous impulses, which might have (by premature disclosure) spoiled their own good intentions. We see here what St. Peter may have had in his mind by making knowledge an element in self-control. He himself had lacked true self-control in the excess of noble impulses ungoverned by knowledge, as when he drew the sword for his Master's sake. St. Paul also has this in mind when he tells the Philippians that their love should increase in knowledge (Ph 1^{9}) and every perception. Beneficence and charity may be spoiled by lack of insight, by being beforehand with their gifts. 'What he desires and asks of them in the matter of charity is not more sacrifice, in which regard the Macedonian Churches had already distinguished themselves (2 Co $8^{1ff.}$ 11^{9}, 1 Th 4^{9}), nor that simplicity in giving which he so often commends (Ro 12^{8}, 2 Co 9^{13}, Ja 1^{5}, Mt 6^{3}), but rather the opposite—a clear insight into and a careful consideration of the circumstances and conditions under which their charity may be exercised consistently with uprightness and good order' (T. Zahn, *Introd. to the NT*, Eng. tr., Edinburgh, 1909, i. 527). Thus we see that there may be intemperance in generosity, in charity, and in the very highest qualities of the soul. Very different from the temperance of Joseph is the false temperance of Saul. He offered sacrifice in Samuel's absence and thus exonerates himself: 'I overcame myself, and offered the holocaust' (*ἐνεκρατευσάμην καὶ ἀνήνεγκα τὴν ὁλοκαύτωσιν*), 1 S 13^{12} (LXX 1 Kings). What appeared to Saul temperance was really lack of faith and lack of patience, and often we see men whose aims are good intemperate in their methods and in their haste. From these examples it is clear that the word 'temperance' may be used in the very widest sense.

The privative adjective is used thus widely also in Pr 27^{20a}, but here the universe of discourse is distinctly mentioned (*οἱ ἀπαίδευτοι ἀκρατεῖς γλώσσῃ*, 'unrestrained in speech'; cf. 4 Mac 5^{34} for a conjunction of the same ideas of training and self-control—*οὐ ψεύσομαί σε, παιδευτὰ νόμε, οὐδὲ φεύξομαί σε, φίλη ἐγκράτεια*). St. Paul has the same ideas in Tit 2^{12}, but to him the source of true *παιδεία* is not the Law but the grace of God; yet in both cases the influence of training is recognized, and training here includes both the Aristotelian *μάθησις* and *ἄσκησις* (Diog. Laert. v. 18). It is striking how large a vocabulary St. Paul has for sins of speech (cf. St. James also), and in the only place where he uses *ἀκρατεῖς*, side by side with it occurs *διάβολοι* (2 Ti 3^{3}). Perhaps the reason for this emphasis on such sins is that these have always been a peculiar failing of the East.

As a strict *terminus ethicus*, however, *ἐγκράτεια*, as Aristotle points out, was restricted to control over the sensual desires—the desires for food, drink, and sexual indulgence. Similar to this is the usage in Sir 18^{30}–19^{3}, a passage which is headed *Ἐγκράτεια ψυχῆς*. There gluttonous luxury (*τρυφή*), wine, and women (*οἶνος καὶ γυναῖκες*) are condemned. 'Wine and women will make men of understanding to fall away: and he that cleaveth to harlots will be the more reckless' (19^{2}). The passage may well be contrasted with 2 P $1^{5\text{-}9}$. In the one passage we have the advance in virtue of the man who makes provision (*ἐπιχορηγήσατε*) for the development of faith; in the other, the descent in vice of him who makes provision (*χορηγήσεις*) for his lusts.

---

* The non-ethical meaning occurs in 2 Mac $10^{15.\ 17}$: *οἱ Ἰδουμαῖοι ἐγκρατεῖς ἐπικαίρων ὀχυρωμάτων ὄντες*, 'being masters of important strongholds'; *ἐγκρατεῖς ἐγένοντο τῶν τόπων*, 'they made themselves masters of the positions.'

Even inside this domain of sensual desires the word differs from σωφροσύνη, with which in popular speech it was often identified, for the latter indicates not only that a man has control of his passions, but that he has an easy mastery over them. Σωφροσύνη extends also to the highest faculties of man, which ἐγκράτεια when accurately used does not. In the σώφρων the passions are entirely harmonized with one another and unitedly under the persuasive hegemony of the reason, the more violent passions being thus excluded. On the other hand, the ἐγκρατής is subject to strong desires, which he can control only with difficulty and effort. This use of ἐγκράτεια agrees well with the manner in which St. Paul describes those Corinthians whose lusts were as a hidden fire or the heathen who burned towards one another in lust.

'Εγκράτεια is thus lower in the moral scale than σωφροσύνη but higher than ἀκολασία (a term not found in the NT). The ἀκόλαστος has definitely adopted pleasure as his good and pursues it without qualms of conscience. The ἀκρατής knows what is right, but either his passions are too strong for him or he sophisticates his reason into thinking that in any particular action the doing of it is good for him. He may be compared to a State which passes good legislation but does not carry it out. The ἐγκρατής would carry it out by force if necessary. His morality at times may be a police and military morality, whereas the σώφρων may be compared to a State in which the citizens obey good laws instinctively and lovingly without the necessity of force, where right is followed easily because it is right. Aristotle also draws moral distinctions inside this virtue itself, saying that the incontinence of anger is not so bad as that of premeditated lust. The one is a momentary impulse, the other is crafty, full of stratagems in order to gratify the 'goddess of the Cyprian isle, artisan of many a wile.' There is no doubt that this is true. St. Paul when he lost his temper before the high priest was not so culpable as David in the case of Bathsheba, though both were guilty of a breach of ἐγκράτεια. We have a conspicuous example of temperance in Joseph in Potiphar's house, where everything conspired against him to test his self-control. The Greek moralist recognizes also those who are incontinent by heredity, by temperament, and by habit. In the discussion of this virtue the Greek thinker came face to face with the problem which confronted St. Paul also (Ro 7)—the problem of moral inability (ἀκρασία). 'How can any one with a right conception of duty be incontinent?' This is the standing moral difficulty of Greek ethics, and indeed of all ethics. In the letter of Aristeas a similar question is asked: 'Why do not the majority of men take possession of virtue?' and it is answered thus—ὅτι φυσικῶς ἅπαντες ἀκρατεῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς ἡδονὰς τρεπόμενοι γεγόνασιν (H. B. Swete, *Introduction to the OT in Greek*, London, 1900, p. 567). Socrates and Plato tried to solve the problem as one of knowledge; hence their insistence on a right education, because to them 'Vice is Ignorance.' Aristotle sees deeper: He maintains that the Socratic view is contrary to experience, but on the whole his solution of the moral problem is intellectual (*Eudem. Eth.* vii. 111). But how lame this is when it is contrasted with St. Paul's view! The exceeding sinfulness of sin, the rebellion of the will against law, even Divine law, the bitter cry, 'O wretched man that I am!' all reveal how deep Christian insight goes in its diagnosis of the moral condition of man; but this only in order to show the radicalness of the needed cure, the greatness of the moral regenerating power issuing from the Redeemer, and the glory of the deliverance effected for man and in man by Him. Greek thinkers were always prone to solve moral difficulties by placing emphasis on the sway of reason in the soul, but what if the reason itself be as disturbed and distorted as the other faculties? What if prior to education there are needed regeneration and repentance—a change affecting a man at the very centre of his personality? 'The Old World knew nothing of Conversion; instead of an *Ecce Homo*, they had only some *Choice of Hercules*. . . . What to Plato was but a hallucination, and to Socrates a chimera, is now clear and certain to your Zinzendorfs, your Wesleys, and the poorest of their Pietists and Methodists' (Carlyle, *Sartor Resartus*, bk. ii. ch. x.). This is after all the great crux in regard to temperance—not a minute analysis of the virtue itself, not a punctilious set of prohibitions and allowances, but its creation in the regeneration of the total character; and this can never be effected satisfactorily by crushing the emotions even to purify the intellect. The mind itself must be moved with a nobler passion, and it is because Christ does this that He is the Saviour of men. To those who indulged in wine wherein is profligacy the command is to be filled with the Spirit—one exalted emotional state is contrasted with another of a different quality.

To the regenerated man there remains the further question, viz. how his new life can be fostered and developed in a corrupt society and in a soul weak and imperfect. Certain things and states are dangerous, and temperance is thus essential. St. Paul is acutely conscious, for instance, of the danger of sexual lust. What does ἐγκράτεια mean in this respect? Does it in its perfection imply celibacy and virginity? This was the view that ultimately gained ground in the Roman Catholic Church, where the clergy cannot marry; and some would so read St. Paul in 1 Co 7, but without justification. St. Paul knew that in a city like Corinth it was almost imperative that men should marry, because otherwise they could not be continent. But if one can be continent without marriage, then his energies are more at the disposal of Christian service. It is clear that St. Paul is not here preaching celibacy *per se* as a duty. Continence is above celibacy or above marriage. His theme is the necessity of ἐγκράτεια. 'But he mentions himself rather than say ἐν ἐγκρατείᾳ to show that continence is not a utopian dream. Pierius, the Alexandrian commentator in the third century (Jerome, *Ep.* 49, Ad Pamm.), is not the last to maintain that the Apostle in this verse preaches celibacy' (T. C. Edwards, *1 Corinthians*^{2}, London, 1885, p. 162). To the Apostle marriage with continence is infinitely better than celibacy with concupiscence. Yet we find this view of ἐγκράτεια as celibacy gaining ground in the Church itself till it assumed the form of organized asceticism. The Encratites enjoined abstinence from marriage altogether. Tatian (Eus. *HE* iv. 29) says it is 'corruption and fornication,' φθορὰ καὶ πορνεία. This attitude is distinctly called a doctrine of demons by St. Paul (1 Ti 4$^{1.2}$), and was condemned by the Church on the ground of its dualistic basis, but the Church itself enjoined Encratite ethics on the clergy—without the Encratite foundation—while allowing the laity to be 'temperate' in marrying. The influences which brought this about were the real moral reactions against gross impurity and the consequent contempt of the marriage state—a contempt utterly alien to the practice and the ideal of Judaism. St. Peter speaks of the chaste conversation of wives, and St. Paul applies to the married bishop the qualification 'temperate' (Tit 1^8).

The temperance of the NT is thus a demand on all—the celibate for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake is higher morally not because of his celibacy but because of his increased energy in the interests of the Kingdom. It is impossible to conceive St. Paul writing letters and treatises on virginity in the manner of the Fathers. He maintains that he himself and all Christians have the liberty to lead about a wife as St. Peter did (1 Co 9^{5}). Although we can see how the rigorous view of *ἐγκράτεια* developed, and can in a sense justify it, yet this should not blind us to the fundamental difference between it and the NT view (see von Dobschütz, *op. cit.*, p. 259 ff., for an excellent description of this development).

Similarly in regard to wine, animal food, and possessions. When abstinence from these is enjoined on dualistic grounds, then such abstinence is wrong. St. Paul exhorts Timothy to drink wine for his stomach's sake, and, even if we do not agree with those who hold that he was here combating total abstinence, yet it is a proof that such abstinence may be practised on false grounds. In our own times this question of abstinence from intoxicating drinks is the 'temperance' problem, and those who maintain that this abstinence is imperative do so on physiological grounds, on the ground of the tremendous havoc caused by drink, and they can defend it on St. Paul's view that for the sake of the weak brother the strong should avoid the creation of stumbling-blocks (see art. ABSTINENCE).

3. The full Christian ideal of ἐγκράτεια.—The *locus classicus* for NT temperance is 1 Co 9. Here the Apostle is dealing with the question of Christian liberty, and he unhesitatingly defends liberty in view of meats and drinks, in view of marriage, and also the liberty of the Christian pastor from manual labour because the Church ought to support him. But temperance comes in in the forgoing of these, if need be, for the sake of effectiveness in Christian work. The freeman of Christ is living in a world full of dangers. He has to face customs innocent in themselves but inextricably bound up with sinful temptations; he has to gain men, steeped in traditions and prejudices, to Christ; he has to think of brethren less advanced than himself, and he has to remember his own sinful tendencies. He is thus like an athlete with a race to run or a pugilist with an antagonist to knock out. The athlete or the pugilist had to undergo a rigorous training beforehand. For ten months before the actual contest, he was under oath to follow a prescribed diet (*ἀναγκοφαγία*) and a strenuous training (*ἄσκησις*). He had to abstain 'venere et vino' (see Horace, *Ars Poetica*, 412 ff., Epict. *Enchir.* 3. 5, and Wetstein, *in loc.*). St. Paul applies all this to the Christian, and can illustrate it by his own conduct. The best commentary is 2 Co $6^{3\text{ff.}}$. It is possible to misunderstand all this impassioned rhetoric of the Apostle and to justify by it not only fasts and restrictions but also positive flagellation and even self-mutilation, but fortunately in Colossians the Apostle himself has made this impossible. The *ἀφειδία τοῦ σώματος* (Col 2^{23}) is not in the Apostle's mind. It is not the material of the body he fights, but the body as the organ of sin, and his disciplining is abundantly furnished by what he has to endure in the pursuit of the great end, viz. gaining others to Christ and self-progress in likeness to Him. His thorn in the flesh he prays against. He would never manufacture means of pain. Lecky is right in condemning useless self-sacrifice and unnecessary suffering, and St. Paul would never approve of Newman's patient (cf. *Map of Life*, ed. London, 1901, pp. 56, 57). Men can be temperate on very low grounds.

The hunter can 'despise pleasure, and bear cold, hunger, and fatigue, as if they were no evils. Cf. Hor. *Car.* I. i. 25.

"Manet sub Jove frigido
Venator, teneræ conjugis immemor,
Seu visa est catulis cerva fidelibus,
Seu rupit teretes Marsus aper plagas"'
(Thomas Reid, *Works*^{2}, ed. Edinburgh, 1849, p. 579).

But it is not Christian temperance unless the aim is Christian, and St. Paul here has more in view—infinitely more—than mere physical self-control. To him the body itself is part of the personality to be redeemed and to rise with Christ a spiritual body. Christian temperance includes the guiding, directing, controlling, of all faculties and actions, the forgoing of privileges, the risking of reputation for others in order that they may be won to Christ. When a man can so stand against sensual dangers, against pedantic criticism, against self-ease and self-praise, against the accidents of fortune and the rage of enemies, and meet them all as a disciplined army meets the foe, and all this *ἐν ἁγνότητι* (2 Co 6^{6}), in absolute purity of motive and temper, mind and body, then he is temperate in this wide, all-embracing sense.

LITERATURE.—See art. SOBRIETY, SOBERNESS; Plato, *Republic*, tr. B. Jowett^{3}, Oxford, 1888, Index, *s.v.* 'Temperance'; Aristotle, *Eudem. Ethics*, bk. vii.; E. von Dobschütz, *Christian Life in the Primitive Church*, Eng. tr., London, 1904, esp. ch. xvi., and Notes 5 ('Vegetarianism among the Ancients') and 6 ('On the Terminology of Morality'). Consult numerous treatises on cardinal virtues: H. Sidgwick, *Methods of Ethics*, 1874, *s.v.* 'Temperance'; T. H. Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics*, Oxford, 1883, bk. iii. ch. v.; E. Norman Gardiner, *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals*, London, 1910. For Encratites see Eusebius, *HE*, McGiffert's note, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Oxford, 1890, p. 208; A. G. Mortimer, *The Chief Virtues of Man*, London, 1904, p. 79 ff.; D. T. Young, *The Enthusiasm of God*, do., 1905, p. 217 ff.; J. Iverach, *The Other Side of Greatness*, do., 1906, p. 103 ff.; J. Clark Murray, *A Handbook of Christian Ethics*, Edinburgh, 1908, ch. iv. All text-books on Ethics deal with the virtue of temperance: cf. J. S. Mackenzie, *Manual of Ethics*^{4}, London, 1900, bk. iii. ch. iv.; J. Dewey and J. H. Tufts, *Ethics*, do., 1909, Index, *s.v.* 'Temperance'; J. Rickaby, *Moral Philosophy*, do., 1888. Consult also Gr. Lexicons, *s.v.* *ἐγκράτεια*; and NT Commentaries *in loc.* Suicer, i. 998, gives a full account of the later usage.

DONALD MACKENZIE.

TEMPLE.—The articles under this heading in *HDB*, *DCG*, and *EBi* make another description of the Temple and its services unnecessary. What is relevant here is an indication of the significance of the sanctuary and its ritual in apostolic Christianity.

1. Jewish Christians and the Temple.—St. Luke evidently attached much importance to the fact recorded at the end of his Gospel, that after the resurrection of Christ the apostles 'were continually in the temple, blessing God' (Lk 24^{53}). Their assurance of Jesus' Messiahship, proved by His victory over death, made no breach in the continuity of their Jewish faith and practice. It rather revealed to their minds a new wealth of meaning in the old ritual, and so fired themselves as worshippers with a new enthusiasm. A. C. McGiffert (*History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, Edinburgh, 1897, p. 64 f.) thinks that 'it may fairly be supposed that the effect of their Christian faith was to make all of the early disciples more devout and earnest Jews than they had ever been.' 'We have distinct evidence that Christian Jews like other Jews frequented the temple, the sanctuary of the nation, and thereby maintained their claim to be Jews in the true sense' (F. J. A. Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, London, 1894, p. 45). After the baptism of fire on the Day of Pentecost they are found 'continuing stedfastly with one accord in the temple' (Ac 2^{46}). Peter and John went up into the Temple at the hour of prayer (3^{1}), and in the fulfilment of their commission as witnesses for Christ (1^{8}) they found their best audiences in the Temple-courts. At the Beautiful Gate—either the Gate of Nicanor leading into the court of the Israelites or the Eastern Gate of the outer court—they moved the crowd by performing an act of healing in Christ's name; and in Solomon's Porch—the long colonnade in the east of the Temple area—Peter testified to the raising of the Prince of Life whom the rulers had in ignorance killed. It is significant that two apostles were arrested not by the religious, but by the secular authorities, *i.e.* the head of the Temple police (*στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ*) and the Sadducees (Ac 4[1]); and, if their freedom of speech was somewhat curtailed, this was not because of their attitude to the Temple and its services, which was evidently quite correct, but simply because they were said to be exciting the multitude and disturbing the peace. The reproof administered to them was as mild as their confinement was brief; and the Christian Jews, finding that they could not be excluded from the Temple precincts, continued to make Solomon's Porch their ordinary rendezvous (5[12]). A second arrest of apostles followed, but the report has it that the angel who released them bade them go and speak in the Temple all the words of this life (5[17-20]), and accordingly they are again found standing there and teaching the people (5[25]). Until the appearance of Stephen created a new situation, the apostles were daily in the Temple, teaching and preaching Jesus as the Messiah. Against so strict and thoroughgoing Jews the guardians of the national religion, as embodied in the Temple and its cultus, had no ground of complaint, and the apostles on their side 'could still cherish the hope that the nation at large might be brought to turn and bow the knee to its true Messiah' (Hort, *op. cit.*, p. 45 f.). For the present the bearing of their teaching upon the Temple itself was but dimly, if at all, perceived, and wholly unexpressed.

2. Stephen and the Temple.—It was the protomartyr that brought Christianity into open conflict with Judaism. His attitude to the Temple has been variously understood. He was accused of speaking 'blasphemous words against Moses, and against the law' (Ac 6[11]), of ceasing not 'to speak words against this holy place and the law' (v.[13]). C. von Weizsäcker (*Apostolic Age*, Eng. tr., i.[2] [London, 1897] 64) holds that his speech does not by any means refute the grounds of complaint. On the contrary, it is at least in part equivalent to a substantial justification of the doctrine complained of, since it declares at its close that the worship of God in this temple 'made with hands' had never been in accordance with the will of God. F. Spitta (*Die Apostelgeschichte*, Halle, 1891, p. 105 f.) also thinks that the building of the Temple is represented by Stephen as an unauthorized and presumptuous act. Teaching of such a kind, however, would have brought Stephen into collision not only with the Hellenistic Jews, but with the whole body of Christians in Jerusalem. It seems much more likely that he made no theoretical attack upon the Mosaic Law, while his declaration that 'the Most High dwelleth not in houses made with hands' (7[48-50]) was so far from being new that it merely echoed the words of Solomon at the dedication of the first Temple (1 K 8[27]). It was not the worship but the spirit of the worshippers that aroused his scornful indignation. Warning them, in the manner of the old prophets, that no amount of attention to outward ordinances could ever secure the favour of God, he demanded a spiritual as opposed to a mechanical religion. If he was in the habit of repeating Christ's prediction of the destruction of the Temple at the Parousia—and this was probably what gave colour to the charges made against him—he interpreted that threat not as an abrogation of the Mosaic Law, but as a judgment upon the nation for its sin. The third Temple might fall as the first had fallen, and yet the Torah itself remain intact. 'To call Stephen a forerunner of Paul, and to think of him as anticipating in any way Paul's treatment of the Jewish law and his assertion of a free Gentile Christianity, is to misunderstand him' (McGiffert, *op. cit.*, p. 89). For him, as for every other Jewish Christian in Jerusalem, the Law, without distinction of moral and ceremonial precepts, was 'ordained of angels'; in his view the nation's treatment of its prophets and its Messiah was the supreme proof that the Law had not been kept; and the burden of his preaching was a call to Jerusalem not to close her Temple and abolish her ritual, but to take the lead in a national repentance for a broken Law.

3. St. Paul and the Temple.—The recognition of the validity of a Christianity to which Jerusalem and the Temple were negligible quantities was the result of a protracted controversy in which St. Paul was the champion of freedom. For him the observance of the ancient ritual laws and traditions, which had so long been a matter of principle, becomes at last one of indifference. He is consequently accused of 'teaching all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses' (Ac 21[21]). This he never did, and, to prove that the charge was groundless, he was advised, during his last visit to Jerusalem, to conciliate the great mass of Christian Jews by performing the vow of a Nazirite in the Temple. Weizsäcker thinks that in the whole narrative of this episode 'practically nothing is historical' (*op. cit.*, ii. [London, 1895] 14; but McGiffert holds 'that Paul may well have done just what he is reported to have done' (*op. cit.*, p. 343). Had he been advised by James to prove that he habitually observed the Law as a matter of conscience, he could never have consented. But he had long been in the habit of identifying himself in things non-essential now with Jews and now with Gentiles in order that he might 'win some of them' (1 Co 9[20]), and the last instance of conformity was merely the most striking. What impression the object-lesson actually made upon the law-abiding Christian Jews for whom it was specially intended is not recorded; but it clearly had other results which were not anticipated, for the Jews rose in arms against St. Paul as a profaner of the Temple, and the Romans arrested him as a disturber of the peace.

4. St. James and the Temple.—James the Just, the Lord's brother, represented two ideas—the continuance of the Church in union with the Temple, and the hope of the conversion of Israel. He was the acknowledged leader of those Christians who were zealous for the Law (*ζηλωταὶ τοῦ νόμου*, Ac 21[20]). If he conceded the principle of Gentile Christian freedom, he did it reluctantly. He was the staunch defender not only of the primacy but of the permanence of Judaic Christianity. After his martyrdom (Euseb. *HE* ii. 23) his spirit and ideal survived for a time, but the swift and dramatic evolution of events made the position of the Christian Church in the Jewish nation and under the Law more and more untenable. When the excitement of the conflict with Rome gradually became intense, and the inevitable crisis approached, the Christians found it necessary (about A.D. 67) to quit Jerusalem and migrate to the Hellenistic city of Pella, beyond the Jordan. Their hope of a Jewish national Church, centralized in the Temple and giving both law and gospel to mankind, had at least to be postponed. But in this instance postponement meant ultimate abandonment. In three years the Temple was destroyed, Jewish nationality shattered, and St. James's theory of a hegemony of Judaic Christianity confuted by the remorseless logic of history. But a far higher ideal could then be realized. 'The hour cometh, when neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father' (Jn 4[21]). 'And he showed me the holy city Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God. . . . And I saw no temple therein' (Rev 21[10. 22]).

LITERATURE.—A. Hausrath, *History of the NT Times*, London, 1895, ii. 176 ff.; E. F. Scott, *The Apologetic of the NT*, do., 1907, p. 78 ff.

JAMES STRAHAN.

TEMPLE-KEEPER.—See DIANA.

TEMPTATION, TRIAL.—'Temptation' is the AV translation of *πειρασμός* in every instance except one (1 P 4^{12}); and generally in RV, but not in Ac 20^{19}, Rev 3^{10}, 1 P 4^{12}, where we find 'trials,' 'trial,' and 'prove.' The cognate verb is usually tr. 'tempt,' but we also find 'assay,' Ac 9^{26} and 16^{7} (AV and RV) 24^{6} (RV); 'go about,' 24^{6} (AV); 'examine,' 2 Co 13^{5} (AV), 'try' (RV). The compound verb *ἐκπειράζω* is tr. 'tempt' by both Eng. versions (1 Co 10^{9}). The tempter is *ὁ πειράζων* (1 Th 3^{5}, AV and RV). *'Απείραστος* is rendered 'cannot be tempted' (Ja 1^{13}, AV and RV).

'Trial' in AV represents *δοκιμή* (2 Co 8^{2}; RV 'proof'); *δοκίμιον* (1 P 1^{7}; RV 'proof'); *πεῖρα* (He 11^{36}, AV and RV). 'Try' represents *δοκιμάζω* (1 Co 3^{13}, 1 Th 2^{4}, 1 P 1^{7}, 1 Jn 4^{1}; RV 'prove'), which, however, in RV is always and in AV is more frequently tr. 'prove' or 'approve' (for 'approve' see G. L. Craik, *The English of Shakespeare*, London, 1869, p. 147f.); *πειράζω* (He 11^{17}, Rev $2^{2.\,10}$ 3^{10}, AV and RV 'try'); *πειρασμός* (1 P 4^{12}; RV 'prove'). 'Tried' is *δόκιμος* (Ja 1^{12}; RV 'approved'), in every other instance tr. 'approve' in both AV and RV.

To 'tempt' does not always mean to 'seduce to sin.' The Gr. word usually so tr. may mean merely 'attempt.' St. Paul 'attempted' to join himself to the disciples (Ac 9^{26}). He 'attempted' to go into Bithynia (16^{7}). He was accused of 'attempting' to profane the Temple (24^{6}). It may mean to 'try,' 'examine,' in order to ascertain the quality or nature of a thing or person. 'The hour of trial or temptation . . . is to come . . . to try or tempt them that dwell upon the earth' (Rev 3^{10}). The angel of the church in Ephesus 'tried' or 'tempted' them which called themselves apostles and were not, and found them false (2^{2}). 'Temptations' may be circumstances which give a man an opportunity of showing what is in him. Thus St. James exhorts his readers to count it all joy when they fall into manifold 'temptations' (1^{2}). The ancient worthies were 'tempted,' and acquitted themselves like the heroes they were (He 11^{37}). St. Paul met with 'trials' which befell him by the plots of the Jews (Ac 20^{19}; cf. He 11^{36}). Sometimes it is clear that the hope is entertained that the person tempted will stand the test. Abraham was 'tried,' and offered up Isaac (He 11^{17}). St. Paul exhorts the Corinthians to 'try' themselves, to 'prove' themselves (2 Co 13^{5}). The angel of the church in Smyrna is warned that some of them will be cast into prison that they may be 'tried' (Rev 2^{10}). St. Peter tells his readers that the fiery trial (*πύρωσις*) among them cometh upon them to 'tempt' or to 'prove' them (1 P 4^{12}). St. Paul rejoices that the 'temptation' to the Galatians in his flesh was overcome by them (Gal 4^{14}). 'God cannot be tempted with evil' (Ja 1^{13}), but there is a sense in which He may be 'tempted' or 'tried.' Men by their sinful and rebellious conduct may provoke Him to display His righteous indignation against sin, and when they act otherwise than in accordance with His will they may be said to be 'tempting' or 'trying' Him. Thus St. Peter says that Ananias and Sapphira are 'tempting' the Spirit of the Lord by their deceit with regard to their property (Ac 5^{9}). The same Apostle asserts that the brethren are 'tempting' God by wishing to subject the Gentile converts to circumcision (15^{10}). In the day of temptation in the wilderness the Israelites 'tempted' God (He $3^{8f.}$, 1 Co 10^{9}). There are not a few instances in which 'temptation' means seduction to sin or exposure to the danger of falling before it. 'They that desire to be rich fall into a temptation and a snare' (1 Ti 6^{9}). The married amongst the Corinthians are warned to beware lest Satan 'tempt' them because of their incontinency (1 Co 7^{5}). St. Paul is afraid lest the Thessalonians have yielded to the 'temptation' to apostasy (1 Th 3^{5}). He exhorts the Galatians to be considerate towards those who have been overtaken in any trespass, lest they also should be 'tempted' (6^{1}). St. James describes the course which temptation when unresisted takes. 'Each man is tempted, when he is drawn away by his own lust, and enticed. Then the lust, when it hath conceived, beareth sin' ($1^{14f.}$). In the sense of enticing to evil it is Satan that tempts men. He is the tempter. St. Paul is anxious lest 'the tempter' had 'tempted' the Thessalonians, and his labour should be in vain (1 Th 3^{5}). Satan may 'tempt' the Corinthians (1 Co 7^{5}). Men transgress by the suggestions of 'the adversary' (Clem. Rom. li. 1). In this sense of the word God tempts no man (Ja 1^{13}). He rather so regulates the temptation that men may be able to resist it. 'God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation make also the way of escape, that ye may be able to endure it' (1 Co 10^{13}). He 'knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation' (2 P 2^{9}); and this is true also when 'temptation' means 'distress.' The Mighty One hath not forgotten the house of Israel in 'temptation' (*in tentatione*, 4 Ezr 12^{47}). Christ, too, succours the 'tempted.' Having been tempted Himself in all points like as we are, yet without sin (He 4^{15}), having Himself suffered being tempted, He is able to succour them that are tempted (2^{18}).

Temptation, whether arising from trying circumstances or from incitement to sin, if successfully encountered, leads to progress in the moral life and to blessedness. Among the Agrapha is the saying, 'A man is unproved (*ἀδόκιμος*) if he be untempted' (*ἀπείραστος*, *Didasc. Syr.* ii. 8). Tertullian reports one to the effect that 'neminem intentatum regna cœlestia consecuturum' (*de Bapt.* 20). Faith tested results in patience (Ja $1^{2f.}$). 'Blessed is the man that endureth temptation; for when he hath been approved (*δόκιμος*), he shall receive the crown of life' (1^{12}). Those whose faith withstands manifold temptations shall receive praise and glory and honour (1 P $1^{6f.}$).

We have seen that the Gr. words usually rendered 'temptation' and 'tempt' sometimes have the meaning of trying or testing. But words used more frequently with these meanings are *δοκιμή* and its cognates, and in the rest of this art. it is with these words that we shall deal. Men and things are 'tried' in order to find out their true nature. Gold is 'tried' with fire (1 P 1^{7}). Before partaking of the Lord's Supper a man must 'try' himself (1 Co 11^{28}). Men must 'try' themselves whether they are in the faith (2 Co 13^{5}). Each man must 'try' his own work (Gal 6^{4}). 'Test all things; hold fast that which is good' (1 Th 5^{21}). Deacons must be 'proved' before they are allowed to serve (1 Ti 3^{10}). Fire 'tests' the work of men (1 Co 3^{13}). God 'tests' or 'examines' men's hearts (1 Th 2^{4}). 'Prove the spirits, whether they are of God' (1 Jn 4^{1}). Sometimes it is evident that it is hoped that the testing will have a favourable result, and it may be pointed out that Satan is never said to 'test' men. St. Paul wrote to the Corinthians that he might know the 'proof' of them, whether they were obedient in all things (2 Co 2^{9}). He 'proves' through the earnestness of others the sincerity of their love (8^{8}). Frequently it appears to be taken for granted that the object 'tested' will be or has been found worthy. The Jew 'approveth' the things that are excellent (? Ro 2^{18}). It is hoped that the Philippians will do the same (1^{10}). Men may 'approve' what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God (Ro 12^{2}). St. Paul has been 'approved' of God (1 Th 2^{4}).

The Ephesians are exhorted to 'approve' what is well-pleasing unto the Lord (5^{10}). Occasionally the word seems to mean 'to pass a verdict of worthiness upon.' 'Whomsoever ye shall approve by letters, them will I send' (1 Co 16^{3}). 'Happy is he that judgeth not himself in that which he approveth' (Ro 14^{22}).

One who conducts himself nobly under trial has advanced a step beyond patience (Ro 5^{4}). He has attained a trustworthy character (Ph 2^{22}; cf. 2 Co 8^{22}). He is 'approved' (δόκιμος). If the result of the testing is unsatisfactory, he is 'reprobate' (ἀδόκιμος). He who serves Christ in the Kingdom of God is 'approved' of men (Ro 14^{18}). Apelles is 'the approved in Christ' (Ro 16^{10}). One who refused to countenance divisions (αἱρέσεις) in the Church is 'approved' (1 Co 11^{19}). 'Approval' means not self-commendation, but the commendation of the Lord (2 Co 10^{18}). A workman needing not to be ashamed is 'approved' unto God (2 Ti 2^{15}). Doing that which is honourable brings a person real, as distinguished from seeming, 'approval' (2 Co 13^{7}).

Literature.—*EBi*, art. 'Trial, Trying,' *HDB*, art. 'Tempt, Temptation,' *DCG*, art. 'Temptation'; *SDB*, art. 'Temptation'; *Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament*^{2}, Freiburg, 1892, *s.v.* 'Versuchung' in Indexes; H. Ewald, *Old and New Testament Theology*, Eng. tr., Edinburgh, 1888, p. 263 ff.; F. W. Robertson, *Sermons*, 1st ser., London, 1875, serm. vii.; John Foster, *Lectures*, do., 1853, i. 42 ff.

William Watson.

TEN.—See Numbers.

TENT, TENT-MAKING.—In only one instance is σκηνή translated 'tent.' This occurs in He 11^{9} RV, where 'tents' replaces 'tabernacles' of AV. Other passages containing σκηνή are dealt with under art. Tabernacle. Of the derived meanings the only one that need be remarked on is found in 2 Co $5^{1.4}$, where σκῆνος (τό) in the sense of 'tabernacle' or 'bodily frame' evidently arises from the 'light tent-house that has no permanency' (A. Deissmann, *St. Paul*, London, 1912, p. 62; cf. p. 51); cf. σκηνῶμα (2 P $1^{13.14}$) and the metaphor underlying τὸ ἀναλῦσαι (Ph 1^{23}), ἀνάλυσις (2 Ti 4^{6}), 'breaking up' (an encampment); see J. B. Lightfoot, *Philippians*^{4}, London, 1878, p. 93.

The chief interest centres in the compound word 'tentmakers' (σκηνοποιοί), occurring in Ac 18^{3}. The clause in which it appears is not found in Codex Bezæ. This omission is significant in view of the indefiniteness of 20^{34} (see W. M. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, London, 1893, p. 159, and *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, London, 1895, p. 253). The collocation διὰ τὸ ὁμότεχνον εἶναι and ἦσαν γὰρ σκηνοποιοὶ τῇ τέχνῃ is felt by Ramsay to be awkward (*St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 253). In spite of this, most commentators are content to accept the additional clause (bracketed, AV; without brackets, RV), and devote attention to the nature of the craft or trade pursued by St. Paul. In regard to this, opinion is divided as to whether he was a weaver of the cloth for tents or whether, the cloth being supplied, he shaped and sewed this together to make tents (see W. M. Furneaux, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Oxford, 1912, p. 294; F. Godet, *Introduction to the New Testament, The Epistles of St. Paul*, Edinburgh, 1894, p. 69 f.). The word employed (σκηνοποιοί) favours the latter view, inasmuch as it names tents and not materials for tents. It may be objected, however, that the manipulation of the web for the specific purpose of tent-making was not sufficient to call for special artisans. All the processes of spinning, weaving, shaping, and sewing together are combined by the Bedouin of the present day (I. Benzinger, *Hebräische Archäologie*^{2}, Tübingen, 1907, pp. 88, 146). On the other hand, the fact that St. Paul was a native of Cilicia, where the industry of weaving goat's hair into a rough kind of cloth was general, supports the former view (E. Schürer, *HJP* ii. i. [Edinburgh, 1885] 44 n.; *HDB* iii. 699^{a}). It is permissible to think that this *cilicium*, as it was called, passed as an article of commerce in the form of a web of stated dimensions, which would require adjustment before it could be used for particular purposes. On the whole, the likelihood is that St. Paul and his fellow-craftsmen made neither the web nor the complete tent, but curtains of several webs' width, which, when hung, formed tents (*SDB*, art. 'Spinning and Weaving').

Chrysostom's σκηνοῤῥάφος (from ῥάπτω, 'sew *or* stitch together') would seem to point to the craft of tent-tailor, but the alternative σκυτοτόμος, also given by him (and Origen), shows that he probably had another material, viz. leather, in his mind. That St. Paul was a worker in leather is accepted by J. Moffatt (*The Historical New Testament*^{2}, Edinburgh, 1901, p. 445; cf. H. A. W. Meyer, *Acts of the Apostles*, Edinburgh, 1877, ii. 131 f.). For a discussion of ἡνιοποιός, 'saddler,' probably a confusion with σκηνοποιός (*EGT*, 'Acts,' London, 1900, p. 385), see *ExpT* viii. [1896–97] 109, 153, 286.

Literature.—This is sufficiently indicated in the article.

W. Cruickshank.

TERTIUS (Τέρτιος, a Latin name).—Tertius is the amanuensis of St. Paul who in Ro 16^{22} interposes a greeting in his own name to the Apostle's readers, 'I Tertius, who write the epistle, salute you in the Lord' (RV), or possibly, 'I Tertius salute you, who write the epistle in the Lord' (ἀσπάζομαι ὑμᾶς ἐγὼ Τέρτιος ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἐν κυρίῳ). That St. Paul generally dictated his letters and added a few words in his own handwriting is clear from 1 Co 16^{21}, Gal 6^{11}, Col 4^{18}, 2 Th 3^{17}, and probably Philem ^{19}. The amanuensis no doubt took down the Apostle's words in shorthand, which was extensively used at the time, and later wrote out the letter for transmission (the employment of different amanuenses has been thought to account to some extent for the considerable diversity of style in the Pauline Epistles; see Sanday-Headlam, *ICC*, 'Romans'^{4}, 1900, p. lx). Then St. Paul took up the pen and authenticated the letter, thus guarding against the palming off of forged documents under his name. Other postscripts of this kind have been suspected in the doxology (Ro 16^{25-27}) and in 2 Co $13^{11\text{ff.}}$, Ph $4^{21\text{ff.}}$, 1 Th $5^{25\text{ff.}}$. All this was quite in accordance with the custom of the time. If we can suppose, with some, that the 'stake in the flesh' from which the Apostle suffered was ophthalmia, or that he was unfamiliar with the use of the pen owing to his manual labour of tent-making, there would seem to be sufficient reason for St. Paul following the custom. Nothing further is known of Tertius. It is quite as unlikely that St. Paul kept a regular secretary as that Tertius was a slave whom he hired to do the work. He must have been a faithful attendant and companion of the Apostle, who, whether the alternative rendering given above be correct or not, 'wrote the epistle in the Lord,' *i.e.* as a Christian, in a spirit of loving service (see G. Milligan, *Thessalonians*, 1908, Note A, p. 124 ff.). His personal salutation does not necessarily imply that he was known to those to whom the letter was directed. If its destination was Rome, it is just possible that, as he bears a Latin name and was perhaps a Roman, he may have had friends among those whom the Apostle greets. If we suppose that the salutations were sent to Ephesian Christians, we may conjecture that Tertius had met many of them on the missionary journeys on which he may have accompanied St. Paul.

T. B. Allworthy.

TERTULLUS.—Tertullus, a diminutive of Tertius, was the name of the 'orator' employed by the

Jews to lay their case against St. Paul before Felix (Ac 24^1). The term 'orator' indicates that the man belonged to the class of hired pleaders often employed in the provincial courts by those ignorant alike of Roman law and of the Latin tongue, in which as a rule all judicial procedure was carried on (but see Lewin, *St. Paul*, ii. 156). The speech delivered by Tertullus and briefly summarized in Ac 24 shows us the devices employed by such special pleaders. He seeks to conciliate the judge by flattering, if not very truthful, allusions to his actions as governor, particularly to his having established peace in the province (v.^{2}), no doubt a reference to the suppression of the bands of robbers that infested the country (Jos. *Ant.* XX. viii. 5, *BJ* II. xiii. 2). He carefully selects the points in the prisoner's career fitted to create the impression that St. Paul was a danger to the Roman rule—an exciter of sedition, a leader of a sect, a profaner of the Temple (vv.$^{5.6}$). In all probability Tertullus was a Roman, and not a Jew, as has been supposed by Blass (*Com. in loc.*). It was customary for budding Roman pleaders to practise for a time in the provinces. The fact that in his speech Tertullus uses the plural form and speaks of 'our law' does not by any means prove Jewish birth or nationality. The advocate naturally speaks from the point of view of his clients.

LITERATURE.—R. J. Knowling, *EGT*, 'Acts,' 1900, p. 476; T. Lewin, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*^{3}, 2 vols., 1875, ii. 156 ff.; art. 'Tertullus' in *HDB*; F. W. Blass, *Acta Apostolorum*, 1896, *in loc.*; H. H. Wendt and H. A. W. Meyer, *Acts*^{8}, 1899, *in loc.*

W. F. BOYD.

TESTAMENT.—See COVENANT.

TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS.—*Introductory.*—*The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* consists of a series of discourses assigned to the twelve sons of Jacob, varying in theme and style, but all more or less on the same general plan —(i.) some personal reminiscences; (ii.) some moral advice or psychological discussion; and (iii.) some predictions, usually including a warning to submit to the headship of Levi and Judah. The third section is invariably interpolated with Christian additions, which seldom occur in the other parts. The main theme in each *Testament* varies greatly; in one the interest may be moral, in another ceremonial and religious, in another military and political, in another psychological. In all except two Joseph is held up as an example of chastity or forgiveness. The references in *Test. Naph.* v. 7, vi. 6 are to the history of the Northern Kingdom but are quite free from the hostile comments passed on it in the *Hebrew Test. Naph.* i. 8, etc.

The work survives in a Greek primary version, valuable attestation being afforded by the secondary Armenian version, which towards the end of the book is remarkably free from Christian interpolations. The original work was written in Hebrew in the later years of John Hyrcanus, probably 109–106 B.C. The author was no doubt a Pharisee. He believes in the Resurrection and in angels, and lays great stress on prayer, almsgiving, and fasting. Visions are mentioned six times.

The work is remarkable for its high ethical teaching, in which it approaches nearer the NT than any other Jewish pseudepigraph, and for its expectation of a Messiah from the tribe of Levi. In the Resurrection life, however, the figure of the Messiah vanishes and in the reconstituted nation each tribe is ruled by its ancestor.

There are a number of Jewish interpolations of the 1st cent. B.C., some of which are as bitter in their attacks on the Hasmonæans as the original *Testaments* were fervent in their praises.

The Christian interpolations, which were somewhat limited in scope by their assumed context, reveal no great reflexion and an absence of developed theology. The Incarnation is crudely expressed, and there is one instance of Patripassian phraseology. Though there are several references to Baptism, there is not one to the Eucharist.

1. Contents.—*The Testament of Reuben* ('concerning thoughts,' β).—He implores his brethren and children to avoid fornication; for his own sin he was smitten with a sore disease for seven months, and would have perished but for the prayer of his father Jacob. On recovery he repented with abstinence from flesh and wine for seven years. In this period he received revelations concerning the seven spirits of deceit (i. 1–iii. 6, ii. 3–iii. 2 but is an interpolation, with Stoic affinities, describing the seven bodily senses). He bids his hearers beware of women, and confesses how he fell; advises them to set their mind on good works, study, and their flocks; impresses upon them the deadliness of fornication (iii. 8–iv. 7); reminds them of how Joseph conquered temptation (iv. 8–11), how women tempt; he cites the fall of the Watchers; he deprecates the meeting of men and women (v. 1–vi. 4); commands his sons to submit to Levi and bow down before his seed (vi. 5–12). Reuben dies and is ultimately buried in Hebron (vii. 1, 2).

The Testament of Simeon ('concerning envy,' β). —He tells how strong and fearless he was, yet he was jealous of Joseph and plotted his death, because the prince of deceit sent forth the spirit of jealousy and blinded his mind; but God's angel delivered Joseph, as Simeon was away when Joseph came. In punishment for his wrath, Simeon's right hand was half-withered for seven days, whereupon he repented and besought the Lord (i. 1–ii. 14). He warns against the spirit of deceit and envy; it wears away the envier and prompts to murder. After two years' fasting he learnt the remedy—to flee to the Lord; then the evil spirit flees, the envier's mind is lightened, and he sympathizes with the object of his envy (iii. 1–6). He recalls Joseph's forgiving treatment of his brethren; 'he was a good man, and had the Spirit of God within him.' Love expels envy with all its distracting power (iv. 1–v. 2). Simeon's descendants shall be few and divided, and not have sovereignty, as they shall be guilty of impurity, and resistance to Levi (v. 3–6). Still, if they forswear envy and stiffneckedness, Simeon shall flourish and spread far in the persons of his posterity (vi. 1, 2). Canaan, Amalek, Cappadocia, the Hittites, and Ham shall perish. Shem shall be glorified, and the Lord Himself will appear, and save men; evil spirits shall be trodden under foot, and Simeon shall arise (from the dead) (vi. 3–7). He enjoins obedience to Levi and Judah; from whom will arise the salvation of God: from the one God will raise a High Priest, from the other a King (vii. 1–3). Simeon dies and is ultimately buried in Hebron (viii. 1–ix. 2).

The Testament of Levi ('concerning the priesthood,' β).—At twenty he avenged Dinah. He describes his vision in Abel-Maul, following on his sudden realization of the world's sin. He enters into each of the three ('seven,' β) heavens, which are briefly described (i. 1–iii. 10). He foretells the Judgment (iv. 1). Levi is to be freed from iniquity, and to become to God 'a son, and a servant, and a minister of His presence,' and light up in Jacob the light of knowledge ['until the Lord shall visit all the Gentiles in His tender mercies for ever'] (iv. 2–6). He beholds the heavenly temple, and the Most High, and receives the priesthood from Him (v. 1, 2). The angel who intercedes (so β) for Israel brings him back to earth, and arms him, and bids him execute vengeance on Shechem (v. 3–7). He and Simeon destroy the Shechemites; he had opposed (so *c*) their being circumcised. He speaks of their outrageous behaviour in general, and declares that ‘the wrath of the Lord came upon them to the uttermost’ (vi. 1–11). He foretells Jacob’s conquest of the Canaanites (vii. 1–3). He describes his second vision; seven angels consecrate him and put on him the high-priestly robes; they foretell his descendants’ three-fold offices (*i.e.* Moses, the Aaronite priesthood, the Maccabæan kings); the third portion shall be called by a new name, and shall establish a new priesthood, and hold a prophetic office (viii. 1–19). At Bethel Jacob is told in vision that Levi is to be priest; he pays tithes to God through him (ix. 1–4). At Hebron Isaac teaches Levi the law of the priesthood (ix. 5–14). [The future captivity of Israel and desolation of Jerusalem, owing to the sins of Levi’s posterity (x. 1–5).]* Levi speaks of his marriage and sons (xi. 1–xii. 7). He commands his children to fear God, study the Law, and keep it; wisdom is the only inalienable possession (xiii. 1–9). [His descendants are intended to be the lights of Israel, and of the Gentiles; but they will abrogate the Law, and be guilty of sacrilege, profanity, and impurity. The Temple will be laid waste, and, but for the merits of Abraham, Isaác, and Jacob, all Israel would perish. For ‘seventy weeks’ they will go astray and profane the priesthood, and murder ‘a man who reneweth the law in the power of the Most High’ (xiv. 1–xvi. 5).] [A fragment in which seven jubilee periods are apparently described (xvii. 1–9).] [Another obscure fragment, referring to a fifth week (Ezra and the Return) and a seventh (marked by corruption of the priesthood in pre-Maccabæan times) (xvii. 10, 11).] He foretells the failure of the priesthood, and the rise of a new priest, as a king inaugurating a period of Messianic bliss (xviii. 1–5). [‘The heavens shall be opened, and from the temple of glory shall come upon him sanctification, with the Father’s voice. . . . And the spirit of understanding and sanctification shall rest upon him’; the Gentiles shall be enlightened, sin shall cease; ‘he (or rather ‘He’; see § 8) shall open the gates of paradise,’ and give the saints to eat from the tree of life, and Beliar shall be bound by him (xviii. 6–14).] Levi’s sons take an oath to keep the Law (xix. 1–3).

The Testament of Judah (‘concerning courage,’ β).—Judah was an obedient son. His father blessed him and foretold his kingship (i. 1–6). He performed feats of strength, and slew Canaanite kings at Shechem and Hazor (ii. 1–iv. 3). He describes the storming of various Canaanite towns (v. 1–vii. 11); he speaks of his marriage with Bath-shua (viii. 1–3), the war with Esau, who is slain by Jacob, the capture of the Edomite stronghold (ix. 1–8), Er and Onan’s sin and death, the evil result of his [Judah’s] Canaanite marriage (x. 1–xi. 5, xiii. 1–8). He recounts his own fall (xii. 1–12). Wine leads to fornication, which strips even a king of his kingship. In repentance he took no wine or flesh till his old age. The fear of God is the only safeguard in drinking wine (xiv. 1–xvi. 5). He warns against the love of money and gazing on women: they harm soul and body, and hinder the service of God. Avarice is connected with idolatry. God had mercy on him because he had acted in ignorance (xvii. 1–xix. 4). Two spirits attend man, that of truth [*i.e.* conscience] and that of deceit; the mind [*i.e.* will] is free to incline to either (xx. 1–5). He bids his sons love Levi; the priesthood is superior to the kingship (xxi. 1–5). [He foretells the sins of the (Maccabæan) kings, and the fall of the kingdom, till the appearing of God Himself. His sons will commit all manner of sins, be enslaved, repent, and be restored (xxi. 6–xxiii. 5).] The Messiah and His Kingdom shall then come (xxiv. 1–6). The patriarchs shall rise from the dead, and the twelve sons of Jacob shall reign—Levi first, Judah second, etc. He draws a picture of future Messianic bliss (xxv. 1–5). Judah dies (xxvi. 1–4).

The Testament of Issachar (‘concerning simplicity,’ β).—He begins with Rachel and Leah’s dispute about the mandrakes. Rachel’s continency is rewarded: she offers the mandrakes to the Lord (i. 1–ii. 5). Issachar was a man of upright character, a husbandman, and generous to the poor and oppressed. He dwells on the peace and power of the single heart. Levi is to have the priesthood and Judah the kingdom; he bids his sons obey both (iii. 1–v. 8). He prophesies the apostasy of his posterity (vi. 1–4). He is not conscious of sin (‘unto death,’ β). He bids his sons follow his chastity, abstinence, and truthfulness. He dies (vii. 1–9).

The Testament of Zebulun (‘concerning compassion and mercy,’ β).—He is not conscious of sin, except his suppression of the truth about Joseph. He gives details of the selling of Joseph: his price is spent on sandals by eight of the brethren; his [Zebulun’s] grief is described (i. 1–iv. 13). He was compassionate towards man and beast, hence his preservation from sickness and drowning (v. 1–5). He first made a boat to sail, and caught fish; thus he supplied all who had need (vi. 1–8). [He once stole a garment from home to clothe the naked; he showed pity at all times (vii. 1–viii. 3)—in 3 MSS only.] He exhorts to unity; disunion will ruin his posterity (viii. 4–ix. 6); but they will repent, and will finally return on God’s appearing. He assures his sons of his own resurrection—he will be their ruler. He dies (ix. 7–x. 7).

The Testament of Dan (‘concerning anger and lying,’ β).—He confesses his jealousy against Joseph. Anger blinds a man, and masters him body and soul (i. 1–iv. 4). Vexation of soul makes the Lord depart. He bids his sons avoid lying, and love the Lord and one another (iv. 5–v. 3). His sons will fall away and oppose Levi and Judah, but in vain; [their prince is Satan, and they will join Levi and Judah in sin (v. 6, 7)]; he foretells their captivity and return; salvation will arise from Judah and Levi; Beliar will be overthrown; ‘the saints shall rest in Eden, and in the New Jerusalem shall the righteous rejoice’ (v. 4–13). He bids his sons draw near to God and the angel that intercedes for them, ‘for he is a mediator between God and man.’ On the day on which Israel repents, the enemy’s kingdom shall end. The Lord will transform Israel into an obedient nation, superior to the angels (vi. 1–6). He dies (vii. 1–3).

The Testament of Naphtali (‘concerning natural goodness,’ β).—He speaks of his birth and his mother’s family. He was swift of foot, and his body corresponded with his spirit; bodily organs and their several functions are described (i. 1–ii. 10). He warns his sons not to go against nature and the law of God, as did the Gentiles, Sodom, and the Watchers (iii. 1–5). He prophesies his posterity’s apostasy, and restoration, when a man shall come ‘working righteousness’ (iv. 1–5). He gives an account of his vision on the Mount of Olives: Levi obtains the sun, Judah the moon, and Joseph ascends on a winged bull. In a second vision—that of the Ship of Jacob in a storm—Joseph flees in a boat, Levi and Judah keep together; at Levi’s prayer they reach land (v. 1–vi. 9). Jacob on hearing these dreams concludes that Joseph is alive (vii. 1–4). Naphtali foretells that from Levi and Judah shall salvation come. He contrasts the consequences of good and evil actions. He dies (viii. 1–ix. 3).

The Testament of Gad (‘concerning hatred,’ β).—Misjudged by Joseph, he hates him (i. 1–ii. 5).

---

* The passages in square brackets are Jewish interpolations.

Hatred recognizes no good, however good a man may be; it disregards God's law; and, while love would fain quicken the dead, hatred would in all things work for death (iii. 1–iv. 7). Hatred leads to lying, and poisons the life; the remedy is to be just and humble. 'True repentance after a godly sort' enlightens a man and 'leads the mind to salvation' (v. 1–9). Gad's sickness proved that 'by what things a man transgresses, by the same also is he punished.' Heart and will must be freed from hatred. One should love from the heart and forgive, whether a man repents or not; and pray for him who prospers more than oneself (v. 10–vii. 7). He bids his sons honour Judah and Levi. His posterity will fall away (viii. 1–5).

The Testament of Asher ('concerning the two faces of vice and virtue,' *β*).—He speaks of the two-foldness of things: if the soul is set on good, it does all well; but, if on evil, it does all ill. He deals with cases of good deeds with ill motives, and cases of the reverse. He warns his sons of the nearness of pleasures to their excesses or opposites (i. 1–v. 4). He emphasizes the importance of sincerity and unity of purpose. The peaceful soul at death is met by the angel of peace, the troubled by the evil spirit it has served (vi. 1–vii. 3). [He foretells the future sin and dispersion of his tribe, as also those of Gad and Dan; but they will finally be gathered again by God's mercy and for the sake of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (vii. 4–7).] He dies (viii. 1, 2).

The Testament of Joseph ('concerning self-control,' *β*).—In all troubles, God was with him—his brethren hated him but God loved him, he was enslaved and God freed him, sick and the Lord visited him, in prison and his God showed him favour (i. 1–7). God helped him in all his (ten) temptations (ii. 1–7). He resisted his mistress's wiles by strict fasting and abstinence, and prayers for himself and her. In prison he thanked God for deliverance from her (iii. 1–ix. 5). God exalts as well as delivers the humble and pure (x. 1–6). He told an untruth to the merchants and again to the Egyptian officer, even when examined by scourging, to save his brethren's honour; the Egyptian woman intervened to rescue and purchase him (xi. 1–xvi. 6). He exhorts his sons to do well even to those who seek their hurt (xvii. 1–xviii. 4). He recounts his two-fold vision: (1) of twelve harts, of which three remained and became lambs, then all were restored as twelve sheep; (2) of twelve bulls—then of a lamb which overcame all the beasts who attacked him (xix. 1–10). He bids them honour Levi and Judah; from them shall come Israel's salvation; his own kingdom would be transitory (xix. 11–12). He gives a dying charge concerning his bones and those of his wife (*a*) (xx. 1–6).

The Testament of Benjamin ('concerning a pure mind,' *β*).—He narrates the story of his birth. Joseph tells him in Egypt what his brethren did. He bids his sons fear God and love their neighbour, then they need not fear Beliar, man, or beast (i. 1–iii. 5). He speaks of Jacob's prediction that in Joseph should be fulfilled the prophecy of heaven—that the sinless should die for ungodly men (iii. 6–8). The good man overcomes evil with good (iv. 1–v. 5). His will is guided by the angel of peace; he desires nothing overmuch, riches, pleasure, or honour; and is sincere and single-minded (vi. 1–7). He warns them against Beliar and his sword of seven-fold evil, evidenced in the case of Cain (vii. 1–5). The pure mind like the sun cleanses away pollutions, itself undefiled (viii. 1–3). He foresees the impurity of his descendants; yet they shall have God's temple in their portion, and there shall the twelve tribes and the Gentiles meet (ix. 1, 2). He tells how he had a vision of Joseph in his absence (x. 1). He charges them to keep the Law; foretells the resurrection of all the patriarchs: each shall rule over his tribe. Israel shall be convicted by the chosen Gentiles (x. 2–11). In the latter days one beloved of the Lord [belonging to Benjamin's seed, *i.e.* Paul, *β* text] shall arise, to enlighten the Gentiles (xi. 1–5). Benjamin dies and is buried (xii. 1–4).

2. Title.—The title of the whole work, if it ever had one, is far from clear. The *Stichometry* of Nicephorus and the *Synopsis* of Athanasius refer to the book under the simple title Πατριάρχαι. But the earliest and indeed the only instance we possess of the use of the word 'patriarch' with special reference to the twelve sons of Jacob is in Stephen's speech in Ac $7^{8.9}$. The reference would not be clear enough, in the absence of any context, to serve as the title of a book. There is less difficulty with regard to the fuller title 'The Testaments of the (Twelve [?]) Patriarchs *or* [in Hebrew] Fathers.' The use of the word *διαθήκη* in our present Greek text does not, as was once thought, imply a late date and a conception borrowed from Roman law. It is true that in the LXX it is always the equivalent of בְּרִית, 'covenant.' But in the (late?) *Hebrew Testament of Naphtali* (see § **6**) we have the simple title, 'The Biddings of Naphtali the son of Jacob' (צוואת נפתלי בן יעקב). The title of the individual *Testament* was no doubt in this form. For the use of צִוָּה to denote a 'testamentary disposition,' or a 'dying charge,' cf. Is 38^1. The Greek MSS differ greatly, but tend to amplify the title, the secondary (*β*) recension and the Armenian adding the main theme of each Testament thus, *διαθήκη Ῥουβὴμ περὶ ἐννοιῶν*.

3. Date.—The text supplies several indications of the date of the original work. It was earlier than the Roman domination, as the list of foreign conquerors in *Test. Naph.* v. 8 ends with the Syrians (Seleucidæ). It was during the rule of the Maccabæan princes,* as the military prowess of Judah and Levi, and more particularly the lists of cities stormed (*e.g.* Tappuah and Hazor; see Charles on *Jubilees*, xxxiv. 4), reflect the exploits of Judas and his brothers. The details of that great struggle are still fresh in the writer's mind. Further, a Maccabæan king of unique powers and position was reigning, a descendant of Levi, who was not only a warrior king (*Test. Reub.* vi. 10, 11), and a priest known by the 'new name' (*i.e.* 'priest of the Most High God'), apparently first assumed by Simon, but also 'a *prophet* of the Most High' (*Test. Levi*, viii. 14, 15). This designation is appropriate only to John Hyrcanus, 137–105 B.C. Further, as the Pharisaic author speaks of him in the highest terms, the date must be earlier than the tragic breach between Hyrcanus and the Pharisees, which occurred probably in 107 B.C. Charles finds an additional indication of date in the references to the overthrow of Shechem. Shechem itself fell to Hyrcanus about 132 B.C., but the allusion may be to the total destruction of Samaria in 120 B.C., the ancient Shechem being intended as an equivalent for the later Samaritan people.

4. Original language.—Until the last few years it was generally agreed that the *Testaments*, as we now have them, were not a translation but were originally written in Greek. Charles, however, preceded by two Jewish scholars, Kohler (*JQR* v. [1893] 400–406) and Gaster (*PSBA* xvi. 33–49,

---

* Burkitt points out in his *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, p. 35, that 'the political conditions of the reign of John Hyrcanus give point to the choice of the *Twelve* Patriarchs as the speakers in the book.' In a sense the ten non-Judaic tribes were represented by the inhabitants of Galilee, Samaria, and Peræa, who were incorporated in the new Israelite kingdom of the Maccabees. In their case the ethical teaching was especially in point.

109–117), has put forward an unanswerable case for a Hebrew original (see his *Greek Versions of the Testaments*, pp. xxiii–xxxii). The text abounds in Hebrew constructions and expressions, *e.g.* *ἐν στήθει ὀστέων αὐτοῦ* (*Test. Jud.* xx. 4), and in curious mistranslations like *ἔξαρχοι σκήπτρων* for *ἔξαρχοι φυλῶν* (שבטים, xxv. 1), and *ἡ τρυφή* for 'Eden' (עֵדֶן, xxv. 2). The naming of the mountain 'Aspis' from the shield (*ἄσπις*) found by Levi (*Test. Levi*, vi. 1) is no proof that the original was in Greek, as the reference appears to be to שׂריון (Sirion) and שׁריון ('body armour')—a word (occurring in the parallel passage in Hebrew in the *Midrash Wajjissau*), which is more properly rendered *θώραξ* in *Test. Jud.* iii. 5. In any case, no mountain is known named Aspis. If we add the dittographs and the numerous paronomasiæ which are explicable or evident on retranslation in Hebrew, not to mention obscure or unintelligible passages which can be cleared up only by the same means, no doubt can remain that the work as a whole was composed in Hebrew. The related Hebrew and Aramaic fragments and narratives (see § 6) are a further proof of this fact. On the other hand, the Christian interpolations naturally show no trace of Hebrew phrasing or constructions.

5. Critical structure.—The prevailing view until quite recently was that the work emanated from a Jewish Christian or even a Gentile Christian source. This was made possible only by taking the work as it stands as the uninterpolated production of a single writer. But even so there remained insoluble problems. We should then be faced with a unique combination of Psilanthropism and Patripassianism, with an equally unique combination not only of the highest moral teaching with the primitive war spirit so evident, *e.g.*, in *Test. Jud.*, but of explicit (if unguarded) Christian theology with a very Judaic glorying in deeds of physical prowess. A decisive argument against any Christian origin, however, is to be found in the remarkable expectation of a Messiah from the tribe of Levi. All Christians from the first must have rejected this curious by-product of the Maccabæan golden age.*

The fact is that the frank recognition of the composite nature of the text alone explains all the problems which are presented. We must first remove the Christian interpolations. In the main these are obvious (see below, § 8). There remain a number of other passages quite foreign to their context or contradicting the whole teaching of the book. Such are the interpolation after *Test. Reub.* ii. 2 of the passage dealing with the senses quite in the Stoic manner, and the violent anti-Maccabæan invective in *Test. Levi*, xiv.–xvi. and *Test. Jud.* xxi. 6–xxiii. Charles regards as 1st cent. B.C. additions *Test. Levi*, x., xiv.–xvi., *Test. Jud.* xvii. 2–xviii. 1 (?), xxi. 6–xxiii., xxiv. 4–6, *Test. Zeb.* ix., *Test. Dan*, v. 6, 7, vii. 3 (?), *Test. Naph.* iv., *Test. Gad*, viii. 2, *Test. Asher*, vii. 4–7. They have as a common feature the frequent citation of the *Book of Enoch*. They refer not merely to a second great apostasy, but to a second destruction of the Temple and a second captivity and a final restoration wrought by God directly or through the Messiah. Charles regards these as genuine predictions. In *Test. Levi*, xvii. 1–9 there is a curious interpolation, which employs the jubilee system of chronology. *Test. Jos.* x. 5–xviii. is quite different in style and theme from the rest of that *Testament*. *Test. Zeb.* has two short sections on almsgiving (vi. 4–6, vii.–viii. 3) which occur in only three MSS and interrupt the narrative (see, further, Charles's edition, pp. lvii–lxi and notes).

6. Text.—The Hebrew original is not extant, but we have valuable evidence available towards the restoration of corrupt and difficult passages in kindred literature:

i. The Aramaic and Greek fragments of what appears to have been a Hebrew source both of the *Testament of Levi* and of the *Book of Jubilees*. For the discovery of these fragments and their mutual relation see Charles, *Greek Versions of the Testaments*, pp. liii–lvii. His conclusions are disputed by Conybeare, in *Review of Theol. and Philos.* iv. [1908–09] 373–382, who regards the Greek text preserved in the fragment as the source of our present *Test. Levi*, but his reasons are not convincing.

ii. The *Hebrew Testament of Naphtali*, which Gaster (*PSBA* xvi.) regarded as the source of our present *Test. Naphtali*. Charles rightly denies this view, and demonstrates the wide diversity between them, but perhaps wrongly assigns it to a late date.

iii. Various passages in Jewish literature, in particular the *Midrash Wajjissau*, which is very useful in regard to the war-passages in *Test. Judah*.*

The work now exists in (*a*) Greek, (*b*) Armenian, (*c*) Slavonic, and many mediæval and modern versions.

(*a*) The primary authority now extant for the text is the Greek version, which Charles divides into two main divisions, the *α* text and the *β* text. The latter has its best representative in the famous Cambridge MS *b* (10th cent.), used by Grosseteste for his Latin version and by Sinker (who cites it as C) for what was till recently the standard work on the *Testaments*. Charles prefers the *α* text, represented by three MSS, the earliest *c* being of the 13th cent., which he uses as the basis of his text. For a spirited attack on his position see J. W. Hunkin in *JThSt* xvi. 80–97. The variations in the 9 Greek MSS are beyond number, and present a most intricate problem to the critical student. A glance at Charles's *Greek Versions* shows at times one to half a dozen variations at almost every word.

(*b*) The Armenian version exists in 12 MSS, and falls into two main divisions, one recension being current in biblical MSS (corresponding roughly to the Greek *β* text), and the other in non-biblical MSS. The Armenian version is of special value in that it omits, or presents in a shorter form, several of the Christian interpolations (see § 8). It also alone preserves *Test. Jos.* xix. 3–7, without which the whole chapter is unintelligible.

(*c*) The Slavonic version is derived from the so-called *Palea*, historical narratives and chronicles based on various sources, and it is extant in a long and a short recension. This version represents a late form of text, and is not critically of much value.

7. Influence on the NT.—(*a*) *Diction.*—The influence of the *Testaments* on the Gospels is very clearly dealt with in Charles's edition, pp. lxxviii–xcix. In the rest of the NT two of the most remarkable passages are those which Charles adduces to prove that St. Paul used the *Testaments* in the Greek translation and in the *α* not the *β* recension (*ib.* lxxxv). Conybeare in his review (*Rev. of Theol. and Philos.* iv. 373–382) has shown how difficult it is to accept the latter statement.

The first instance is 1 Th 2^{16}. The words *ἔφθασεν δὲ ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἡ ὀργὴ* (*τοῦ Θεοῦ*, D, etc.) *εἰς τέλος* are difficult to explain on the accepted view of the early date of the Epistle. In *Test. Levi*, vi. 11, on the other hand, the reference is obvious and appropriate. It presupposes a slightly different text in Gn 30^{5}, ויגע חמת instead of ויהי חמת. There is a curious resemblance to the phrase in Wis 19^{1}, but both there and in Ps 78^{31} the words and the reference are different. In *Test. Levi*, vi. 11 the *β* texts read Κυρίου, and the *α* texts τοῦ Θεοῦ. (In 1 Th 2^{16} the Western text alone contains the latter.) On the other hand, *aaef* read *ἔφθασε δὲ αὐτούς*, not *ἐπ' αὐτούς*, so that the balance of evidence is against Charles's view that the *α* text was followed. St. Paul appears to be quoting, with grim irony, the description of the Shechemites' doom in the *Testaments* (or some earlier work), with the application changed to the doom of the exclusive Jews, who would fain imitate the violent deed of Levi.

---

* On the other hand, there exists a curious fragment attributed to Irenæus in which Christ is represented as descended from Levi and Judah (ed. W. W. Harvey, Cambridge, 1857, ii. 487): *ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς προετυπώθη καὶ ἐπεγνώσθη καὶ ἐγεννήθη. ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῷ Ἰωσὴφ προετυπώθη· ἐκ δὲ τοῦ Λευὶ καὶ τοῦ Ἰούδα τὸ κατὰ σάρκα ὡς βασιλεὺς καὶ ἱερεὺς ἐγεννήθη, κτλ.* These ideas may have been suggested by the *Testaments*. At the same time the fact remains that our Lord's kinsman John the Baptist was of the priestly tribe, and a quite early tradition connects the Blessed Virgin with the Temple.

* For all these documents see Charles, *Greek Versions of the Testaments*, pp. li–lvii, 235–256.

The second instance is Ro 1^{32}: *οὐ μόνον αὐτὰ ποιοῦσιν ἀλλὰ καὶ συνευδοκοῦσιν τοῖς πράσσουσιν* (*ποιοῦντες . . . συνευδοκοῦντες*, B Clem. Rom. [?], also, with *οὐκ ἐνόησαν* earlier, D, Lat. Vers. etc.). Here the parallel in the *Testaments—Test. Asher*, vi. 2, *καὶ πράσσουσι τὸ κακόν, καὶ συνευδοκοῦσι τοῖς πράσσουσιν*—is less appropriate to its context, and is omitted by A (Arm. version) as well as *bg*. But four other MSS of the *β* text support the *α* text here. It is not a clear case of quotation by St. Paul.

Other noteworthy parallels are—2 Co $6^{14.15}$, *τίς κοινωνία φωτὶ πρὸς σκότος; τίς δὲ συμφώνησις Χριστοῦ πρὸς Βελίαρ;* ‖ *Test. Levi*, xix. 1, 'Choose for yourselves either the light or the darkness, either the law of the Lord or the works of Beliar.' Also Ro 12^{1}, 'present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your reasonable (spiritual) service (worship)' ‖ *Test. Levi*, iii. 6, 'offering to the Lord a sweet-smelling savour, a reasonable (*λογικήν*) and bloodless sacrifice' ('offering,' *β*). Ro 12^{21}, *νίκα ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῷ τὸ κακόν* ‖ *Test. Benj.* iv. 3, *οὗτος τὸ ἀγαθὸν ποιῶν νικᾷ τὸ κακόν*. 1 Co 13^{5}, (*ἡ ἀγάπη*) *οὐ λογίζεται τὸ κακόν* ‖ *Test. Zeb.* viii. 5, *ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους, καὶ μὴ λογίζεσθε ἕκαστος κακίαν πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ*. 2 Co 7^{10}, *ἡ γὰρ κατὰ Θεὸν λύπη μετάνοιαν εἰς σωτηρίαν . . . ἐργάζεται* ‖ *Test. Gad*, v. 7, *ἡ γὰρ κατὰ Θεὸν ἀληθὴς μετάνοια . . . ὁδηγεῖ τὸ διαβούλιον πρὸς σωτηρίαν*. Ph 2^{15}, 'among whom ye are seen (or 'shine ye') as lights (*φωστῆρες*) in the world' ‖ *Test. Levi*, xiv. 3, 'so also ye are (or 'be ye') the lights (*φωστῆρες*) of Israel.' In 1 and 2 Tim. Charles notes four almost exact parallels: 1 Ti 1^{13}, 'I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly' ‖ *Test. Jud.* xix. 3; 1 Ti 2^{5}, *μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων*=*Test. Dan*, vi. 2; 2 Ti 2^{16}, 'they will proceed further in ungodliness' ‖ *Test. Jud.* xxi. 8; 2 Ti 4^{8}, 'the crown of righteousness'=*Test. Levi*, viii. 2 (for 'crown of glory,' 1 P 5^{4}, cf. *Test. Benj.* iv. 1). Ja 4^{7}, 'the devil . . . will flee from you'= *Test. Naph.* viii. 4; Rev 3^{12}, 'new (*καινή*) Jerusalem' ‖ *Test. Dan*, v. 12 (*νέα*). In Acts Charles notes five instances. Two worth noting, though not decisive, are: Ac 7^{10} ‖ *Test. Reub.* iv. 8, 10, 'found favour in the sight of God and men . . . God delivered him from every evil ('seen,' *β*) and hidden death' (both passages refer to Joseph), and Ac 12^{11} ‖ *Test. Sim.* ii. 8, 'God sent forth His angel and delivered him out of my hands.' Also in Ac 8^{23} the meaning of *χολὴ πικρίας* is illustrated by the function assigned to the *χολή* in *Test. Naph.* ii. 8, *χολὴ πρὸς πικρίαν*.

In the difficult passage Jude $^{22.23}$ Charles suggests the insertion of *μὴ* before *διακρινόμενοι* (better *διακρινομένους*), on the basis of *Test. Zeb.* vii. 2: *ἀδιακρίτως πάντας . . . ἐλεᾶτε*, but this phrase hardly seems to bear on the passage, nor does it really aid in the problem of text or interpretation.

(*b*) *Ideas.*—The Pauline (and Johannine) metaphor of light and darkness, Ro 1^{21} 13^{12}, Eph 4^{18} $5^{8.9}$, 2 Co 6^{14}, is found in *Test. Reub.* iii. 8, 'darkening his mind' (cf. *Test. Gad*, vi. 2), *Test. Naph.* ii. 10, 'neither while ye are in darkness can ye do the works of light,' *Test. Levi*, xix. 1, 'Choose for yourselves either the light or the darkness, either the law of the Lord or the works of Beliar,' xiv. 4, 'the light of the law which was given to lighten every man' (cf. Jn 1^{9}, where the 'light' is the ever-existing Word). The equation of covetousness and idolatry in Eph 5^{5}, Col 3^{5} appears as a connexion of cause and effect in *Test. Jud.* xix. 1, 'the love of money leadeth to idolatry ('idols,' *β*); because, when led astray through money, men name as gods those who are not gods.' Ja 3^{10} is similar in idea to *Test. Benj.* vi. 5, 'the good mind hath not two tongues, of blessing and cursing.'

The prohibition of feminine adornment in 1 P 3^{3-5}, 1 Ti 2^{9} is found also in *Test. Reub.* v. 5, and the reason given in v. 6, 'for thus they allured the Watchers who were before the flood,' helps to explain the obscure statement of St. Paul in 1 Co 11^{10}, 'for this cause ought the woman to have (a sign of?) authority on her head, *because of the angels.*' In the *Book of Enoch* the invention of adornment was not previous but subsequent to the fall of the Watchers, who themselves were the first teachers of the art.

Reservation for judgment, asserted of the angels in 2 P 2^{4}, Jude ^{6}, is predicated also of women who adorn themselves in *Test. Reub.* v. 5 and of the unrepentant in *Test. Gad*, vii. 5. The juxtaposition of the fallen Watchers and the men of Sodom in Jude $^{6.7}$ is paralleled by *Test. Naph.* iii. 4, 5. Both alike acted against their appointed nature (probably the AV rendering, 'which kept not their first estate' [*ἀρχή*], is correct, as *Test. Naph.* iii. 5 has *ἐνήλλαξαν τάξιν φύσεως αὐτῶν*).

That self-judgment averts external judgment is a thought common to 1 Co $11^{31.32}$ and *Test. Benj.* vi. 7, *Test. Gad*, v. 3; and the idea of self-condemnation is vividly expressed alike in Ro 2^{15} and in *Test. Jud.* xx. 5, while in 1 Co 4^{4} St. Paul seems to quote but immediately to condemn the self-satisfaction of *Test. Iss.* vii. 1, 'I am not conscious of committing any sin' (+ 'unto death,' *β*), and *Test. Zeb.* i. 4.

(*c*) *Theology.*—*God* is referred to twice (in passages which have been modified by Christian influence) as Father—'the Holy Father' in *Test. Jud.* xxiv. 2, and, in connexion with the Bath Qol, 'with the Father's voice as from Abraham to (or 'the father of') Isaac,' in *Test. Levi*, xviii. 6; as the 'God of peace' in *Test. Dan*, v. 2 (cf. 1 Th 5^{23}, Ro 15^{33}, Ph 4^{9}); and as 'the Great Glory' in *Test. Levi*, iii. 4 (cf. 1 *En.* xiv. 20, cii. 3). Other titles are not noteworthy.

How far the expected theophany in *Test. Sim.* vi. 5, *Test. Levi*, ii. 11, v. 2, etc., was conceived in the original text as mediated through a Messianic personage we cannot say. The present writer's view is that an unmediated theophany was the only one mentioned in the pre-Christian work (see § **8**).

The *Spirit of God* is referred to in *Test. Sim.* iv. 4, where it is said that 'Joseph was a good man and had the spirit of God within him.' Elsewhere the 'spirit' appears to be merely one of the constituents of man's nature imparted to him at creation or birth, and practically identical with the 'good will' or 'inclination,' as in *Test. Jud.* xx. 1, 5, where the 'spirit of truth'=the *Yetzer ha Tōb*. The *Hebrew Test. Naph.* x. 9[*] is nearer the thought of St. Paul in 1 Co $3^{16.17}$ 6^{19}. The Apostle, however, regards the Spirit as a subsequent not an original gift. The two passages (*Test. Jud.* xxiv. 2, 3, *Test. Levi*, xviii. 7) which deal with the gift of the Holy Spirit on a specific occasion, the present writer regards as Christian.

The *Priesthood of Christ*, an idea so fully developed in the Epistle to the Hebrews, was until recently a conception the development of which could not be explained except as the synthesis of the thought of Christ as the perfect offering for sin with the thought of Him as the Divinely appointed and perfect Agent of the Father. The conception, however, receives new light from recent research into the theological views of the Maccabæan period, when a priestly family ruled and were so highly gifted as to come to be regarded in the person of one or two kings as the embodiment of the Messianic idea. Ps 110 has a new appropriateness in view of this unprecedented situation. There the Messianic victor King is addressed, 'Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek'; hence the continual emphasis—in *Test. Reub.* vi. 7–12, *Test. Levi*, xviii., *Test. Jud.* xxv. 1, 2, *Test. Jos.* xix. 11 (*α*)—on the pre-eminence of Levi. The most astonishing passage, however, is *Test. Jud.* xxi. 1–5: 'I command you, love Levi, that ye may abide, and exalt not yourselves against him, lest ye be utterly destroyed. For to me [Judah] the Lord gave the kingdom, and to him the priesthood, and He set the kingdom beneath the priesthood. To me He gave the things upon the earth; to him the things in the heavens,' etc.

---

[*] 'Blessed is the man who does not defile the holy spirit of God which hath been put and breathed into him, and blessed is he who returns it to its Creator as pure as it was on the day when He entrusted it (to him).'

The striking prerogatives and powers which Charles (*Testaments*, p. xcviii) regards as ascribed to *the Messiah* tend to diminish seriously on a careful examination of the text (see § 8). Possibly there remain his freedom from sin, new priesthood, and prophetic office.

More important, because more reliable, is the light thrown by the *angelology* of the *Testaments* on the NT doctrine of Christ, especially as the unique and only Heavenly Intercessor. In *Test. Levi*, iii. 5 f. the angels of the presence 'minister and make propitiation to the Lord for all the sins of ignorance of the righteous. And they offer to the Lord a sweet-smelling savour, a reasonable (λογικὴν) and bloodless sacrifice' ('offering,' *β*). In *Test. Levi*, v. 6 an angel (Michael or the angel of peace) 'intercedeth (*β*) for the nation of Israel that they may not be smitten utterly (cf. *Test. Dan*, vi. 5), for every evil spirit attacketh it.' In *Test. Dan*, vi. 2 prayer to this angel is commanded—'draw near unto God and to the angel that intercedeth (*β*) for you, for he is a mediator between God and man,' etc. It is just this Jewish doctrine that is combated in 1 Ti 2^{5}, He 1^{4-14}, etc.

The 'angel of peace' has a national and a personal function. He 'shall strengthen Israel, that it fall not into the extremity of evil' (*Test. Dan*, vi. 5); he guides the soul of the good man (*Test. Benj.* vi. 1), and at death meets his soul and leads him into ('eternal,' *α*) life (*Test. Asher*, vi. 7).

Angels are divided in *Test. Levi*, iii. 5–8 into 'angels of the presence' (*β*), or 'archangels' (*α*), and, in a lower heaven, 'thrones and dominions' (cf. Col 1^{16}, Eph 1^{21}), but the angelology of the book is far less developed than that of *1 Enoch.*

The text of *Test. Levi*, ii. 7–iii. 8 has undergone a great deal of alteration, but in ii. 7–9 the *α* text clearly speaks of three *heavens* only, the older view, while the *β* text in ii. 9 and both texts in iii. 1–8 now speak of seven. St. Paul in 2 Co 12^{2} seems to regard the third as the highest heaven.

The doctrine of *sin* is very full and varied. In the main it is traced to the action of the spirits of error, and their head, Beliar (see *Test. Reub.* iii. 3–6, *Test. Sim.* ii. 7, iv. 9, *Test. Jud.* xix. 4, etc.). Each sin has its own particular spirit, and several are attached to various organs of the body. Sin is also traced to man's free will, which can exclude all evil desire (*Test. Reub.* iv. 9), need not be in the power of any evil spirit (*Test. Benj.* vi. 1; cf. iii. 3, 4), and is free to choose good and evil (*Test. Jud.* xx. 2, 'in the midst is the spirit of the understanding of the mind, to which it belongeth to turn whithersoever it will'). The will determines the quality of the action (*Test. Asher*, i. 6, 'if the soul take pleasure in the good, all its actions are in righteousness'). Inasmuch, however, as two inclinations appear to be born with a man, the evil as well as the good, the problem of freewill is not consistently or thoroughly faced. Thus God knows the inclination (*Test. Naph.* ii. 5), yet tries it by temptation (*Test. Jos.* ii. 6). Sin blinds the inclination (*Test. Jud.* xviii. 3), which in turn blinds the mind (xi. 1). The (evil) inclination can be destroyed by good works (*Test. Asher*, iii. 2).

Sin entails physical punishment (sickness, *Test. Reub.* i. 7, *Test. Sim.* ii. 12, *Test. Gad*, v. 9; cf. 1 Co 5^{5} 11^{30}), and spiritual (*Test. Reub.* iii. 8; cf. Ro 1^{21}) and eternal (*Test. Zeb.* x. 3, *Test. Gad*, vii. 5) penalties. Sin is finally to be destroyed and Beliar cast into the fire for ever (*Test. Jud.* xxv. 3).

Repentance is a very prominent feature in the *Testaments.* In Reuben's case it includes life-long penitence (*Test. Reub.* iv. 3) and seven years' penance in the way of strict abstinence from flesh and wine (i. 10); in Simeon's case prayer and weeping (*Test. Sim.* ii. 13) and two years' fasting (iii. 4); in Judah's case abstinence from flesh and wine and all enjoyment till old age (*Test. Jud.* xv. 4). Repentance includes a moral change and attainment of higher insight, 'for true repentance after a godly sort destroyeth ignorance, and driveth away the darkness, and enlighteneth the eyes, and giveth knowledge to the soul, and leadeth the mind to salvation' (*Test. Gad*, v. 7; cf. 2 Co 7^{10}). National repentance will make possible national restoration—'on the day on which Israel shall repent, the kingdom of the enemy shall be brought to an end' (*Test. Dan*, vi. 4; cf. *Test. Iss.* vi. 3, 4; *Test. Zeb.* ix. 7). For the close connexion of repentance and the Kingdom of Heaven, cf. Mt 3^{2}. For the human conditioning of the coming of the Kingdom, cf. 2 P 3^{12}.

Eschatology.—Death is referred to as 'sleep' in *Test. Iss.* vii. 9 and four other passages. In each of these four other cases, however, Charles would emend the phrase to 'died at a good old age' (so *Test. Benj.* xii. 2, *β*). In *Test. Dan*, vii. 1, *Test. Jos.* xx. 4 the *β* text reads, 'slept the eternal sleep.' 'Eternal life' awaits the righteous (*Test. Asher*, vi. 6; cf. v. 2). 'Hades' is mentioned three times, twice in Christian interpolations, and never as a place of punishment. The 'judgment' is referred to three times, twice in passages interpolated. The first passage, *Test. Levi*, iii. 2, 3, refers to the judgment on men and on the evil spirits. For the heavenly armies of iii. 3, cf. Rev 12^{7}. The resurrection is expected of all the patriarchs from Enoch in order (*Test. Benj.* x. 6, 7) and the twelve sons of Jacob each amid his descendants (*Test. Sim.* vi. 7, *Test. Jud.* xxv. 1, *Test. Zeb.* x. 2, *Test. Benj.* x. 7). The resurrection is limited to the righteous Israelites in *Test. Zeb.* x. 2, but includes all mankind good and bad in *Test. Benj.* x. 8 (probably not original). The Resurrection life will be eternal (*Test. Jud.* xxv. 4, 5) and so will the punishment of the wicked (*Test. Zeb.* x. 3, *Test. Gad*, vii. 5).

Asceticism is a marked feature. See on *Repentance* above, and especially *Test. Iss.* iii. 5, iv. 2–4, *Test. Jos.* iii. 3–5, iv. 3, 8, viii. 1, ix. 2, x. 1–3. *Almsgiving* is also prominent (*Test. Iss.* iii. 8, v. 2, vii. 5, *Test. Zeb.* vi. 4, 5, *Test. Jos.* iii. 5). Zebulun even steals to clothe the naked (*Test. Zeb.* vii. 1).

Remarkable stress is laid upon the duty of *love*, not only to God, but also to one's neighbour. We may compare *Test. Gad*, iv. 7, 'the spirit of love worketh together with the law of God in long-suffering unto the salvation of men,' with Ro 2^{4}; and vi. 3–7, 'love ye one another from the heart;

and if a man sin against thee, speak peaceably to him, and in thy soul hold not guile; and if he repent and confess, forgive him. . . . And though he deny it, . . . give over reproving him. . . . And if he be shameless and persist in his wrong-doing, even so forgive him from the heart, and leave to God the avenging' (cf. Ro 12^{19}).

8. The Christian interpolations.—If we could be certain exactly where the Christian interpolations occur and where they begin and end, the evidence of the *Testaments* would be of higher value as a witness both to Jewish theology in the two centuries before Christ and to primitive Christian views as to the Person of our Lord. As it is, we can never feel certain that a striking parallel to NT theology may not be post-Christian in date, and the presumption lies that way unless there is evidence, *e.g.* in *1 Enoch* or other pre-Christian pseudepigrapha, of the same view. In other words, the evidence of the *Testaments* can hardly be admitted in its own right as to pre-Christian beliefs and teaching. Charles's method has been rather to bracket only manifest Christian interpolations, and then never a word more than is absolutely necessary.

Very often the interpolation consists of a word or two, or the turn given to a passage: in such cases a slight alteration restores a perfectly Judaic text, at least not going beyond Is 40^{3-10}; cf. *Test. Sim.* vi. 5, *Test. Dan*, vi. 7: an important series of additions, often introduced by the word 'until,' transforms an original theophany prediction into an unguarded expression regarding the Incarnation, *e.g.* 'the Lord God shall appear upon earth *as man*' (*Test. Sim.* vi. 5); 'since you have with you the God of heaven and earth *walking with men in singleness of heart*' (*Test. Iss.* vii. 7—a few inferior manuscripts read 'you walk,' etc.); 'the Lord shall be in the midst of it (Israel) *living amongst men*. And the Holy One of Israel shall reign over it, *in humility and in poverty*,' etc. (*Test. Dan*, v. 13); 'the Most High shall visit the earth, coming Himself *as man, with men eating and drinking*' (*Test. Asher*, vii. 3); 'worshipping the King of heaven, *who appeared upon earth in the form of a man in humility*,' etc. (*Test. Benj.* x. 7; the Armenian version is free from this addition). Similar statements are found more detached from the context, *e.g.* '*God hath taken a body and eaten with men and saved men*' (*Test. Sim.* vi. 7^{c}), '*this Branch of God Most High, and this Fountain giving life to all*' (*Test. Jud.* xxiv. 4); 'ye shall see *God in the fashion of a man*' (*Test. Zeb.* ix. 8^{bdg}); '*through his* [Judah's] *tribe shall God appear dwelling among men upon earth*,' etc. (*Test. Naph.* viii. 3); '*God speaking in the person of man*' (*Test. Asher*, vii. 3); '*when He appeared as God in the flesh*,' etc. (*Test. Benj.* x. 8; Armenian version omits).

The language is frankly Patripassian in *Test. Levi*, iv. 1, ᾅδου σκυλευομένου ἐπὶ τῷ πάθει τοῦ ὑψίστου (which is a reference to Mt $27^{52.\ 53}$). But cf. Ac 20^{28}, 'the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood' (ℵ B). Two passages which would be Psilanthropist were they Christian are 'the compassion of the Lord shall come, *a man* (ἄνθρωπος) working righteousness and working mercy unto all them that are afar off, and to all them that are near' (*Test. Naph.* iv. 5), and '*a man* (ἄνδρα) who reneweth the law in the power of the Most High ye shall call a deceiver; and at last ye shall rush (upon him) to slay him,' etc. (*Test. Levi*, xvi. 3). The reference in the latter is obscure, but both passages are obviously Judaic in origin.

Once Christ is called '*Son*'—'until the Lord shall visit all the Gentiles in the tender mercies of His Son' (*Test. Levi*, iv. 4).

The *Virgin Birth* may be referred to in the strange and corrupt passage, *Test. Jos.* xix. 8: 'from Judah was born a virgin wearing a linen garment, and from her was born a lamb without spot.' A 'virgin' (cf. Is 37^{22}) might well represent the Jewish community (cf. Rev 12^{1}), but the context uses animal symbolism only. Twice the order 'from Levi and Judah' is varied. In *Test. Dan*, v. 10 and *Test. Gad*, viii. 2, Judah is put first. In *Test. Jud.* xxiv. 1, 5, 6 and *Test. Naph.* viii. 2^{b}, 3 descent from Judah alone is mentioned, and so too *Test. Jos.* xix. 8 (but here 'from Judah' is clearly an intrusion; see Charles's note).

The *events of our Lord's life* mentioned are: (1) His baptism (*Test. Levi*, xviii. 7^{b}); (2) descent of the Spirit, 'the spirit of understanding and sanctification shall rest upon Him in the water' (xviii. 7), 'the heavens shall be opened to Him, to pour out the spirit, even the blessing of the Holy Father' (*Test. Jud.* xxiv. 2); (3) the voice from heaven: 'the heavens shall be opened, and from the temple of glory shall come upon Him sanctification, with the Father's voice as from Abraham to (or 'the father of') Isaac' (*Test. Levi*, xviii. 6; cf. *Test. Jud.* xxiv. 2); (4) His crucifixion—'Nevertheless thy sons shall lay hands upon Him and crucify Him' (*Test. Levi*, iv. 4), 'the chief priests who shall lay their hands upon the Saviour of the world' (xiv. 2), 'there shall the Lord be treated with outrage and He shall be lifted up upon a tree' (*Test. Benj.* ix. 3; cf. *Test. Levi*, x. 2, xiv. 1 and [?] xvi. 3^{cd}); the rending of the veil of the Temple (*Test. Levi*, x. 3, *Test. Benj.* ix. 4); (5) His resurrection and ascension, 'He shall ascend from Hades and shall pass from earth into heaven' (*Test. Benj.* ix. 5).

Titles and attributes.—Christ is called 'the Lamb of God' in *Test. Jos.* xix. 11, *Test. Benj.* iii. 8, 'Saviour' in *Test. Dan*, vi. 7 (β), 'Saviour of the World' in *Test. Benj.* iii. 8, 'Saviour of the Gentiles' in *Test. Dan*, vi. 9, 'Prophet'—'only begotten Prophet' ('Son,' *c*) in *Test. Benj.* ix. 2, 'a prophet of the Most High' in *Test. Levi*, viii. 15 (possibly originally applied to Hyrcanus; see Charles's note). He is to be 'meek and lowly' (*Test. Dan*, vi. 9), to reign over Israel 'in humility and in poverty' (v. 13); He 'appeared upon earth in the form of a man in humility' (*Test. Benj.* x. 7). His suffering is vicarious. He 'taketh away the sins of the world' (*Test. Jos.* xix. 11). 'A blameless one shall be delivered up for lawless men and a sinless one shall die for ungodly men in the blood of the covenant,' etc. (*Test. Benj.* iii. 8). He redeems the souls of the saints (*Test. Dan*, v. 11). He 'teaches by His works the law of God' (vi. 9; cf. *Test. Levi*, xvi. 3). Belief in Him bestows a kingdom here and joy hereafter (*Test. Dan*, v. 13, *Test. Benj.* x. 7); unbelief shall condemn Jews first and then Gentiles (x. 8, 9).

The Gentiles.—Salvation is never explicitly limited to Israel in the *Testaments*, but every case of explicit inclusion of the Gentiles in the scheme of salvation is suspect, though quite probably in two cases their implicit inclusion (*Test. Levi*, v. 7 [β] and *Test. Jud.* xxiv. 6) is original (see Charles's *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, note on *Test. Benj.* ix. 2). The present writer cannot agree with Charles, however, in accepting the other passages as original. In *Test. Benj.* ix. 4, 'the Spirit of God shall pass on to the Gentiles as fire poured forth' after the Crucifixion. The chosen of the Gentiles will be used to convict Israel in the judgment (*Test. Benj.* x. 10; cf. Ro 2^{27}, Lk $11^{31.\ 32}$).

Christian baptism is referred to in *Test. Levi*, xvi. 5: ('through faith *and water*'), in *Test. Asher*, vii. 3: 'breaking the head of the dragon *in the water*' (διὰ τοῦ ὕδατος).

Finally, though the first six lines may just conceivably be pre-Christian, the present writer regards the following passage, *Test. Levi*, xviii. 8–12, in its present form as indubitably Christian in point of view:

> 'For He shall give the majesty of the Lord to His sons in truth for evermore;
> And there shall none succeed Him for all generations for ever.
> And in His priesthood the Gentiles shall be multiplied in knowledge upon the earth,
> And enlightened through the grace of the Lord:
> [But Israel shall be minished through ignorance,
> And darkened through grief: all MSS except *be*]
> In His priesthood shall sin come to an end,
> And the lawless shall cease to do evil.
> And the just shall rest in Him.
> And He shall open the gates of paradise,
> And shall remove the threatening sword against Adam.
> And He shall give to the saints to eat from the tree of life,
> And the spirit of holiness shall be upon them.
> And Beliar shall be bound by Him,
> And He shall give power to His children to tread upon the evil spirits' (cf. *Test. Zeb.* ix. 8bdg).

The continual change in reference of the pronoun 'he,' 'him,' 'his' is very difficult. What can 'His sons' and 'His children' mean?* Again, the last six lines would be unique if they referred to the Messiah, as Charles holds. Apparently they must refer to God. Surely only the Christian interpolator could be guilty of such an astonishing combination of what were no doubt originally two Jewish statements (possibly in one and the same passage), one referring to the Messiah, and one to the marvels which God would work in Messiah's days.

LITERATURE.—I. CHIEF EDITIONS OF THE TEXT.—(i.) In the Greek versions.—J. E. Grabe, *Spicilegium Patrum*^{2}, Oxford, 1714; R. Sinker, *Testamenta XII Patriarcharum*, Cambridge, 1869, *Appendix* (containing a collation of the Roman and Patmos MSS), do., 1879; R. H. Charles, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Oxford, 1908. (ii.) In the Armenian version.—H. Sargis Josepheanz, *The Treasury of the Old and New Fathers*, Venice, 1896, i. 27–151. (iii.) In the Slavonic version.—N. Tichonravov, *Pamiatniki Otrechennoi Russkoi Literaturi*, 2 vols., St. Petersburg, 1863. (iv.) In translations.—(*a*) From the Greek: Grosseteste's Latin version, Eng. tr. by A. G(olding), London, 1581; F. Schnapp, in E. Kautzsch's *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen*, Tübingen, 1900, pp. 458–506; R. H. Charles, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, London, 1908, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, Oxford, 1913, ii. 296–360. (*b*) From the Armenian: J. Issaverdens, *The Uncanonical Writings of the Old Testament*, Venice, 1901, pp. 349–479.

II. COMMENTARIES AND CRITICAL INQUIRIES.—J. E. Grabe, *Spicilegium Patrum*^{2}, i. 129–144, 335–374; R. Sinker, *Testamenta XII Patriarcharum*, pp. 1–125, 'Testamenta XII Patriarcharum' in *DCB* iv. 865–874; F. Schnapp, *Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen untersucht*, Halle, 1884, also in Kautzsch's *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen*, ii. 458–506; W. J. Deane, *Pseudepigrapha*, Edinburgh, 1891, pp. 162–192; F. C. Conybeare, 'On the Jewish Authorship of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,' *JQR* v. [1893] 375–398, sect. of art. 'Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs' in *JE* xii. 113, reviews of Charles in *Rev. of Theol. and Phil.* iv. [1908–09] 373–384; K. Kohler, 'The Pre-Talmudic Haggada,' *JQR* v. 400–406, sect. of art. 'Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs' in *JE* xii. 113–118; M. Gaster, 'The Hebrew Text of one of the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs,' *PSBA* xvi. [1893–94] 33–49, 109–117; A. Harnack, *Gesch. der altchristl. Litteratur*, Leipzig, 1897, II. i. 566–570; E. Schürer, *GJV* iii.^{3} [do., 1898] 252–262, *HJP* II. iii. [Edinburgh, 1886] 114–124; R. H. Charles, 'Apocalyptic Literature,' *EBi* i. 237–241, 'Testaments of the XII Patriarchs,' *HDB* iv. 721–725, 'Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,' *EBr*^{11} xxvi. 666–668, *HJ* iii. [1905] 558–573, *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, ii. 282–295; W. Bousset, 'Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen,' in *ZNTW* i. [1900] 187–209, 344–346; F. C. Burkitt, in *JThSt* x. [1908] 135 f., *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (Schweich Lectures, 1913), London, 1914, pp. 34–37; J. W. Hunkin, in *JThSt* xvi. [1914] 80–97.

III. RELATED WORKS.—(*a*) A Hebrew *Testament of Naphtali*: text collated by M. Gaster, *PSBA* xvi. 109–117; translated in Kautzsch's *Apok. und Pseud.* ii. 489–492; original in Charles, *Greek Versions*, pp. 239–244, translated in his *Testaments*, pp. 221–227, and *Apoc. and Pseud.* ii. 361–363. (*b*) A source of the *Testament of Levi*: Aramaic text in *JQR* xix. [1907] 566–583; in Charles, *Greek Versions*, pp. 245–256, where also (*c*) Greek text (interpolation in Mount Athos MS, *Test. Asher*, vii. 2), pp. 247–253, and (*d*) Syriac fragment, p. 254. For translations see his *Testaments*, pp. 228–235, *Apoc. and Pseud.* ii. 364–367.

A. LL. DAVIES.

TESTIMONY.—See MARTYR, TRIAL-AT-LAW.

TETRARCH.—This title originally signified the governor of the fourth part of a country. Thus Philip of Macedon divided Thessaly into four districts called 'tetrarchies.' Later, however, the title came to be used in a loose sense of any petty ruler, and in this sense it is applied in the NT to Herod Antipas, Philip, and Lysanias. Of these Herod is called 'king' in Mt 14^9; but the usual and correct designation of him is 'tetrarch,' and it is thus that he is mentioned in Ac 13^1, the only passage in the apostolic writings where the title occurs.

G. WAUCHOPE STEWART.

THANKSGIVING.—The true ideal of human life, as interpreted in the NT, is to make it a great service of thanksgiving. The thanksgivings of our Lord, culminating in His institution of the Eucharist, which was typified in His thanksgiving prayers at the feeding of the crowds, prepared the Church for this thought, linking worship with work.

It has been finely said: 'As prayer is a recognition of our dependence upon God amid the darkness and uncertainties of the future, so thankfulness is a recognition of our indebtedness to Him for the blessings of the past.'* St. Paul's Epistles are full of a deep spirit of joy which is the constant reward of a truly thankful spirit. All his letters addressed to churches, with the exception of the Epistle to the Galatians, begin with words of thanksgiving. We note this especially in 2 Co 1^{11}, when the dark cloud of grief over the backsliders at Corinth is passing (cf. 4^{15}).

He regards unbroken and universal thanksgiving as 'the will of God in Christ Jesus' (1 Th 5^{18}). He traces one root of the degradation of the heathen world to lack of thanksgiving (Ro 1^{21}). In Ro 14^6 he demands that the scrupulous man no less than the Christian who is indifferent to ordinances about meats or days should show thankfulness.

The great collection for the poor saints in Jerusalem is to be motived by thanksgiving, and will produce results beyond the material offering in the recipients as in the givers: 'Ye being enriched in everything unto all liberality which maketh through us thanksgiving to God' (2 Co $9^{11.12}$). In Eph 5^{20} he teaches that thanksgiving is the inspiration of Christian poetry and music, in which it found its most characteristic expression.

That St. Paul feels that it cannot be carried too far is proved by such strong expressions as Col 2^7, 'abounding in thanksgiving,' for the glory of the faith in Christ. His main line of thought is always 'in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God the Father through him' (3^{17}). He expects that the universality of our intercessions will be matched by equal universality in our thanksgivings (1 Ti 2^1).

Finally, we note that, when writing to the Philippians, whose unwavering loyalty was a constant solace to him in many trials, his thanksgiving (Ph 1^{3-5}) was 'more than usually earnest. The Apostle dwells long and fondly on the subject. He repeats words and accumulates clauses in the intensity of his feeling' (Lightfoot, *ad loc.*).

In Rev $11^{17.18}$ 'the Elders represent the Church in her great function of εὐχαριστία' (Swete, *ad loc.*) and respond to the great voices of the living creatures in stirring strains.

The Apostolic Fathers strike the same note, *e.g.* Clement of Rome (*Ep. ad Cor.* i. 38): 'Seeing therefore that we have all these things from Him, we ought in all things to give thanks to Him, to whom be the glory for ever and ever. Amen.' The Ignatian Epistles are redolent of the spirit of thanksgiving, especially for the Revelation in Christ and 'the love of the churches' (Ro 9) (see

---

* Cf. for this difficulty *1 En.* xlviii. 7.

* H. P. Liddon, *Sermons on Some Words of Christ*, London, 1892, p. 217.

Epistle of Barnabas, 7, quoted under PRAISE). See also art. PRAYER.

LITERATURE.—E. von Dobschütz, *Christian Life in the Primitive Church*, London, 1904; W. H. Frere and A. L. Illingworth, *Sursum Corda*, do., 1911; W. Law, *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life*, do., 1899; A. J. Worlledge, *Prayer*, do., 1902, pp. 219-223. A. E. BURN.

THEATRE.—The ancient Greek theatre (lit. 'a place of spectacle,' 'a beholding place') was regularly a building of semicircular ground-plan, open to the sky. On the diameter were the stage and everything pertaining to it. The inner part of the semicircle below the level of the stage had an altar in the middle on which incense was burnt. Around this central part the tiers of stone seats rose to the top, intersected at regular intervals by passages to enable the spectators to reach their places. The entrances for spectators were at the ends of the stage. In origin theatrical exhibitions were in honour of the god Dionysos, and were held only on the days of his festivals. Attendance at the theatre on such occasions was an act of worship. Only in course of time did the theatre become a place of amusement entirely, divorced from all connexion with religion. The size of a theatre varied according to the size of the population of the city in which it was. As a general rule it was of necessity the largest building in the city, and, as on most days of the year it was not required for play-acting, it was available for public meetings. In Athens the meetings of the public assembly (ἐκκλησία) took place in the theatre. So at Ephesus (Ac 19), when the disturbance aroused by Demetrius took place, it was the most natural thing in the world that a rush should be made to the theatre (v.^{29}).

LITERATURE.—A. E. Haigh, *The Attic Theatre*^{3}, ed. A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, Oxford, 1907. A. SOUTER.

THEFT.—See STEALING.

THEOPHILUS.—Theophilus is the name of the person to whom the author of the Lucan Gospel and the Acts addressed his treatises. It is not certain whether Theophilus was a real person or a literary figment. The same doubt applies to other books in early Christian literature which seem to have been intended for a general public but are addressed to an individual, *e.g.* the *Epistle to Diognetus*. There is, however, no proof that the fiction of an imaginary address was a common literary artifice.

Origen (*Hom. in Luc.* i.), without rejecting the existence of a historical Theophilus, applied the name to all who are loved of God. Jerome (*Anecdota Maredsolana*, Maredsous, 1895, iii. 3. 20) equates Theophilus with 'amicus vel amator Dei,' and Salvianus (*Ep.* ix. 18) says that Luke addressed the two books 'ad amorem Dei.'

It is also possible that there is a reference to this interpretation in Tatian, *Orat. adv. Græcos*, xii. 3: τὰς θειοτάτας ἑρμηνείας αἳ κατὰ χρόνον διὰ γραφῆς ἐξεληλεγμέναι πάνυ θεοφιλεῖς τοὺς προσέχοντας αὐταῖς πεποιήκασιν (suggested by E. A. Abbott, *EBi* ii. 1790), but the point cannot be pressed.

Lightfoot (*Biblical Essays*, London, 1893, p. 197) seems to favour the view that Theophilus is a *nom de guerre*. If this be so, the following remarks as to the interests of Theophilus would need to be interpreted as referring to the class of which this imaginary person was typical. In this case it is interesting to note the parallel between Ac 1^1, τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον ἐποιησάμην περὶ πάντων, ὦ Θεόφιλε, and Philo, ed. Mangey, ii. 445, ὁ μὲν πρότερος λόγος ἦν ἡμῖν, ὦ Θεόδοτε, περὶ τοῦ κτλ.

Assuming that Theophilus was a real person, the use of the title 'excellent' (κράτιστος) in Lk 1^3 has been used as a proof that he was a man of high official rank. It appears, however, that this title was often given to persons of good position as a matter of courtesy, and proves nothing. It is used by other writers in their dedicatory addresses (cf. Dion. Hal. *de Orat. Antiq.* [ὦ κράτιστε Ἀμμαῖε] and the *Epistle to Diognetus*). W. M. Ramsay thinks that the title ought to be interpreted in the strictest official manner, though he admits that 'some Greeks were not so accurate as Luke' (*St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, London, 1895, p. 388 n.); he endeavours to meet the obvious (and, in most writers' judgment, fatal) objection that Theophilus cannot be the name of a Roman of equestrian rank, as it is Greek and not Latin, by the suggestion that Theophilus is the baptismal name of an official who would have been compromised if his legal name had been used. Attractive as this theory is, it is faced by the difficulty, stated, but apparently not appreciated, by Ramsay himself, that there is no evidence of the use of baptismal names at any period which can be suggested for Luke's writings.

The question has often been disputed whether the Lucan writings assume that Theophilus was a Christian, or only an interested heathen inquirer. There seems to be nothing decisive either way, but, although the word κατηχήθης, used in Lk 1^3, need not be used of Christian catechetical instruction, it is perhaps more likely that it ought to be taken in this sense. The most probable guess is that Theophilus may have been a 'God-fearer,' but there is no evidence either for or against this view.

There is no credible tradition as to Theophilus in early literature.

The *Clementine Recognitions* (x. 71) say that a rich citizen of Antioch named Theophilus founded a great basilica which was established as the See (*cathedra*) of Peter. Pseudo-Hippolytus identified this Theophilus with the one to whom Luke wrote, and in *Apost. Const.* vii. 46 Theophilus appears as the third bishop of Cæsarea, Zacchæus and Cornelius being his predecessors. This tradition is almost certainly a confusion of the Theophilus of the *Recognitions* with the Theophilus who was living about 190. It is also to be noted that Seneca addressed his seventh letter to a Theophilus. The notes occasionally appended to MSS of the Gospels sometimes say that Theophilus was a disciple of Luke (H. von Soden, *Die Schriften des NT*, Berlin, 1902, i. 319), sometimes that he was a man of senatorial rank (συγκλητικὸν ὄντα καὶ ἄρχοντα ἴσως) because he is addressed as κράτιστος (p. 324), but these statements are important only as showing the absence of any tradition or legend.

Among modern guesses, ingenious but devoid of any foundation, may be mentioned A. Beck's, who identifies Luke with the unnamed companion of Cleopas on the way to Emmaus and Theophilus with an Antiochene tax-collector, the friend of Chuza and Herod, who had gone to Cæsarea with Herod and Berenice (*Prolog des Lk.-Evangeliums*, Amberg, 1900).

As 'tradition' is thus ignorant of any facts concerning Theophilus, the only source of information which we possess is contained in the implications of the Lucan writings. Using this clue, the interest of Theophilus in Christianity may fairly be regarded as identical with the purpose of Luke in writing. Fully or certainly to discover what this was is doubtless impossible, but a general consideration of the Lucan books, both by themselves and as compared with the other Gospels, gives some important clues.

The most remarkable feature of the Lucan writings is that, unlike Mark and Matthew, they contain a continuation of the history of Jesus. This clearly points to a circle in which Church life, as something distinct from the Synagogue, had become self-conscious. It must be remembered that, so far as Mark goes, there is nothing to show this self-consciousness. The Second Gospel seems to have been written to prove that Jesus was the Messiah, not to support the view that the Christians were the chosen people of God. Similarly in Matthew, though there is a great development beyond the position of Mark, the question is that of the Law, not of the Church, or congregation of God. Matthew's object is to show Christianity as the New Law, and therefore he added to Mark large sections expounding the teaching of Jesus in this light. He could not be satisfied with Mark, but was not obliged to consider the meaning of the Christian community. Luke, however, and Theophilus by implication, were concerned to give a reasonable account of the community, and to propound the view that the Christians, not the Jews, are the true Ecclesia—using the word which from its associations in the LXX implied that those to whom it was applied were the Ancient People of God. Acts especially seems intended to prove this proposition, and it justifies the conclusion that one of the λόγοι in which Theophilus had been instructed concerned the claim of Christians that they and not the Jews were the true people of God.

It is also possible that this contention had a further apologetic importance. It has often been noticed that Luke is anxious to prove that there was no lawful reason for persecution by the Romans. The right of the religion of Israel to toleration was unquestioned, and it was possibly part of Luke's apologetic aim that the Christians' Church, not the Jewish Synagogue, could claim this toleration.

LITERATURE.—J. Moffatt, *DCG*, art. 'Theophilus'; T. Zahn, *Einleitung in das NT*^{3}, Leipzig, 1906, § 58, n. 5.

K. LAKE.

THESSALONIANS, EPISTLES TO THE.—1. The Thessalonian Church.—(1) *The narrative of Ac 17.*—Thessalonica, a free Greek city with the right to summon its own assembly, was a flourishing seaport and the capital of one of the four divisions of Macedonia. Thither, in the course of his second missionary journey, came Paul, together with Silas and Timothy, to carry on the work cut short in Philippi by the civil power. Beginning as usual with the Jews, the Apostle preached in the synagogue on three successive Sabbaths. The result of his preaching was the conversion of a few of the Jews, of a great multitude of Greek proselytes, and of a considerable number of the principal women. Subsequently the Jews, aided by the rabble* of the city, created an uproar, stormed the house where the apostles lodged, and dragged Jason their host before the municipal assembly. There they accused him of harbouring men whose presence was a menace to the public peace, adherents of a rival Emperor, one Jesus. To such a charge no Imperial officer could safely turn a deaf ear, least of all in a city possessing peculiar privileges. Yet the action of the politarchs was lenient. They bound over Jason and 'the rest' to keep the peace of the city and let them go, probably holding them responsible for the continued absence of Paul and Silas from Thessalonica (Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, p. 231). Meanwhile the apostles and Timothy had been sent by night to Berœa, where they continued their missionary labours. But the hostility of the Thessalonian Jews still pursued them, and their work had to be abandoned. Paul departed to the sea,* probably to Dium, where he embarked for Athens. Silas and Timothy remained at Berœa with instructions to rejoin him as soon as possible (ὡς τάχιστα, Ac 17^{15}).

(2) *Supplementary details supplied by the Epistles.*—The reliability of Ac 17 is attested by the accuracy of its local information. The existence of the Thessalonian δῆμος (v.^{5}), the title πολιτάρχης (vv.$^{6-8}$), the greater freedom of women in Macedonian life as compared with that of Athens (v.^{4}), are all facts substantiated by contemporary evidence (cf. Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, p. 237 ff.; Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 227, *AJTh* ii. [1898] 598–632). Yet the Acts narrative is an outline sketch rather than a finished picture (Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 233; cf. Harnack, *The Acts of the Apostles*, London, 1909, p. 206). Its appearance is considerably altered by the addition of details gleaned from 1 Thessalonians.

(*a*) Though the writer of the Acts admits that most of the Thessalonian Christians were Gentiles, he speaks only of Gentile proselytes to Judaism (τῶν τε σεβομένων Ἑλλήνων, 17^4). 1 Thess. implies that the Thessalonian Church was composed largely of converts from heathenism (1^9 2^{14} 4^{1-5}). This discrepancy certainly disappears if we regard as the true text of Ac 17^4 Ramsay's emendation πολλοὶ τῶν σεβομένων, καὶ Ἑλλήνων πλῆθος πολὺ κτλ. (*St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 226 n.). But probably the insertion of καὶ by the Bezan and 'inferior' MSS on which it is based represents only a scribe's attempt to avoid the unusual phrase τῶν σεβομένων Ἑλλήνων (Askwith, *An Introduction to the Thessalonian Epistles*, p. 12 ff.).

(*b*) Ac 17 seems to suggest that Paul left Thessalonica soon after his three weeks of synagogue teaching. From 1 Thess. we gather that the Apostle settled down to his ordinary trade (2^9; cf. 2 Th 3^8), dealt personally with individual converts (2^{7-11}), and built up a simple form of church organization (5^{12}). Twice at Thessalonica he received donations from Philippi (Ph $4^{15.\,16}$). These things would scarcely be crowded into three weeks. Clearly the Apostle spent a much longer time at Thessalonica. The chronological scheme of Acts would allow for a stay of six months (Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 228).

(*c*) From Ac 18^5 it would naturally be inferred that Silas and Timothy first rejoined Paul at Corinth. 1 Thess. makes it clear that before this they had been with him in Athens (3^1). These differences between Acts and 1 Thess., while they betray no fundamental contradiction, yet serve to show the complete independence of the two narratives. 'It is evident that that epistle was not in the hands of the author of Acts . . . nor was Acts in the hands of the author of 1 Thess.' (*EBi* iv. 5040 f.).

2. Occasion and date of the Epistles.—In Athens Paul was joined by Silas and Timothy, who caused him grave anxiety by their tidings of fresh persecutions suffered by the Thessalonian Church (1 Th 3^{1-5}). More than once Paul planned a return to Thessalonica, but the way was barred. What particular obstacle is meant by the Oriental phrase ἐνέκοψεν ἡμᾶς ὁ Σατανᾶς (2^{18}) is uncertain. Perhaps it was the unrescinded prohibition of the Thessalonian politarchs (Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 231). Whatever its nature, it did not affect Timothy, and accordingly Paul and Silas (cf. ἐπέμψαμεν, 3^1) sent him in their stead to learn the state of the Church's affairs, and to strengthen the persecuted Christians. Left alone in Athens, after a sojourn in that city of not more than four or five weeks Paul went on to Corinth, where Silas and Timothy found him on their return from Macedonia[*] (Ac 18^{5}). Timothy's report, supplemented perhaps by a letter from the Thessalonians, was on the whole extremely satisfactory (see *Exp*, 5th ser. viii. [1898] 161 ff. for an attempt to reconstruct the supposed letter). The constancy of the Thessalonians under persecution not only had proved them worthy of their 'election,' but had also caused their example to be held up for imitation to all believers throughout Macedonia and Achaia (1 Th 1$^{2-10}$ 3$^{5-8}$). Yet they were beset by dangers. Adversaries of the apostles had misrepresented their motives in preaching at Thessalonica, possibly making capital out of their secret departure from the city (2$^{3\text{ff.}}$, where the words πλάνη, ἀκαθαρσία, δόλος, κολακεία, πλεονεξία, ζητοῦντες δόξαν seem to echo actual charges brought against the writers). If the Thessalonian Christians were once brought to distrust their teachers, it seemed probable that persecution would soon drive them back to heathenism.

---

* Lake (*The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, p. 69 n.) suggests that ἀγοραίων (Ac 17^5) means not 'loafers' but 'agitators' (cf. Plutarch, *Æmil. Paul.* 38), and that the δῆμος to which the apostles were to have been brought was not a special juridical body, but merely the agitation meeting called into existence by the ἀγόραιοι.

* Zahn, following in v.^{14} the reading of the MSS HLP ὡς ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν, suggests that Paul travelled overland to Athens (*Introd. to the NT*, Eng. tr., 3 vols., Edinburgh, 1909, vol. i. p. 214).

Furthermore, difficulties existed within the Christian community. Heathen social life and the impurity tolerated by public opinion still had attractions for some (4$^{1-8}$); some were inclined to abandon useful employment for a life of idleness (4^{11}), while others showed a spirit of disorder and contempt for those in authority (5$^{12-14}$). Misunderstandings had arisen as to the use of peculiar spiritual gifts (5$^{19, 20}$). Some Christians who had lost friends by death were anxious to know what part these should have in the Parousia.

Harnack ('Das Problem des zweiten Thessalonicherbriefs,' in *SBAW*, 1910) thinks that Timothy also reported a serious cleavage between Jewish and Gentile converts; hence the insistence on '*all* the brethren,' *e.g.* 1 Th 3^{12} 5$^{15, 26}$.

To remove these difficulties, the two apostles and Timothy wrote the joint Epistle, 1 Thessalonians. It was the only possible substitute for a personal visit, and every paragraph bears witness to the warmth of personal affection existing between teachers and pupils. Who bore this letter to its destination, and whether he returned immediately to Paul, we do not know. By some means, however, the Apostle learned that fresh trouble had arisen at Thessalonica. Persecution still continued and was still bravely endured (2 Th 1^{4}); but a new source of anxiety had arisen from a spreading belief in the imminence of the Parousia. 1 Thess. had spoken not of the time, but only of the suddenness of the Lord's coming, yet one phrase at least (ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες κτλ., 4^{15}) seemed to give colour to the idea that it was to be expected within the lifetime of the existing generation. This notion was fostered by men who claimed the authority not only of the apostolic letter, but also of their own personal gift of prophecy (2 Th 2^{2}). Wild excitement followed, and men began entirely to neglect the duties of daily life (3^{11}).

To end this disorder, the three teachers wrote a second letter. Its main point lies in the section 2$^{1-12}$, which supplements the eschatological teaching of 1 Thess., by dwelling on the number of things which must happen before the victorious coming of the Lord, and so removing all ground for the belief that it is near at hand.

This account of the order of writing of the two Epistles is generally accepted by those who admit their genuineness. Harnack, however, suggests that they were written at or about the same time, 1 Thess. to the Gentile, 2 Thess. to the Jewish section of the community[†] ('Das Problem des zweiten Thessalonicherbriefs,' in *SBAW*, 1910).

The actual date assigned to the Epistles depends upon the particular system of Pauline chronology adopted. Both, if genuine, were written during Paul's stay at Corinth at the end of his second missionary journey (Ac 18^{11}; see *EBi* iv. 5037), and must in any case have been composed between A.D. 47 and 53 (see Moffatt, *Historical NT*^{2}, pp. 121–137). The interval between them would be at most a few weeks.

3. Contents of the Epistles.—(i.) 1 THESSALONIANS. — After the opening salutation (1^{1}), which represents a combination of the conventional Greek and Hebrew greetings of the period (χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη), the Epistle falls into two sections.

(*a*) *Narrative and personal* (1^{2}–3^{13}).—(1) Thanksgiving for the Thessalonians' steadfastness under trial and progress in the faith, which have made them a pattern for all Christians throughout Macedonia and Achaia. Their new strength springs from the fact that they have become servants of a God who is living and real (1$^{2-10}$).

(2) Surely they can have no doubts about the apostles' motives, when they recall their freedom from all self-seeking, their solicitude for individuals, the persecution they had suffered, the labour and privation necessitated by their voluntary independence. Pupils themselves bear witness that their teachers' attitude was that of a father exhorting his children to walk worthily of God (2$^{1-12}$).

(3) The children have responded nobly. The message of power they received has inspired them bravely to endure persecution at the hands of their countrymen, even as the Jewish Christians had already done in Judæa (2$^{13-16}$).

(4) Driven from Thessalonica, the apostles have longed to return. More than once Paul planned to do so, but in vain. Unable to bear suspense, he and Silas sent Timothy from Athens to learn how they fared.[*] The good news he brought back has put new life into the apostles. In spite of persecution, the Thessalonians have remained steadfast. The apostles therefore pour out their hearts in thanksgiving to God, and in new longing to revisit and strengthen their spiritual children (2^{17}–3^{10}). May God soon grant them their desire, and lead their converts still further in the way of holiness (3$^{11-13}$).

(*b*) *Hortatory and doctrinal.*—(1) So far they have done well. They must not relax their efforts. The Christian watchword is progress. Christian progress will involve complete severance from the impurity of pagan life. They who wilfully sin against the body, the dwelling-place of the Spirit, lay themselves open to the vengeance of God (4$^{1-8}$).

(2) Brotherly love, already a manifest token of Divine guidance in them, must be maintained. One mark of its presence will be such quiet performance of daily duties as will be an example to heathen neighbours (4$^{9-12}$).

(3) Let no one be anxious about departed friends. Christians are one with Christ. Those who sleep will awake and have their place along with the living at His coming (4$^{12-18}$). When He will come no man can tell. Christians must so live as to be prepared for His coming at any time (5$^{1-11}$).

(4) Finally, they must remember their duty of obedience to those in authority and of mutual help and forbearance to each other. Joy, prayer, thanksgiving are the basis of the Christian life. Peculiar spiritual gifts are to be neither discouraged nor over-estimated: that which is good must

---

[*] Soon after Timothy's departure from Athens, Silas seems to have been sent on a similar errand to another Macedonian Church (Ac 18^{5}), perhaps to Philippi (Ph 4^{15}).

[†] This theory of the destination of 2 Thess. is based chiefly on the essentially Jewish complexion of the Epistle, especially 2$^{1-12}$, and on the reading εἵλατο ὑμᾶς ὁ θεὸς ἀπαρχὴν εἰς σωτηρίαν (2^{13}). Its author is inspired by a desire to accept the authenticity of 2 Thess., although he thinks that its difference in tone from 1 Thess. makes it incredible that the two Epistles were written to the same people about the same time.

[*] κἀγὼ ἔπεμψα (3^{5}) may perhaps imply that St. Paul sent a second messenger on his own account.

be held fast; all that bears the image of evil must be rejected (5^{12-22}).

The Epistle ends with a prayer for their complete sanctification, a request for their intercessions, a command to circulate the Epistle itself, and a final benediction (5^{23-28}).

(ii.) 2 THESSALONIANS.—(1) The salutation ($1^{1.2}$) leads up to a thanksgiving for the readers' spiritual progress, especially for their endurance under persecution. Such constancy is a proof of what awaits them at the Final Judgment (1^{2-4}). The Final Judgment is then described in a rhythmical passage based on OT phrases (1^{5-10}), perhaps an adaptation of a primitive Christian hymn (Bornemann, *Die Thessalonicherbriefe*, pp. 329, 336). May they be made worthy to set forth the glory of the name of the Lord Jesus in that day (1^{10-12}).

(2) But let them not be misled. That day is not yet, whatever mistaken teachers may say, even though they claim the support of the Apostle's letter (2^{1-3}). Do they not remember the Apostle's teaching? A mystery of lawlessness is at work in the world, but as yet it is kept in check. First must come the removal of the restraining power, the great apostasy, the climax of lawlessness in the person of the man of lawlessness and the time of his temporary success. Then, and not before then, will Christ come in victory to destroy the 'man of lawlessness' and his followers (2^{1-12}). Thanks be to God who has delivered the readers from such a fate: let them hold fast those things which they have received, and may God strengthen and keep them steadfast (2^{13-17}).

(3) Let them pray for their teachers, who have full confidence in their sincerity. God grant them love and patience (3^{1-5}).

(4) Idle and unruly brethren are to be shunned. Such conduct is opposed both to the teaching and to the example of the apostles. The Christian must be self-supporting or be cut off from the community (3^{6-15}). May God's own peace rest on them all (3^{16}). The Epistle closes with a salutation in Paul's own handwriting.

4. Teaching of the Epistles.—(i.) DOCTRINE OF GOD.—The dominant thought is that God is a living personal reality, as opposed to the abstractions of heathen philosophy or the mere fancies of heathen religion (1 Th $1^{9.10}$). God gave the apostles their message ($2^{4.13}$), and His inward power moved their hearers to accept it (2^{13}, 2 Th 2^{13}), so that their life is now lived in His very presence (ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ, 1 Th 1^{3}). From Him alone come grace and peace (3^{12} 5^{23}, 2 Th 2^{16} 3^{16}). He is our Judge (1 Th 2^{4}) but He is also our Father (1^{3} $3^{11.13}$, 2 Th $1^{1.2}$ 2^{16}).

(ii.) CHRISTOLOGY.—(*a*) *Person of Christ.*—It is not too much to say that the essential Divinity of Christ and His essential equality with the Father are everywhere taken for granted. Christ is the Son (1 Th 1^{10}): He is linked with the Father as the source of the Church's life (1^{1}, 2 Th 1^{1}; cf. 1 Th 2^{14}), as the object of prayer (1 Th 3^{11}, 2 Th 2^{16}), as the giver of supreme blessings (2 Th 1^{2}; cf. 3^{18}, 1 Th 5^{28}). To one trained in Jewish monotheism, this can have meant nothing less than that Christ Himself is God (see Sanday in *HDB* iii. 648). Therefore He is naturally called ὁ κύριος, a title commonly applied to God among the Hellenistic Jews. At the same time His humanity is indicated by the use of the simple human name 'Jesus' (1 Th 1^{10} 4^{14}), and His Messiahship by the frequent repetition of the title Χριστός.

(*b*) *Work of Christ.*—On earth Christ died and rose again (1 Th 1^{10} 4^{14} 5^{10}). His death was the means of man's salvation ($5^{9.10}$); His resurrection is the pledge of the resurrection of His followers (4^{14}), who shall hereafter share His glorified life (4^{17} 5^{10}). As Messiah He will finally vanquish the forces of evil (2 Th 2^{8-10}), and sit on the judgment-seat (1^{7-10}).

(iii.) THE HOLY SPIRIT.—As the Son is linked with the Father, so also the Holy Spirit is associated with the Divine activity. The Holy Spirit inspired both the conviction with which the apostles preached and the joy with which their message was received (1 Th $1^{5.6}$). From the Holy Spirit came those charismatic gifts which abuse seemed likely to bring into contempt (5^{19}). Bodily impurity is a sin against the Holy Spirit of God planted within (4^{8}). It cannot be claimed, however, that the Holy Spirit is spoken of as distinctly personal.

(iv.) ESCHATOLOGY.—The eschatological teaching of these Epistles centres round the doctrine of the victorious coming of the Lord Jesus as the climax of human history. Yet in neither Epistle do the writers profess to give a complete description of that final event. They select only those points which bear directly on the practical question before them at the moment. The teaching of the First Epistle is framed to answer the question 'What part will dead Christians take in the Parousia?' That of the Second Epistle is shaped by the desire to quiet hysterical unrest at Thessalonica with an assurance that the Parousia is not imminent. If the statements of the two Epistles have few points of contact, it is because they are dealing with entirely different aspects of their subject.

(1) 1 Th 4^{13}–5^{10}.—(*a*) *The Parousia and the resurrection of the dead* (4^{13-18}).—No anxiety need be felt about the faithful departed. When Jesus comes again, God, who raised Him from the dead, will also raise up those who are united to Him.* Nor will they be at any disadvantage as compared with the living. 'For the Lord himself will descend from heaven with a commanding word (κελεύσματι), with the voice of the archangel and with the trumpet of God.' The dead in Christ will first rise; then they who are (still) alive will be snatched up along with them into the air in clouds to meet the Lord: thus shall they be ever with the Lord (4^{15-18}). In this passage the writers claim to be speaking ἐν λόγῳ Κυρίου (4^{15}). Whether they are referring to actual sayings recorded in the Gospels (*e.g.* Mt $24^{30ff.}$, Jn 6^{39}) or to some personal revelation to Paul is uncertain (cf. Milligan, *Thessalonians, ad loc.*). But there can be no doubt as to the source of many of the details of their picture. They have freely borrowed the bold imagery of Jewish Apocalyptic. This should be a sufficient warning against a too literal interpretation of their statements.

κέλευσμα, φωνὴ ἀρχαγγέλου, σάλπιγξ θεοῦ, whether they be synonymous or distinct ideas, are the usual prelude to a theophany in Jewish imagery (Ex 19^{16}, Zec 9^{14}), and are especially connected with the end of the last world age and the Resurrection (Dn 12^{1}, *4 Ezr.* vi. 23; cf. Targum on Zec 14^{4}, 'at that time will Jehovah take in His hand a great trumpet and with it blow ten blasts to raise the dead'). The advantage of those who survive ('qui derelicti sunt'; cf. οἱ περιλειπόμενοι) at the end over the dead is discussed in *4 Ezr.* xiii. 24, though the conclusion is different from that of 1 Thessalonians. The mention of clouds in connexion with the Lord's coming seems to go back to Dn 7^{13} (cf. Mt 24^{30} 26^{64}). The snatching up of the living in clouds as in a chariot (cf. Ps 104^{3}) has no known parallel in earlier or contemporary writers, but the idea is quite in keeping with Jewish apocalyptic notions (see Thackeray, *The Relation of St Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*, ch. v.).

These examples are sufficient to show how large a use is made in 1 Thess. of traditional Jewish ideas. But these ideas have become the setting of new Christian truths—the knowledge of Christ's resurrection as a fact, and the assurance that His resurrection is the pledge of the resurrection of His servants (4^{14} 5^{10}). It is in these truths that we find the real centre of the writers' interest. For them, as for us, the setting is relatively unimportant. The permanent lesson of their teaching is that 'neither death nor any cosmic crisis in the future will make any essential difference to the close relation between the Christian and his Lord' (Moffatt, *EGT*, 'Thessalonians,' p. 38).

---

* This seems to be the sense of the difficult verse 1 Th 4^{14} if we connect the clause διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ with ἄξει rather than with κοιμηθέντας.

(*b*) *The time of the Parousia.*—The expression ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες οἱ περιλειπόμενοι ($4^{15.\ 17}$) is generally understood to imply that Paul expected the Parousia to be within his own lifetime. Perhaps this is reading too much into his words. The Thessalonians had asked a question concerning the relative advantages of 'those who are dead' and of 'us who are still alive,' in the event of a speedy return of Christ. It may be that the Apostle's answer merely repeats the terms of the question. Or the clause ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες οἱ περιλειπόμενοι may well be paraphrased, 'When I say "we," I mean those who are living, those who survive to that day' (Lightfoot, *Notes on Epistles of St. Paul*, p. 66). At any rate, the writers definitely refuse to predict 'times and seasons' ($5^{1.\ 2}$). The Christian's duty is not to seek to know the future, but so to live as to be prepared for the Lord's coming at any time ($5^{4\text{ff.}}$).

(2) 2 Th $2^{1\text{-}12}$.—*The signs of the end.*—The eschatological teaching of the Second Epistle is supplementary to that of the First. It deals with the troublous times which will immediately precede the Second Advent. The coming of Christ is certain, but the end is not yet. First must come the apostasy, and the culmination of evil in the person of the 'man of lawlessness,' who will wage war on every object of human veneration, and take his seat in the Temple, claiming Divine honours as his right. Deceived by the signs and wonders he displays, those who have rejected the true Christ will hasten to follow this blasphemous imitator. Their infatuation is the Divine punishment of their previous wilful blindness.

The 'mystery of lawlessness,' of which these things will be the climax, is already at work in the world. But at present it is prevented by some influence (τὸ κατέχον, 2^6) or person (ὁ κατέχων, 2^7) from attaining its full development. Only when the restraining power has been removed will the 'man of lawlessness' be revealed. For a time he will succeed, but his reign will be ended by the coming of the Lord Jesus to destroy him and to set up the kingdom of the saints ($2^{1\text{-}12}$). This teaching claims to be merely an echo of instruction already given to the Thessalonians by word of mouth (2^5). This will help to explain why to us it seems fragmentary and obscure. The readers for whom it was intended had clues to its meaning which we no longer possess. One thing, however, is certain. The main features of this 'Pauline Apocalypse' are taken unmodified from purely Jewish sources.

Later Jewish eschatology always spoke of the time immediately preceding the coming of the Messiah as one of great upheavals among the nations, and of unprecedented outbreaks of evil (see *4 Ezr.* v. 1–12, vi. 19–28, *Apoc. Bar.* lxx., *Jub.* xxiii., *Ass. Mos.* x.; cf. Mt 24). Whether or not this idea has its roots in a primitive Babylonian Creation-myth (so Bousset, *The Antichrist Legend*, London, 1896; and H. Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, Göttingen, 1895) is immaterial. It is sufficient to trace its development in Jewish literature. The very earliest 'Messianic'* prophecies of the OT represent the Golden Age as preceded by a time of conflict—the conflict which will destroy the particular oppressor of Israel at the time, and wipe out the ungodly in Israel itself (*e.g.* Am 9, Is 10^{28}–11^9 31. 32; cf. Hag $2^{6\text{-}9}$). The power to be overcome is in each case an actually existing Empire—Assyria, Babylon, or Persia—whose downfall will immediately usher in the glorious reign of peace. In the later prophetic books a difference appears. The Messianic age is thrown forward into a remote future, and is introduced by a struggle on a much vaster scale. Not one but all the heathen nations gather in a combined attack upon Jerusalem and are destroyed (Ezk 38. 39, Jl $3^{9\text{-}21}$; cf. Zec $14^{1\text{-}7.\ 12}$). Obviously such descriptions are symbolical. They mark the transition-stage between prophecy properly so called and apocalypse.

In the apocalyptic literature of a later period, the general notion of a final conflict between the powers of the world and the kingdom of the saints reappears in varying forms. In times of unusual oppression it seemed to be near at hand, and existing heathen rulers seemed to represent the very incarnation of the heaven-defying world-spirit. The book of Daniel takes this view of Antiochus Epiphanes (Dn $11^{36\text{ff.}}$), and at a later time the Psalms of Solomon seem to regard Pompey in a similar way (*Pss.-Sol.* ii. 1, 29, xvii. 13).

In later pictures of the last struggle a shadowy figure sometimes appears, half-human, half-demonic, who is to lead the world-forces in the last times (*Apoc. Bar.* xl.; cf. *4 Ezr.* v. 1 ff., *Sib. Orac.* iii. 60 ff.). His reign will be a time of general impiety (*4 Ezr.* v. 1, 10–12); he will perform miracles (see *4 Ezr.* v. 4, 7, *Sib. Orac.* iii. 65 ff., *Asc. Isa.* iv. 5) and deceive even the faithful (*Sib. Orac.* iii. 69), till finally he is slain by Messiah (*Apoc. Bar.* xl.). This is the person familiar to later speculation under the name 'Antichrist,' a name which first appears in 1 Jn $2^{18\text{-}20}$. An allusion to this idea is possibly to be found in the personal character given to the 'abomination of desolation' by the use of the masculine participle ἑστηκότα in Mk 13^{14}. Bousset, less probably, sees a similar reference in the words of Jn 5^{43}, 'If another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive' (*The Antichrist Legend*, p. 134).

The picture of the 'man of lawlessness' is indubitably a phase of the Antichrist tradition. Like all Apocalyptists, the writer felt himself free to introduce new details, *i.e.* the crowning impiety of sitting as God in the Temple, and the idea of a restraining power, which was necessary to explain why the end was delayed. But the figure presented is purely conventional, and is not directly connected with any historical person or circumstances. Its main features are borrowed from Daniel's account of Antiochus Epiphanes (Dn $11^{36\text{ff.}}$), with a possible reminiscence of Ezekiel's description of the prince of Tyre (Ezk 28^2). The idea, common to most apocalyptic works, of a widespread apostasy in the last times seems to have sprung from the memory of the actual apostasy of many Jews in the time of Antiochus (1 Mac 1^{11} $2^{15.\ 23}$; cf. Mt $24^{10\text{-}18}$). For the miracles wrought by the 'man of lawlessness,' his deluding of the Jews, and his destruction by Messiah, Jewish parallels have already been quoted (cf. also Mk 13^{22}). It is not necessary to suppose that the writer of 2 Th 2 intended to make any close application of the details of the old tradition to the circumstances of his own age. Many interpretations of the chapter have been based on that supposition, but they are at best precarious and quite unnecessary (see Milligan, *Thessalonians*, p. 166 ff.; Findlay, *Thessalonians*, p. 223 ff.; *HDB* iv. 748). The one point which may be granted is that by the force which restrains the final outbreak of lawlessness is meant the Roman Empire.* The 'mystery of lawlessness' is any power, whether Jewish or heathen, which actively opposes the spread of Christ's Kingdom. The portrait of the 'man of lawlessness' is wholly ideal, a kind of personification of the supreme effort of the anti-Christian forces.

---

* It is convenient to speak of these passages as 'Messianic,' although some of them contain no reference to a personal Messiah. The fact that in some cases the description of the Messianic age is of much later date than the account of the conflict is unimportant. It is sufficient that they were placed side by side when the prophetic books took their final form.

* τὸ κατέχον will then be the power of the Empire: ὁ κατέχων the Emperor as the representative of that power, or perhaps the angel which presides over the fate of the Empire (cf. Dn 10^{13}).

Superficially viewed, this teaching may seem to be merely an echo of an obsolete myth. But it must not be forgotten that the language of Apocalypse is essentially symbolical. Paul has not hesitated to use all the imagery of Jewish Apocalyptic, yet through this conventional symbolism he expresses the truly Christian confidence that in the end the cause of Christ must triumph and all the powers of evil cease to be (see Findlay, *Thessalonians*, p. 230; Kennedy, *St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things*, p. 184).

5. Authenticity of the Epistles.—(i.) 1 THESSALONIANS.—At the present day it is scarcely necessary to defend the authenticity or even the integrity of 1 Thessalonians. Both are accepted as fully established by all modern critics (*e.g.* Jülicher, Wrede, Harnack, Milligan, Moffatt, Lake), except the small minority who regard all the Pauline Epistles as spurious (see *EBi*, art. 'Paul,' § 38). The only really doubtful clause is 2^{16b}, *ἔφθασεν δὲ ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἡ ὀργὴ εἰς τέλος*, which seems to be a reminiscence of *Test. Levi*, vi. 11, and may have been added after the fall of Jerusalem. The genuineness of the rest of the Epistle is put beyond all doubt by its thoroughly Pauline style, its independence of the Acts narrative, and the absence of any doctrinal or polemical interest which could supply the motive of a forgery.

(ii.) 2 THESSALONIANS.—The case for 2 Thess. is not so clear. Its genuineness has been doubted on the following grounds.

(1) *Its close resemblance in structure to 1 Thess.*, with which is said to be coupled a difference in tone and colour so great as to make it incredible that the two Epistles were written by the same writer to the same community about the same time (Wrede). This is the most weighty objection that has been advanced, but it is by no means conclusive. It may be granted that, apart from the sections 1^{5-12} $2^{1-12.\ 15}$ $3^{1-5.\ 10.\ 13.\ 17}$, the Second Epistle is almost a reproduction of the First. Yet, amid this general resemblance, we do not find those subtle differences of vocabulary and syntax which betray the hand of the imitator. The difference of vocabulary is not greater than can be accounted for on natural grounds (Moffatt, *LNT*, p. 79). There is an un-Pauline stiffness and formality about the style of some passages (*e.g.* 1^{5-10} 2^{7b-10}), yet it occurs chiefly in what may be quotations of some semi-liturgical sentences (cf. Findlay, *Thessalonians*, p. lvii; *EBi* iv. 5044). A possible explanation of the close resemblance between the two Epistles may be that Paul had a copy of 1 Thess. before him when he dictated 2 Thessalonians. Such a reference to the earlier Epistle would be quite natural, in view of its having been quoted to support mistaken ideas about the Parousia (2^{2}). The colder, more official tone of 2 Thess. as compared with the First Epistle may be explained by the necessity for plain speaking occasioned by the errors of some Thessalonians. Its more Jewish complexion is due to the essentially Jewish nature of its subject. Harnack's theory that it was addressed exclusively to the Jewish community is ingenious but unconvincing.

(2) *Its eschatology.*—(*a*) A former generation of scholars maintained that the passage 2^{1-12} contains references to events much later than the death of Paul (so Kern, Baur, Hilgenfeld, Bahnsen). This position is no longer tenable. Increased knowledge of Jewish and primitive Christian eschatology has shown that the references of the Epistle are not to actual events but to traditional expectations.

(*b*) A second argument has been based on the ground that the teaching of 2 Th 2^{1-12}, which represents the Parousia as heralded by many signs, is incompatible with the view of 1 Th $5^{1\text{ff.}}$, that it will be sudden and unexpected. In any case, this is not a fatal objection to the Pauline authorship of either Epistle. Such seeming inconsistencies are characteristic of all primitive Christian conceptions of the end (*e.g.* Mt $24^{29\text{ff.}}$). But it is possible to exaggerate the discrepancy. Perhaps the meaning which the writer of 1 Th $5^{1\text{ff.}}$ intended to convey was that 'the day of the Lord comes as a thief in the night' only for those who are asleep in indifference. Those who are awake will not be taken unawares (see *EBi* iv. 5042). If this be the true explanation of the passage, the discrepancy between the two Epistles disappears.

(3) *References to forged epistles.*—A minor objection to the authenticity of 2 Thess. has been found in its supposed reference to the existence of forged epistles (2^{2}, *μήτε δι' ἐπιστολῆς ὡς δι' ἡμῶν*). It is certainly difficult to believe that spurious Pauline Epistles were circulated while the Apostle was alive. But close examination of the syntax of the verse 2^{2} shows that the clause *ὡς δι' ἡμῶν* should be connected not with *ἐπιστολῆς* but with *θροεῖσθαι*. The allusion then is not to spurious epistles, but to erroneous interpretations of a genuine one (Askwith, *Thessalonian Epistles*, p. 92 ff.). Various theories of the origin of 2 Thess. have been formulated on the assumption that the whole or part of it is spurious, *e.g.* (*a*) that into a genuinely Pauline Epistle have been interpolated the two later sections 1^{5-12} and 2^{1-12} (P. Schmidt, *ad loc.*); (*β*) that 2^{1-12} is a genuine Pauline fragment for which a later writer has provided a setting by a close imitation of 1 Thess. (Hausrath, *History of NT Times*, Eng. tr., 4 vols., London, 1895, iii. 215); (*γ*) that the Epistle was written by Timothy, who was influenced by a 'Caligula-apocalypse' (Spitta, *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristentums*, i. 111 ff.); (*δ*) that the whole of 2 Thess. was written to counteract the eschatological views encouraged by the Pauline Epistles. The writer took 1 Thess. as his model because it contains the most notable outline of Pauline eschatology (Wrede, 'Die Echtheit des zweiten Thessalonicherbriefs,' in *TU*, new ser. ix. 2). All these theories raise more difficulties than they remove. The style of 2 Thess. is too uniform throughout to lend any support to the theory of interpolation. The Epistle must stand or fall as a whole. On the other hand, it is difficult to believe that a forger wishing to correct Paul's teaching would address his work to a Church already in possession of a recognized Epistle of Paul. When all possible objections have been fully weighed, the conclusion which presents the least difficulty is that 2 Thess. is actually what it claims to be—an authentic letter of Paul to the Christians of Thessalonica. As such it found a place in the canon of Marcion and in the Old Latin and Syriac translations of the NT. Earlier still its language (1^{4}) was quoted as Pauline by Polycarp (*ad Phil.* xi.), though by mistake he quotes it as addressed to the Philippians.

6. Value of the Epistles.—(1) The Thessalonian Epistles are probably the earliest extant Christian writings. They present to us a primitive stage in the growth of the Church, and an early form of Christian teaching. They may be compared with Paul's speeches at Lystra (Ac $14^{15\text{ff.}}$) and at Athens ($17^{22\text{ff.}}$) as examples of his preaching to the heathen world. Though their teaching is simple and undeveloped, it is thoroughly Pauline in tone, and latent in it we may find the germs of the full-grown Pauline theology.

(2) These letters are an interesting expression of the writer's personality. They show us Paul the

pastor and his method of treating newly-made converts, his self-sacrificing devotion, his gentle dealing with personal difficulties and temptations, his continual yearning for his children in the faith. They show us Paul the Hebrew, saturated with the eschatological ideas of his own race and age, though for him all the eschatology that matters is summed up in the words: 'Whether we wake or whether we sleep, we live together with Christ' (cf. 1 Th 5^{10}).

(3) They help us to supplement the incomplete account of the founding of the Thessalonian Church given by the Acts.

LITERATURE.—(1) Artt. 'The Thessalonian Epistles,' 'Antichrist,' 'Man of Sin,' 'Apocalyptic Literature,' in Smith's *DB*, *HDB*, *EBi*, and *EBr*^{10}.

(2) General works on the NT, especially the *Introductions* of **T. Zahn** (Eng. tr., 3 vols., Edinburgh, 1909); **A. Jülicher** (Eng. tr., London, 1904); **B. W. Bacon** (New York, 1900); **J. Moffatt**, *Historical NT*^{2}, Edinburgh, 1901, *LNT*, do., 1911; **K. Lake**, *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, London, 1911.

(3) Commentaries: (*a*) German: **P. Schmidt**, *Der erste Thessalonicherbrief*, Berlin, 1885; **W. Bornemann**, *Die Thessalonicherbriefe* (Meyer's *Kommentar über das NT*), Göttingen, 1894; **B. Weiss**, *Brief an . . . die Thessalonicher*^{2}, Leipzig, 1902; **G. Wohlenberg**, *Der erste und zweite Thessalonicherbrief ausgelegt* (Zahn's *Kommentar zum NT*), do., 1903.

(*b*) English: **H. Alford**, *The Greek Testament*^{2}, London, 1857, iii.; **B. Jowett**, *Thessalonians, Galatians, Romans*^{2}, do., 1859; **J. B. Lightfoot**, *Notes on Epistles of St. Paul*, do., 1895; **J. Denney**, *Thessalonians* (*Expositor's Bible*), do., 1892; **J. Drummond**, *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle* (*International Handbooks to the NT*), New York, 1899; **G. G. Findlay**, *Thessalonians* (*Cambridge Greek Testament*), Cambridge, 1904; **G. Milligan**, *Thessalonians*, do., 1908; **J. Moffatt**, *EGT*, 'Thessalonians,' London, 1910; **J. E. Frame**, *ICC*, 'Thessalonians,' Edinburgh, 1912.

(4) Special Studies: **E. H. Askwith**, *Introduction to the Thessalonian Epistles*, London, 1902; **F. Spitta**, 'Der zweite Brief an die Thessalonicher,' in *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristentums*, i. [Göttingen, 1893]; **W. Wrede**, 'Die Echtheit des zweiten Thessalonicherbriefs,' in *TU*, new ser. ix. 2 [Leipzig, 1903]; **A. Harnack**, 'Das Problem des zweiten Thessalonicherbriefs,' in *SBAW*, 1910.

(5) Historical and doctrinal: **J. B. Lightfoot**, *Biblical Essays*, London, 1893, pp. 253–269; **W. M. Ramsay**, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, do., 1895; **H. St. J. Thackeray**, *St. Paul and Contemporary Jewish Thought*, do., 1900; **R. J. Knowling**, *The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ*, do., 1911; **H. A. A. Kennedy**, *St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things*, do., 1904; **W. Bousset**, *The Antichrist Legend*, Eng. tr., do., 1896.

A fuller list of authorities will be found in J. Moffatt, *LNT*, pp. 64–66.

F. S. MARSH.

THESSALONICA (Θεσσαλονίκη, now *Salonika*).—Thessalonica was a large and important Macedonian city, whose original name of Therme, derived from the hot springs found in the vicinity, was preserved in the *Thermaicus Sinus*, the bay at the head of which the city stood. Refounded by Cassander about 315 B.C., it was named after his wife Thessalonica, the sister of Alexander the Great. 'He pulled down the cities in the district of Crucis and on the Thermaic Gulf, collecting the inhabitants into one city' (Strabo, VII. fr. 21). The site was well chosen alike for defence and for commerce. Rising in tiers of houses from the sea-margin to the top of rocky slopes, and surrounded by high white walls, the city presented a striking appearance from the sea. Receiving the products of the vast and fertile plain watered by the Axius and the Haliacmon, it was the most populous city in Macedonia (Strabo, VII. vii. 4) and had a large share in the commerce of the Ægean. Under the Romans it became the capital of one of the four districts into which Macedonia was divided, and afterwards the virtual capital of the whole province. It was made a strong naval station, and during the first Civil War became the headquarters of Pompey and the senate. Having afterwards favoured the side of Octavian and Antony in the struggle with Brutus and Cassius, it was rewarded by being made a free city of the Empire. Cicero, who spent seven months of exile in it, was struck by its central position, the Thessalonians seeming to him 'positi in gremio imperii nostri' (*de Prov. Consul.* ii. 4).

With unerring judgment St. Paul chose Thessalonica as the scene of one of his missionary campaigns. He must have seen its strategic importance. If his aim was to establish Christianity in the governing and commercial centres of the Empire, in order that the light might radiate over the widest areas, his choice of Thessalonica was justified by an immediate and signal success. From the Christians of this city the word of the Lord sounded forth like a trumpet (ἐξήχηται) not only in Macedonia and Achaia, but 'in every place' (1 Th 1^8).

As a *civitas libera* Thessalonica enjoyed autonomy in all internal affairs. It was the residence of the provincial governor, but in ordinary circumstances he exercised no civic authority. The city was ruled by its own magistrates, who were known as politarchs (Ac 17^6). Luke's accuracy in the use of political terms is here strikingly illustrated. The term πολιτάρχαι is not found in any classical author, though the forms πολιάρχοι and πολιτάρχοι occur; but the inscription on a marble archway, probably erected in the time of Vespasian and still spanning a street of modern Thessalonica, begins with the word ΠΟΛΙΤΑΡΧΟΥΝΤΩΝ, which is followed by the names of seven magistrates. As part of its constitution Thessalonica had no doubt a senate and public assembly, but it is not clear whether the people (δῆμος) to whom an attempt was made to bring out Paul and Silas was the regular public meeting, as W. M. Ramsay thinks (*St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, London, 1895, p. 228), or the disorderly mob. In a free city even the *canaille* of the forum—οἱ ἀγοραῖοι—liked to feel that they had a semblance of power, and their passions could easily be played upon by flattering and panic-mongering demagogues.

But St. Paul's real enemies in Thessalonica were his own compatriots, who had been attracted to the city as a busy mart of commerce. Evidence of the presence of Jews in Macedonia is to be found in Philo's version of an Epistle of Agrippa to Caligula (*de Virtut. et legat. ad Caium*, 36). Their numbers and influence in Thessalonica are indicated by the 'great multitude' of Greeks who had accepted the Jewish faith (Ac 17^4), as well as by the ease with which they made the city crowd the instrument of their will. St. Paul went to the synagogue of Thessalonica, doubtless a splendid one, according to his custom (κατὰ τὸ εἰωθός; cf. Lk 4^{16}), his rule being to go 'to the Jew first' (Ro $2^{9.10}$). His preaching and reasoning on three successive Sabbaths—or perhaps during three whole weeks (σάββατα)—ended in the inevitable quarrel between Jew and Jewish Christian. Luke's succinct narrative might be supposed to imply that St. Paul's work in the city did not extend beyond the synagogue, and that Jewish intrigues compelled him to leave at the end of three weeks; but that can scarcely be the historian's meaning. Time must be allowed for the conversion of a large number of the Gentile population of Thessalonica, for the founding of an important and influential church, and for the Christians of Philippi, 100 miles distant, sending St. Paul their gifts 'once and again' (Ph 4^{16}). The Apostle himself recalls a fruitful ministry among the Thessalonians, in which he 'dealt with each one' not publicly but privately, 'as a father with his own children' (1 Th 2^{11}), till he had formed the nucleus of a Christian church. This quiet house-to-house work could not be compressed into three weeks. Ramsay thinks that St. Paul's residence in Thessalonica probably lasted from Dec. A.D. 50 to May 51 (*St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 228). J. Moffatt's suggestion of a month or two (*EGT* iv. 3) seems barely sufficient.

As the hostile Jews of Thessalonica knew that they could not silence St. Paul by fair means, they resorted to foul, getting the rabble of the forum to do the work of which they personally were ashamed. The accusation which was trumped up against the Apostle amounted to high treason (Ac 17^7), and resembled the charge that had been levelled against Jesus Himself (Jn $19^{12.15}$). There was hypocrisy in the indictment. The Messianic hope cherished by every devout Israelite was counted no crime, yet the actual proclamation of 'another king, Jesus,' is set down as an act of open rebellion, and the Jews of Thessalonica, like those of Jerusalem, have no king but Cæsar. Though only the most ignorant of the populace took the charge seriously, and the politarchs soon satisfied themselves that it was baseless, yet *læsa maiestas* was much too grave a matter to be dealt with lightly.

Tacitus says that already in the reign of Tiberius 'the charge of treason formed the universal resource in accusations' (*Ann.* iii. 38), and in course of time it became more and more common. The mere suspicion of *maiestas* was many a man's ruin. Pliny the younger says in his panegyric of Trajan that nothing enriched the exchequer of the prince and the public treasury so much as the charge of treason, 'singulare et unicum crimen eorum qui crimine vacarent' (*Paneg.* 42).

The magistrates of Thessalonica saw that they had to demonstrate their loyalty to the Empire. As the peace of the city had been disturbed, the angry passions of the 'wild beast' aroused, and a dangerous state of public feeling created, they felt justified in binding over the Apostle's friends—Jason and others—to keep the peace, and in the circumstances this could be done only if those friends advised the man who was the innocent cause of the disturbance to leave the town. Against the verdict of civic prudence it was vain to protest, but St. Paul evidently continued to chafe long under the ingenious device which made the honour of his friends a barrier between him and the work he had so successfully begun. It was such subtlety, and not the hatred of the mob, that made him think of the devices of Satan (1 Th 2^{18}).

The Christians of Thessalonica must have endured some persecution after he tore himself away from them. They imitated the Judæan churches in patient suffering (1 Th 2^{14}). It was three or four years before St. Paul could return to Macedonia (1 Co 16^5), and he certainly would not fail to visit the capital, unless its gates were still shut against him. Members of the church of Thessalonica whose names are known are Jason, Gaius, Secundus, Aristarchus, and perhaps Demas. In post-apostolic times the gospel made rapid progress in Thessalonica, which became one of the bulwarks of Eastern Christendom, winning for itself the name of 'the Orthodox City.' It has now a population of 130,000, of whom 60,000 are Sephardic Jews, speaking a corrupt form of Spanish, called Ladino.

LITERATURE.—W. M. Leake, *Travels in Northern Greece*, London, 1835; Murray's *Handbook to Greece*, do., 1900, 822–833.

JAMES STRAHAN.

THEUDAS.—Theudas is mentioned only once in the NT. In Ac 5^{36} Gamaliel counsels moderation in the treatment of the Christians, citing Theudas's career as evidence that a movement which is not of God will come to naught of itself. Regarding Theudas we are told that he claimed to be a unique person and drew to himself about four hundred followers, but the uprising was soon crushed and the leader slain. This incident is said to have taken place some time before the days of Judas of Galilee, who led a revolt at the time of 'the enrolment.'

These statements in themselves occasion no particular difficulty. It is only when they are placed beside similar statements in Josephus that any problem arises. In *Ant.* XX. v. 1 f. Josephus mentions a certain Theudas who set himself up as a prophet and persuaded a large number of persons to follow him to the Jordan, where he said he would stay the waters by his word and lead his followers across on dry land. But Fadus, the procurator of Judæa (from A.D. 44 to *c.* 46), sent out a band of horsemen, who scattered or slew Theudas's followers, captured their leader, cut off his head, and carried it to Jerusalem. Soon afterwards Fadus's successor, Alexander, put to death two sons of Judas of Galilee—the Judas who had raised an insurrection when Quirinius made an enrolment of the Jews. In another connexion Josephus describes this revolt, which occurred in A.D. 6–7 (*Ant.* XVIII. i. 1, 6, *BJ* II. viii. 1).

The agreement between Acts and Josephus with respect to Judas is apparent, although it is not certain that they have exactly the same date in mind (cf. Lk $2^{1ff.}$). They are also in general agreement as to the performance and fate of Theudas, but they differ very radically as to his date. Josephus places him nearly forty years after Judas, and thus subsequent to the time of Gamaliel, while Acts makes Theudas precede Judas. It is this chronological discrepancy that constitutes the chief difficulty in the interpretation of Ac 5^{36}.

Various solutions of the problem have been proposed:

(1) It has often been assumed that Acts and Josephus refer to two different persons, and that Josephus's failure to mention the incident recorded in Acts is not a sufficient reason for doubting the latter. This explanation seems to have been current as early as the time of Origen (cf. *c. Cels.* i. 57), and it still has many advocates.

(2) Others, while also believing that Ac 5^{36} and Jos. *Ant.* XX. v. 1 refer to different events, seek to discover elsewhere in Josephus an incident corresponding to that of Acts. Theudas is thought to have been one of the many revolutionists mentioned in Josephus by some other name. He has been identified with the Simon who is found among the disturbers arising soon after the death of Herod the Great (*Ant.* XVII. x. 6, *BJ* II. iv. 2). This was the opinion of Sonntag ('Theudas der Aufrührer' in *SK* x. [1837] 622–652). K. Wieseler (*Chronologischer Synopse der vier Evangelien*, Gotha, 1843, p. 103 ff., *Beiträge zur richtigen Würdigung der Evangelien und der evangelischen Geschichte*, do., 1869, p. 101 ff.) equates the Theudas of Acts with Matthias (*θευδᾶς* = *θεόδωρος* = מַתְּיָה), who in the last days of Herod's reign incited his pupils to pull down the golden eagle which had been placed over the great gate of the Temple (*Ant.* XVII. vi. 2–4, *BJ* I. xxxiii. 2–4).

(3) Still other interpreters think the Theudas incidents of Acts and of Josephus are so similar in general content that they must have been originally identical, but it is Josephus, they hold, rather than Acts that is erroneous. So J. D. Michaelis (*Einleitung in die göttlichen Schriften des Neuen Bundes*^{4}, Göttingen, 1788, i. 62 f.), who says that Josephus is correct in mentioning an uprising under Fadus, but wrong in making Theudas the leader. More recently F. Blass (*Acta Apostolorum*, Göttingen, 1895, p. 89) explains the difficulty by assuming a textual corruption in Josephus. Originally he had given no name, or else a different one, and some Christian copyist under the influence of Ac 5^{36} introduced the name of Theudas.

(4) Another type of explanation ascribes the error to Acts. B. Weiss would make the reference to Theudas a redactional interpolation (*Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das NT*^{2}, Berlin, 1889, p. 574, n. 4). Other analysts would also derive the verse about Judas from a secondary source. But most scholars who find Acts at fault think the error a

part of the original composition and due to the author's defective knowledge of Josephus. Dependence upon Josephus has been argued most fully by M. Krenkel (*Josephus und Lucas*, Leipzig, 1894, pp. 162–174) and P. W. Schmiedel (art. 'Theudas' in *EBi*). Josephus, it will be remembered, after referring to Theudas's fate, goes on to remark that soon afterwards the sons of Judas of Galilee were put to death. The author of Acts, so the argument runs, had vaguely remembered, or carelessly noted, the succession 'Theudas . . . Judas,' without precisely observing that Josephus was speaking in this connexion not of the fate of the well-known Judas but of that of the sons of Judas. This oversight, accordingly, resulted in the anachronism of Ac 5^{36}.

LITERATURE.—All the important commentaries on Acts discuss the present subject. See also, in addition to treatises already referred to, H. Holtzmann, 'Lucas und Josephus' in *ZWT* xvi. [1873] 85–93 and xx. [1877] 535–549; T. Keim, *Aus dem Urchristentum*, Zürich, 1878, i. 18–21; J. Belser, 'Lukas und Josephus,' in *Theol. Quartalschrift*, lxxviii. [1896] 1–78 (esp. pp. 61–71); W. M. Ramsay, *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?*, London, 1898, pp. 252–260; E. Schürer, *GJV* i.^{4} [Leipzig, 1901] 566 (and literature cited in note 6).

S. J. CASE.

THIGH.—'Thigh' (*μηρός*) is found in the NT only in Rev 19^{16}, 'on his garment and on his thigh a name written.' There is considerable doubt as to the interpretation (see *HDB*, *s.v.* 'Thigh'), but the general view is that the second phrase limits the first, *i.e.* the name was written upon the outer garment where it falls over the thigh; or it may have been that the inscription was partly on the garment and partly on the thigh (or what covered it). It was customary to attach a legend of some sort to statues, equestrian and other, and to place this in a prominent position. See references in H. Alford, *Greek Testament*, iv.^{5} [London, 1875] 728, and in H. B. Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*^{2}, London, 1907, p. 255. In contrast to v.^{12} this name is not cryptic.

W. CRUICKSHANK.

THISTLES.—See THORNS.

THONGS.—The word tr. 'thongs' (pl. of *ἱμάς*) in Ac 22^{25} (AV and RV) refers to the leather straps with which a captive or criminal was tied in a leaning posture to an inclined post, preparatory to flogging. In carrying out the order of the chiliarch that St. Paul should be examined by torture, the centurion directed his subordinates to bind him in this fashion, the 'thongs' being the instruments used to effect their purpose. In RVm the term is taken to signify the leather strands or lashes of the scourge (*horribile flagellum*) with which the torture was inflicted. The 'thongs' are thus regarded as a synonym for whip (*μάστιξ*) in v.^{24}. It is doubtful, however, whether the word *ἱμάς* in the plural is ever used in this sense. Grimm admits that it may bear either signification, but in the present instance prefers the latter.

W. S. MONTGOMERY.

THORN IN THE FLESH.—See PAUL.

THORNS, THISTLES (*ἄκανθα, τρίβολος, σκόλοψ*).—Apart from the Gospels, thorns or thistles are alluded to only twice in the NT. In He 6^{8} *ἄκανθα*, 'thorn,' and *τρίβολος*, 'brier,' occur together. The writer exhorts his readers to be steadfast in the faith, and reminds them of the spiritual blessings which they have received. Just as the earth 'which drinketh in the rain that cometh oft upon it,' and in spite of that 'beareth thorns and briers, is rejected,' so too will those who, endowed with all blessings and graces from above, fail to bring forth the fruits of righteousness. The term for 'bearing' in this passage is *ἐκφέρουσα*, and in contrast with the normal term *τίκτουσα* in v.^{7} indicates something which is unnatural. It is contrary to nature for a field which has been duly planted with good seed, and subsequently cared for and watered, to yield thorns and briers. It is equally unnatural for those in whom the spirit of truth has been planted, and who have received similar care and attention, to fall away and abandon the faith thus planted.

In 2 Co 12^{7} the word used is *σκόλοψ*, 'stake.' St. Paul writes that he has been given a 'stake for the flesh—the messenger of Satan to buffet me, lest I should be exalted above measure.' St. Paul elsewhere (Ro 6^{6} 8^{13}) recognizes the need for mortifying or crucifying the flesh, while in 1 Co 5^{5}, as here, he alludes to Satan's derived power for inflicting pain and suffering, a power which Satan, however, is impelled to use for the accomplishment of man's ultimate salvation. Opinions differ as to the nature of the stake for the flesh here alluded to, but there can be no doubt that it was a bodily ailment (cf. Lightfoot, *Galatians*^{5}, p. 189 f.). It may possibly have been a permanent affection of his eyesight (cf. Gal 4^{15}), or it may have been malaria, which would perhaps explain St. Paul's statement that he first visited Galatia on account of an infirmity in his flesh (Gal 4^{13}), or it may have been a form of epilepsy.

Thorns and thistles of various kinds are found all over Palestine. They cover fallow ground, and must be burnt before the ground can be ploughed. Prickly plants are used as hedges, and they also form the regular food of camels and goats.

LITERATURE.—*The Speaker's Commentary*, iii. [London, 1881] 469 f.; B. F. Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, do., 1889, p. 152 f.; J. B. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*^{5}, do., 1876, p. 186 ff.; *SDB*, pp. 600, 688; *HDB* iv. 758; *EBi* ii. 1456, iii. 3620.

P. S. P. HANDCOCK.

THOUSAND YEARS.—See APOCALYPSE.

THREE.—See NUMBERS.

THREE TAVERNS (*τρεῖς ταβέρναι*, representing the Lat. *Tres Tabernæ*).—Three Taverns was a station on the Via Appia, and probably a village of some importance on account of the stream of traffic constantly flowing through it. Cicero (*ad Att.* ii. 11) mentions it as the point where a branch road from Antium joined the Appian Way. Here St. Paul, who had landed at Puteoli and was proceeding to Rome, was met by a company of Christian brethren who had come from the capital to welcome him (Ac 28^{15}). According to the Antonine Itinerary, the station was 10 Roman miles nearer Rome than Appii Forum (where the Apostle had already been met by Roman brethren), and 17 Roman miles from Aricia, which is known to have been 16 Roman miles south of Rome. Tres Tabernæ probably stood about 3 miles from the modern Cisterna, on the road to Terracina, and very near the northern end of the Pontine Marshes.

LITERATURE.—C. Baedeker, *Southern Italy and Sicily*^{15}, London, 1908, p. 12.

JAMES STRAHAN.

THRONE (*θρόνος*).—'Throne' in the NT always implies a seat of office (cf. Ac 2^{30}). Metaphorically it is used of God's sovereignty in Heb. and Rev. (cf. Rev $4^{2-6.\ 9.\ 10}$) and of Christ's (He 1^{8}, Rev 3^{21} 20^{11}). In Rev 20^{4} there are thrones for the judges, where 'the plural is perhaps meant to include Christ and His assessors, the Apostles (Mt 19^{28}) and Saints (1 Co 6^{3})' (H. B. Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*^{2}, 1907, p. 261). In Rev 4^{4} 11^{16} RV the elders are on thrones round about the throne of God. We also read of 'Satan's throne' (Rev 2^{13} RV) established at Pergamum, which is probably explained by the fact that Pergamum was the chief seat of Cæsar-worship, and the first city in Asia to erect a temple to Augustus; others connect it with the worship of Æsculapius, for which the city was also famous (cf. 13^{2} RV: 'the dragon gave him his throne,' and 16^{10} RV: 'the throne of the beast'). In Col 1^{16} 'thrones' form one of the classes of angels—the term occurs only here in the NT—but in systems of angelology 'thrones' belong to the highest grade. These angels may be so called as sitting on thrones round the throne of God, the imagery expressing their conspicuous and serene dignity (so Origen, Lightfoot, Meyer, Abbott, etc.). Clement of Alexandria thought that they were so called because they form or support the throne of God, like the cherubim (Ezk 10^{1} 11^{22}, Ps 99^{1}), with which several of the Fathers identified them (Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Augustine). See PRINCIPALITY.

W. H. DUNDAS.

THUNDER (βροντή).—Thunder, the noise due to the disturbance of the air by the discharge of electricity, was regarded throughout the ancient world as supernatural. One of the elements of a theophany was 'the voice that shook the earth' (He 12^{26}), words reminiscent of Ps 46^{6} and of the manifestation on Sinai (Ex 19^{16} 20^{18}). 'The thunder to the feeling of the ancients is the most important part of the storm, seeming to be the commanding voice, the terrifying exclamation of Jahwé' (H. A. von Ewald, *Commentary on the Psalms*, Eng. tr., i. [London, 1880] 94). Thunder is one of the most impressive categories of the Book of Revelation. Like the seven stars, churches, seals, trumpets, and bowls, the seven thunders 'form a complete portion of the apocalyptic machinery' (H. Alford, *The Greek Testament*, iv.^{5} [London, 1875], on Rev 10$^{3.4}$). To the prophet's imagination, thunder is now a celestial warning to wicked men, now a majestic chorus in praise of God. When an angel casts a censer filled with fire upon the earth, and another pours his bowl upon the air, there are lightnings and thunders (8^{5} 16^{18}). When the lost Ark of the Covenant is restored to its place, the thunders of Sinai are again heard (11^{19}). To conscience-stricken men it always appeared that lightnings and thunders proceeded from the very throne of God (4^{5}); and even a modern poet says that 'if He thunders by law, the thunder is still His voice.' But thunder does not always suggest terrible things to the apocalyptist. His ear catches the echoes of thunder-music in heaven. The voice of harpers harping with their harps is as the voice of a great thunder (14^{2}); and the voice of a great multitude is as the voice of mighty thunders, saying Hallelujah (19^{6}).

JAMES STRAHAN.

THYATIRA (Θυάτειρα, neut. pl.).—Thyatira was a busy commercial city of northern Lydia, close to the southern border of Mysia. Situated a little to the south of the mountain ridge which is the watershed of the Caicus and the Hermus (Strabo, XIII. iv. 4), it controlled the traffic of the open and fertile valley of the Lycus, which flows S.W. to join the Hermus. Doubtless an old Lydian settlement, it retained its Lydian name, but its history begins with its refounding by Seleucus Nicator, the first of the Seleucid kings of Syria, who saw the advantage of establishing garrison cities and centres of Greek culture throughout his dominions, which extended from Western Asia to the Indus. The refounded city, 'a colony of the Macedonians' (Strabo, *loc. cit.*), was intended as a defence against Lysimachus, the master of northern Asia Minor. Some of the 2,000 Jewish families whom Antiochus the Great deported from Mesopotamia and Babylonia to Phrygia and Lydia (Jos. *Ant.* XII. iii. 4) must have been settled in Thyatira. In the Roman period the town became an important station on the overland route by the Hellespont (Dardanelles) to the East. It lay midway between the once royal cities of Pergamos and Sardis, but its own significance was always purely mercantile. It owed its prosperity to the manufacture of woollen goods, and especially to its dyed fabrics. An interesting evidence of the spiritual influence of the Jews in Thyatira is furnished by the fact that St. Paul's earliest European convert, the proselyte Lydia, is described as 'a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira' (Ac 16^{14}). Many scholars think that 'Lydia' was not her proper name but her ethnic designation—'the Lydian.' It was probably at her home in the Lycus Valley that she had been attracted to the lofty theism and pure morality of Judaism, and, on going to Philippi as the agent of a house of Thyatiran manufacturers and dyers, she naturally sought out the fellowship of the Jewish *proseuche*.

Purple had a much wider meaning in ancient than in modern times. The purple of Thyatira was probably the well-known turkey-red, made from the madder-root which grows abundantly in that region.

The native deities of Thyatira, as appears from inscriptions on coins, were the male and female Tyrimnos and Boreitene, whom the Ionian settlers identified with Apollo and Artemis. Christianity was probably brought to the city at the time of St. Paul's prolonged mission in Ephesus (Ac 19$^{10.26}$). Sown by whatever hand, the seed took firm root there and steadily grew. There was no ensuing decline of the Church's 'love and faith and ministry and patience,' her last works being more than her first (Rev 2^{19}). Thyatira had, however, a perplexing moral problem to solve, and it is the handling of this question that makes the letter to the church of Thyatira (2$^{19-29}$) the longest and in some respects the most obscure of all the Messages to the Seven Churches. Like the craftsmen of mediæval Europe, those of many towns in Asia Minor were united in gilds, called ἔργα or ἐργασίαι. Inscriptions prove that no city had more flourishing societies of this kind than Thyatira, the workers in wool and linen, the tanners and bronze-smiths, the dyers and potters, and so on, all having their separate gilds. When the new religion was firmly established and became a real power in the city, the burning question of the hour came to be the attitude of the Christian society to the gild. Could the new and the old live peaceably side by side? One section of the church was led by a prominent and influential woman, admired by the weaker minds of the community as worthy to rank with those prophets whose oracular utterances in the primitive Church almost rivalled the inspired words of the apostles. The watchword of this party was hearty fellowship between the church and the gild. Throwing themselves with equal zest into the life of both, they no doubt justified themselves with specious arguments. All labour, they said, is sacred, the strong collective activity of the gild no less than the feebler service of the lonely toiler. It cannot be wrong for members of the same craft to associate themselves in order to defend and promote their common interests, as well as to assist one another in days of sickness and misfortune. To enlightened Christians no real harm can come from initiation into the gild with the conventional pagan rites, from partaking of food sacrificed to idols, and even from witnessing the riotous mirth of the heathen orgies. And in the name of liberty some so-called Christians of Thyatira evidently went still further, maintaining that a plunge into occult 'depths,' an experience of unnamed immoralities, could affect only the vile body, while it was powerless to soil or harm the pure immortal soul.

Writing in the name of Christ to the church of Thyatira, St. John uses the scathing language of indignant scorn, the piercing invective of wounded love. Leaving unanswered the theoretical question whether the gild might conceivably be so Christianized that the believing artisan might conscientiously seek its protection and share its fellowship, he keeps his eye on the actual situation. To him it is clear as daylight that no servant of God can become, or remain, a member of the gild *as it is*—steeped in idolatry and immorality. The union of the Christian Church with the pagan association is nothing less than treason to Christ; in the language of Hebrew and Christian Puritanism, it is fornication or adultery (Rev 2^{20-22}). The 'prophetess' of the Thyatiran church is denounced as a new Jezebel, all the more subtly dangerous because she is not, like the first, a fanatical heathen defender of nature-worship, but a philosophical and sentimental dabbler in it, who is using her intellectual gifts to 'teach and seduce' the followers of Christ, reviving the old fallacy, 'ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.' To the indignant prophet of the Apocalypse this kind of reasoning is infernal; the 'depths' of experience into which members of the church of Thyatira are being initiated are the 'depths of Satan' (2^{24}). He warns the coadjutors and youthful victims of the Thyatiran 'prophetess'—called 'her lovers' and 'her children'—that they will see the couch of pleasure changed into the bed of sickness and disease, and find that no sophistry can prevent sin from working death (2^{22-23}). All antinomian progress is retrogression; every ascent 'beyond good and evil' is a disastrous fall.

> 'Set the maiden fancies wallowing in the troughs of Zolaism,
> Forward, forward, ay and backward, downward too into the abysm'
> (Tennyson, *Locksley Hall Sixty Years After*, 145–146).

Outside the gate of Thyatira, as an inscription (*CIG*, 3509) proves, there stood the shrine of a Chaldæan sibyl, whose name, Sambethe, was doubtless familiar to the whole town, and of whose soothsaying St. John may well have heard. E. Schürer suggested (in *Theol. Abhandlungen, Carl von Weizsäcker zu seinem 70ten Geburtstage gewidmet*, Freiburg i. B., 1892, p. 39 f.) that this may have been the Jezebel denounced in the letter, but the theory has not found acceptance. That the writer of the Apocalypse may have seen some likeness between the two clever women, the sibyl and the 'prophetess,' each of whom had a large following in Thyatira, is not improbable; but the Jezebel whom the Church did wrong to suffer (v.[20]), and who had been granted time to repent (v.[21]), was clearly regarded by him as being not outside but inside the Christian community. Ak-hissar, as Thyatira is now called, is a large town of mud houses, almost hidden from view by the luxuriant vegetation of its gardens. The ruins are of no great importance.

Literature.—W. M. Ramsay, *The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia*, London, 1904; C. Wilson, in Murray's *Handbook to Asia Minor*, do., 1905, p. 84 f.

James Strahan.

THYINE WOOD (*ξύλον θύϊνον*, the tree being *ἡ θυία* or *θύα*, rarely *τὸ θύον*).—Thyine wood is mentioned among the precious wares of the Apocalyptic Babylon, *i.e.* Rome (Rev 18^{12}). It was a hard, dark brown, aromatic wood, exported from N. Africa and used for the making of costly furniture (Theophrastus, *Hist. Plant.* v. iii. 7; Diod. v. 46; Pliny, *HN* xiii. xxx. 16). It is commonly identified with the *Thuia articulata.* The Greek name (probably from *θύω*) refers to the fragrance of the wood, which was burned as a perfume (Hom. *Od.* v. 60). The Romans called it *citrus*—probably a mutilation of *cedrus*—which must not be confounded with the citron. '*All* thyine wood' refers, not to different species of the tree, but to the variety of objects made of this precious wood in the luxurious Imperial city. James Strahan.

TIBERIUS.—The Emperor Tiberius belonged to the family of the Claudii Nerones, a branch of the patrician *gens Claudia* which separated from the original family about the middle of the 3rd cent. B.C. His father, Tiberius Claudius Nero, son of another Tiberius, appears in history in 54 B.C. as desirous to prosecute A. Gabinius for extortion. He made overtures in Asia for the hand of Cicero's daughter Tullia in 50, but her betrothal to Dolabella had already taken place in Rome. In 48 he distinguished himself as *quæstor* and admiral of the fleet to Julius Cæsar in the Alexandrian war. Later he was elected *pontifex* (46) and *prætor* (42). Having taken up arms against Octavian (40), he had to flee to Sicily with his young wife Livia Drusilla and his scarcely two-year-old son, the future Emperor. Later he removed to Sparta, and on returning to Rome with M. Antonius in 39 he was included in the general amnesty. Soon afterwards Octavian made Livia's acquaintance and prevailed upon Nero to give her up to him (38), though at the time she was expecting the birth of her second son, Drusus, which took place in Octavian's house. Thus it came about that the Claudian house supplied so many of the early Emperors. For Tiberius, having been brought to Octavian's house at the age of four, may be said to have known no other father: his own died not later than 33. Octavian's passion for Livia did not imply the treatment of her sons as his own. Circumstances alone forced him to this decision.

Tiberius was born on 16th Nov. 42 (Suet. *Tib.* 5) in a house on the Palatine Hill in Rome. He made successful appearances in the law-courts in his early youth, and was given two commissions, one connected with the corn supply and the other with the inspection of the barracoons of Italy. He was a *tribunus militum* (colonel) in the expedition against the warlike Cantabri of N.W. Spain (25), and afterwards in the East placed the diadem on the head of Tigranes, king of Armenia (20). He also recovered from the Parthians the standards they had captured from Crassus in 53 (Hor. *Od.* iv. xv. 4–8). In 16 Augustus and Tiberius went to Gaul, and on 1st Aug. of the following year Tiberius and Drusus were victorious over the Ræti and Vindelici. In 15 Tiberius' son Drusus and nephew Germanicus were born. [Tiberius' wife was Agrippina, the daughter of the great general, Augustus' right-hand man, Agrippa, and granddaughter of T. Pomponius Atticus, Cicero's correspondent. After the birth of the child Tiberius was compelled by Augustus to divorce his wife and to marry Julia (11), Augustus' own daughter by his wife Scribonia. Julia had been married in 25 to young Claudius Marcellus, who died in 23. She became the wife of Agrippa († 12) in 21, and bore him two sons, Gaius (20) and Lucius (17). In the latter year Augustus adopted these two grandsons of his as his own sons. Julia's profligacy, scarcely to be wondered at, led to her banishment in 2.] Tiberius' first consulship was passed in Rome in 13, and in the next year he succeeded Agrippa as governor of Pannonia, where he conducted campaigns in 11 and 10. In the following year Tiberius' brother Drusus, who had been co-operating in Germany with his brother in Pannonia, met his death, and Tiberius brought the body to Rome, on which occasion he triumphed over the Dalmatians and Pannonians. In 8 he was victorious over the Sugambri and other German tribes, and celebrated his triumph in 7. In 6 he received for the first or (according to some) the second time the *tribunicia potestas* for five years. This was one of the most important elements of the Imperial power. On receiving it he was sent on an important mission to the East, but retired for some years to Rhodes, whence he did not return to Rome till

A.D. 2. The death of Lucius on 20th Aug. A.D. 2 and of Gaius on 21st Feb. A.D. 4 forced Augustus at last to adopt Tiberius. First Tiberius was compelled to adopt as his son Germanicus, son of Drusus, and then Augustus adopted both as his own sons. At the same time the *imperium proconsulare* and *tribunicia potestas* were conferred on Tiberius, the latter either for five or for ten years. In this year he defeated the Cherusci, and for some years afterwards was engaged in almost continuous warfare, particularly in the country to the N.E. and the E. of the Adriatic. He triumphed in A.D. 9, but returned then to Pannonia and afterwards to the Rhine. In A.D. 12 he was in sole command there, and in A.D. 13 he triumphed for victories in Pannonia and had his *proconsulare imperium* and *tribunicia potestas* renewed without limit of time. On 19th Aug. A.D. 14, the day of the death of Augustus, he succeeded to the Empire.

Tiberius had shown himself a most capable general and had led for the most part a very strenuous life. For some years he had been colleague in the Empire, but the tyrannical manner in which Augustus had treated him, joined to his obvious unwillingness to adopt him, must have embittered one who was fully conscious of the splendid services he had rendered to the Empire. The period of Tiberius' sole rule makes melancholy reading, not entirely due to the gloom and suspicion cast over him by the genius of Tacitus. Tiberius seems to have been by nature fonder of retirement and study than of anything else, and despite his military achievements proved a bad ruler. In his reign began the encouragement of informers (*delatores*), who made life dangerous for all with birth, position, or wealth. Tiberius' naturally melancholy and morose disposition had developed into suspicion.

Few political events of importance took place during the reign. During the rule of Augustus, the popular elective assembly had gradually ceased to have any real voice in the elections, and at the very beginning of Tiberius' reign its electoral powers were transferred to the Senate. In A.D. 17 Cappadocia and Commagene were annexed. The chief literary events of the reign were the publication in A.D. 14 of the *Astronomica* of Manilius, 'the one Latin poet who excels even Ovid in verbal point and smartness' (A. E. Housman, *M. Manilii Astronomicon*, i. [London, 1903] p. xxi), the death of Ovid and of Livy in 17, the publication of the history of Velleius Paterculus in 30, and in this reign and the next the publication of Phædrus' *Fables*. The reign was distinguished by military operations. At the very beginning of it there were serious mutinies of the troops in Pannonia and Germany, and Germanicus, the adopted son of the Emperor, proved so brilliant a general as to arouse the Emperor's jealousy. In A.D. 15 the troops were exposed to terrible risks in the campaign against the German general Arminius (modern Hermann). In the next year Germanicus advanced to the Elbe and returned by sea to the Rhine. The project of the Elbe frontier was, however, abandoned and Germanicus was recalled. He triumphed on 26th May 17, and was then sent to the East. About the same time a rising took place in Africa under a native, Tacfarinas, which was not subdued for many years. A serious disagreement between Germanicus and Piso, the governor of Syria, was followed by the death of the former on 10th October 19. Piso, under strong and perhaps justifiable suspicion of complicity in the death of Germanicus, was compelled by his own troops to leave Syria, and, being next year charged with this crime and with treason, committed suicide. The year 21 saw the rising of Julius Florus and Julius Sacrouir in Gaul. Their defeat was celebrated by the erection of the still-existing arch at Arausio (Orange). In the same year Arminius was assassinated.

In the year 21 the moroseness of Tiberius took a serious turn, and he retired to Campania. It was a new thing for the Emperor to leave Rome except for military or administrative purposes, and, though technically it meant no loosening of his hold on the helm of State, practically it was bound to have that effect. In 22 the *tribunicia potestas* was conferred on his son Drusus, who, however, died in the following year. His death is attributed by Tacitus to L. Ælius Seianus, prefect of the prætorian guard, a man of inordinate ambition, who aimed at the purple. In 26 Tiberius finally left Rome, and from this date the office of *præfectus urbi* (governor of Rome) became a permanent institution of the Empire. The Emperor settled at Capreæ (Capri), the island off the Campanian coast, where he lived for the rest of his days. There Seianus was accustomed to consort with him. The Senate was servile to both: Agrippina († 33), the widow of Germanicus, and her son Nero were exiled; another son, Drusus, was imprisoned (and executed in 33). The way was thus paved for Seianus' promotion to the *imperium proconsulare* in 31. But his ambition had overleapt itself. At last his Imperial master's jealousy was aroused against him, and he, his family, and his adherents were put to death. Tiberius himself died on 16th March 37.

It was in this drab and gloomy reign that the light of the gospel first shone forth. For the historian Luke tells us that it was in the 15th year of the rule of Tiberius Cæsar that 'the word of God came unto John the son of Zacharias' (Lk 3^{1-2}). In spite of the elaborate synchronisms of the historian the question what date is really intended is not easy to answer. The best solution seems to be that of W. M. Ramsay (*Was Christ born at Bethlehem?*, London, 1898, p. 199 ff.) that A.D. 25–26 is intended, Luke having counted from the time when Tiberius began to rule as colleague of Augustus with equal power in all provinces of the Empire (end of A.D. 11). Neither Jesus nor (so far as we know) any of the apostles came into personal contact with Tiberius. The nearest approach made by Jesus to the Imperial throne was on the occasion when He was tried before the Emperor's *procurator*, or agent, Pilate (Pontius Pilatus). Pilate obtained this appointment in 26. In 36, being accused of maladministration, he was sent to Rome by L. Vitellius, governor of Syria. Tertullian (*Apol.* 21) states, what is intrinsically probable, that Pilate sent a report of the trial of Jesus to Tiberius. He also (*ib.* 5) alleges that Tiberius himself proposed to the Senate the enrolment of Jesus among the gods, and that, on the proposal being rejected, he himself remained of the same opinion, and threatened persecutors of Christians with trial. These statements are now regarded as historically valueless, and may have been taken from some apocryphal work, possibly the original *Acts of Pilate*, known to Justin (*Apol.* I. xxxv. 9, xlviii. 3). Some, however, are of opinion that Justin is referring to official documents, and this is certainly the more natural interpretation to put upon his language. Tertullian, in that case, is probably borrowing from Justin. A supposed letter from Pilate to Tiberius or Claudius contained in the apocryphal *Acts of Peter and Paul* (*Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, ed. R. A. Lipsius and M. Bonnet, i. [Leipzig, 1891] 196 ff.), and the so-called *Acts of Pilate* (*Gospel of Nicodemus*) (C. de Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apocrypha*^{2}, Leipzig, 1876; F. C. Conybeare, in *Studia Biblica*, iv. [Oxford, 1896] 59–132; E. Hennecke, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, Tübingen, 1904, p. 74 ff.), is now generally dated in the 4th or 5th cent. and regarded as of no value as history. The reference to a certain Tiberius' proconsulship (of Africa) in Tertullian (*Apol.* 9) can hardly have anything to do with the Emperor of that name (cf. J. S. Reid in the *Class. Rev.* xxviii. [1914] 27).

LITERATURE.—The ancient authorities are Tacitus, *Ab Excessu Diui Augusti Libri*, i.–vi.; Suetonius, *Tiberius*; Dio Cassius, Velleius Paterculus, etc. Modern works are the Histories of Rome by V. Duruy, *History of Rome*, 6 vols., London, 1884–86; H. F. Pelham, *Outlines of Roman History*^{5}, do., 1909; J. B. Bury, *Student's History of the Roman Empire*, do., 1893; T. Mommsen, *The Provinces of the Roman Empire*, tr. W. P. Dickson, 2 vols., do., 1909; H. Schiller, *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*, i. [Gotha, 1883] 248–303; H. Furneaux's edition of the *Annals* of Tacitus^{2} [Oxford, 1896], 100–160; A. Viertel, *Tiberius und Germanicus: eine historische Studie*, Göttingen, 1901; A. von Domaszewski, *Geschichte der römischen Kaiser*, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1909, i. 251–319; chronology of principal events by J. S. Reid in J. E. Sandys' *Companion to Latin Studies*^{2}, Cambridge, 1913, p. 136 f.; an English monograph on Tiberius, J. C. Tarver, *Tiberius the Tyrant*, London, 1902; J. S. Reid, art. 'Tiberius,' in *EBr*^{11}. For Tiberius' father see F. Münzer in Pauly-Wissowa, iii. 2777 f., and for Seianus, P. von Rohden, *ib.* i. 529 ff.

A. SOUTER.

TIME.—1. The conception of time.—In all ages and among all peoples the idea of time tends to be expressed in the figure of a continually and evenly running stream. It is viewed, however, in sections; and each section brings with itself or takes up into itself all the events that happen. This conception is maintained consistently in the writings of the Apostolic Age. Time comes into being (*διαγενομένου*, Ac 27^{9}, 'spent,' lit. 'had come through'). It passes by (*ὁ παρεληλυθὼς χρόνος*, 1 P 4^{3}). It is generally looked at as a whole, but it is divisible into parts which differ quantitatively and may be measured—it is 'much,' or 'little,' or 'sufficient' (for a given purpose). 'Sufficient' (*ἱκανὸς χρόνος*, Lk 8^{27} 23^{8}, Ac 8^{11}; *ἡμέραι ἱκαναί*, Ac $9^{23.\ 43}$ 18^{18}; *ἱκανῶν ἐτῶν*, Ro 15^{23}) as applied in measuring time is an expression of indefiniteness. The adequacy of the measure of time for the maturing of a definite plan is given in the idea of 'fullness.' Time accumulates as if in a reservoir and becomes sufficient for its end (*πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου*, Gal 4^{4}; cf. Ac 7^{23}). Naturally the flow of time involves succession and order as between first and last. But all time future to any particular moment may be from the view of it at that moment 'last.' The Christian outlook on the future involves a great consummation and a radical world change. The period just preceding this consummation was especially designated 'the last times' (*ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων*, 1 P 1^{21}; *ἐσχάτη ἡμέρα*, Jn $6^{39.\ 40}$ 11^{24}; *ἔσχαται ἡμέραι*, Ac 2^{17}, 2 Ti 3^{1}, Ja 5^{3}, 2 P 3^{3}; *ἐσχάτη ὥρα*, 1 Jn 2^{18}).

The relativity of length of time to the mind is indicated in the conception that to God's mind human measures and standards of time have no inherent reality ('One day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day,' 2 P 3^{8}). The notion shows a trace of philosophical influence in the thinking which culminates in the apocalyptical conception of the transiency of time and its contrast with eternity ('There shall be time no longer,' Rev 10^{6}).

2. Season.—Time from the point of view of its special content or relation to a definite event or events is specifically denoted by the term *καιρός* (generally, 'definite time'). The most accentuated usage of the term in this sense is the Apocalyptist's *καιρὸν καὶ καιροὺς καὶ ἥμισυ καιροῦ* (Rev 12^{14}), where the evident design is to indicate a period of known duration, like a year (or century). The term is more nearly synonymous with 'season' when it designates a time (the time during the year) for the appearance of certain events ([*καιρὸς*] *τοῦ θερισμοῦ*, Mt 13^{30}; *καιρὸς σύκων*, Mk 11^{13}: cf. Lk 20^{10}; *τοὺς καρποὺς ἐν τοῖς καιροῖς αὐτῶν*, Mt 21^{41}). More generally *καιρός* is any division of time which differs from all others by some characteristic, as, for instance, that it ought to be observed as more sacred (*μῆνας καὶ καιρούς*, Gal 4^{10}); to be watched against because of the evil influences which it brings (*καιροὶ χαλεποί*, 2 Ti 3^{1}); chosen by God for special revelation of His word (Tit 1^{3}); a period when certain special events develop, distinguished by the moral character of the Gentiles (*καιροὶ ἐθνῶν*, Lk 21^{24}); events have their own time (Lk 1^{20}), persons may have their own time for the full display of their peculiar character or the accomplishment of their work (*e.g.* the time of Jesus, *ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐμός*, *ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ὑμέτερος*, Jn $7^{6.\ 8}$). The term *καιρός* thus differs from *χρόνος* in designating 'opportune' or 'fit' time, a time associated with, and therefore distinguished by, some special event or feature. In the phrase *πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρός* (Mk 1^{15}) the more appropriate term would have been *χρόνος*, but since the intention of the writer is to show not the lapse of mere time, but the appearance of a new era, the word used expresses the idea more accurately.

3. The ages.—The largest measure of time known is the 'age' (*αἰών*, 'æon'). An 'age,' however, is not a definite period (though the 'present age' is estimated by some as 10,000 or 5,000 years in duration). It is rather a period of vast length. It so far transcends thought that it impresses the mind with the mystery of the whole notion of time. Hence the combination 'eternal times' (Ro 16^{25}) stretching back into the inconceivably remote past (practically the equivalent of the modern philosophical 'species of eternity').

The conception of the æon is specially prominent in the apocalyptic system, which looks on all duration as divided into æons. An æon combines in itself the essential content of the Hebrew *'olam* and of the Greek *αἰών*. In the first the emphasis is laid on the mysterious aspect of time without measure and apart from all known conditions. In the second the conception is based on a cyclic return similar to that marked by the seasons of the year. The modern analogy may be found in the geologic period. On a still larger scale the æon has its analogy in the Hindu *kalpa*. Of such ages there is an indefinite series. This is given in the plural (*αἰῶνες*, Gal 1^{5}, Ph 4^{20}, 1 Ti 1^{17}, 2 Ti 4^{18}, He 13^{21}, 1 P 4^{11}, Rev., *passim*). The series taken together constitutes all time ('All the ages,' RVm, *εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας*, Jude ^{25}).

Later Jewish thought singled out two æons (ages) and largely limited itself to their contemplation. From the practical point of view these were the only ones that concerned living men. These two were the 'present age' (*ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος*, *ὁ νῦν αἰών*, *ὁ ἐνεστὼς αἰών*, עוֹלָם הַזֶּה, Eph 1^{21}, Mt 12^{32}, Gal 1^{4}, 2 Ti 4^{10}, Tit 2^{12}) and the 'future age' (*ὁ αιων ὁ μέλλων*, *ὁ αἰὼν ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, עוֹלָם הַבָּא, He 6^{5}, Lk 20^{35} 18^{30}). The doctrine became prominent in the Apocalypses (cf. *4 Ezr.* vii. 50). It fitted the apocalyptic scheme wonderfully. On one side it helped to define the older prophetic 'latter days' (as a distinct period when ideal conditions would prevail); at the same time it gave a background to the doctrine of the 'Day of Jehovah.' On the other side, by discovering an ideal moral character in the latter age, the doctrine infused comfort into the hearts of the faithful in the present evil days by promising a definite change with the beginning of the new era. Questions of the exact length of the age were raised and by some answered. The author of *Ethiopic Enoch*, xvi. 1, xviii. 16, xxi. 6, fixes the duration of the 'evil [present] age' as 10,000 years; the *Assumption of Moses* at 5,000. The apocalyptists consider that they are themselves living so near the end of the older age and the beginning of the new that it may be a question as to whether they will be still living when the crisis arrives and the one age yields to the other (*4 Ezr.* iv. 37, v. 50 ff., vi. 20; *Syr. Bar.* xliv. 8 ff.). These two ages (the present and the one to come) are successive. But this is not the case with all the æons of the series. ‘Unto the ages of the ages’ (*εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*) suggests the inequality of some of the ages and the inclusion of the briefer within the longer ones (cf. G. B. Winer, *Grammar of NT Greek*^{9}, Edinburgh, 1882, p. 36).

4. The era.—The NT writings contain no allusion to a uniform era. Undoubtedly each people of the period used its own era. The Romans dated events and documents from the founding of the city (A.U.C. = 752 B.C.); the Greeks went back to the beginning of the Olympiads (= 776 B.C.). The Jews, owing to the frequent vicissitudes experienced in their history, had changed their method of registering the relative dates of events. The Books of Kings and Chronicles use the very familiar device of synchronizing the regnal years of the kings of Israel and Judah respectively. Occasionally the deliverance from bondage in Egypt is used as a starting-point (1 K 6^{1}), or the building of the Temple of Solomon (9^{10}), or the beginning of the Babylonian Exile (Ezk 33^{21} 40^{1}). The later Jewish usage settled down to reckoning all events from the creation of the world, which was supposed to have occurred in the 3761st year before the birth of Christ. But this computation is of post-Christian origin. In the Apocrypha, which may be regarded as the fair index of usage at the time, the Seleucid Era is frequently referred to. This was computed from the year of the seizure of Palestine by Seleucus after the battle of Gaza. It was also called the Era of the Greeks or Syro-Macedonians and (incorrectly) the Era of Alexander. By the Jews it was called the Year of Contracts (*Tarik Dilkarnaim*) from the fact that it was obligatory in the case of all legal documents. The beginning of the era was dated in the first year of the 117th Olympiad or 442 A.U.C., hence 312 B.C. (1 Mac 1^{11} 6^{16} 7^{15} 10^{1}). The Era of Simon (1 Mac 13^{42} 14^{27}) was proposed, but never extensively adopted.

In the New Testament events are associated with the reigns of contemporary rulers (‘In the days of Herod the king’ [Mt 2^{1}, Lk 1^{5}], ‘in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judæa,’ etc. [Lk $3^{1.2}$; cf. also Ac 11^{28} 12^{1}]). But in all cases the dating is approximate and intended to serve practical rather than scientific ends. With the exception of Lk $3^{1.2}$, all such dating of events seems not to be intentionally chronological (cf. A. Harnack, *The Acts of the Apostles*, London, 1909, p. 6 f.).

The method of Matthew (1^{17}) of giving a general intimation of date by the expedient of ‘generations’ is unique and highly artificial.

5. The year.—It has always been difficult to adjust with precision the limits of the year. In all the efforts to make the adjustment first the natural return of the seasons with their agricultural features calls for a definition that will harmonize with the apparent revolution of the sun around the earth in 365 + days. But the fact that this period approximately coincides with twelve lunar periods has tempted many peoples to settle down to a year of 354 days. In the Apostolic Age the problem had not as yet been solved fully. The usage of Palestine, inherited from early Canaanite and Babylonian antecedents, was still prevalent. The year began with the 1st of Nisan and was constituted of twelve months, with the periodical intercalation of a thirteenth to equalize difference. Intercalation was common all over the world, but the method of intercalating was different at different times, and probably not constant anywhere for any consecutive period of time. Among the Jews the Sanhedrin decided whether in any particular year a month should be intercalated. Among the Romans Plutarch testifies that 22 days were added every other year to the month of February (which, according to Varro, *de Ling. Lat.* vi. 55, was the last month of the year). But a more common way was the insertion of an additional month every three years, and as this left a troublesome margin it was corrected into three months every eight years and finally fixed as seven months in a cycle of nineteen years. This cycle was introduced into Athens by Meton the astronomer in 432, but found its way only gradually into general practice. Popularly the year must always have been viewed as divided into 12 months (Rev 22^{2}).

6. The month.—Throughout the Apostolic Age the ancient way of fixing the month as the exact equivalent of a complete lunation was maintained. The month accordingly began with the appearance of the moon in its first phase, and ended with its reappearance in the same phase the next time. Within the New Testament months are mentioned generally, not with precise reference to their relations to one another in the calendar, but as an indication and a measure of time in the terms of the fraction of a year (Lk $1^{24.36.56}$). In Acts it is probable that the usage is not meant to be minutely precise since the mention of months is invariably in threes (Ac 7^{20} 19^{8} 20^{3} 28^{11}, but once in twice three—six, Ac 18^{11}).

So far as the calendar is concerned, there are evidences of mixed usage. The predominance at different times of different influences (Roman, Macedonian, Egyptian, older Jewish) brought into use different names. The occurrence of Xanthicus in 2 Mac $11^{30.38}$ (the sixth month of the Macedonian calendar) shows clearly the existence of a Macedonian element in the mixed usage. The name ‘Dioscorinthius’ (mentioned earlier in the same account, 2 Mac 11^{21}) is also probably Macedonian and a modified form of the first month, Dius. It may, however, be a textual corruption for ‘Dystrus’ (the name of the fifth month), as H. A. Redpath, in Hastings' *SDB*, p. 937, suggests, supporting the suggestion with the Sinaitic text of To 2^{12}, where Dystrus is mentioned. Otherwise Dioscorinthius is the name of an intercalary month. That an intercalary month must have had a place in the Macedonian calendar is to be assumed, though its name and place are unknown. Of the Egyptian calendar traces are found in the names ‘Pachon’ and ‘Epiphi’ in 3 Mac 6^{38}.

7. The feasts.—A popular and practically useful method of reckoning time within the year is that which relates events to well-known religious festivals. This method is especially useful where for some reason or other the names of months have become involved in confusion. In the nature of the case, of such festivals in the New Testament the Passover (‘the days of unleavened bread,’ *ἡμέραι τῶν ἀζύμων*, Ac 12^{3} 20^{6}, *πάσχα*, Ac 12^{4}) stands prominent. The Day of Pentecost (*ἡμέρα τῆς πεντηκοστῆς*, Ac 2^{1} 20^{16}) and the Day of Atonement (‘fast,’ *νηστεία*, Ac 27^{9}) are also used as landmarks. But in the allusion to the Feast of Dedication (*ἐνκαίνια*, Jn 10^{22}) the intention perhaps was not so much to give the exact time as to account for Jesus' walking ‘in the temple in Solomon's porch.’ Similarly the Feast of Tabernacles (*σκηνοπηγία*, Jn 7^{2}) is mentioned as explanatory of the course which Jesus had taken. In Jn 5^{1} the purpose of the author would be defeated if he had meant to fix the time of the action (cf. also Lk 22^{1}, Mk 15^{6}, Jn 6^{4} 12^{12}).

8. The week.—Though peculiar to the Jewish people, the constitution of a unit of time by grouping together seven days was retained in the usage of the Christian Church. But no separate word was adopted to designate the week as such. In spite of the fact that the Greek language offered the tempting word ἑβδομάς (which came later into universal use) the period was generally known by its last day, the Sabbath (σάββατον, Lk 18^{12}), and in the plural (σάββατα), as shown in the name of the first day (μία τῶν σαββάτων, Mt 28^{1}, Mk 16^{2}, Lk 24^{1}). In Ac 17^{2}, σάββατα τρία (rendered 'weeks' in RVm) is, in the light of St. Paul's custom to use the Sabbath day as the time for preaching (Ac 18^{4}), correctly translated 'three Sabbath days.' The seven-day period required to mature the process of fulfilling a vow is evidently not viewed as a week in the modern sense of any period of seven consecutive days (Ac 21^{27}).

With the exception of the Sabbath (the seventh day) the days of the week are given no names, but are distinguished by ordinal numbers. The first day, however, acquired greater importance among Christians because of its association with the resurrection of the Lord ('Lord's day,' κυριακὴ ἡμέρα, Rev 1^{10}). And this ultimately came to be the name of the day (=*Dominica*). It was the day on which the Christians assembled together for the observance of their services (the 'breaking of bread,' mutual exhortation, taking up collections for the needs of their brethren, Ac 20^{7}, 1 Co 16^{2}). But in the earlier period the day was called the 'first of the week' (μία τῶν σαββάτων, Ac 20^{7}). Other distinctions between the days of the week do not appear, with the exception of the fact that the day before the Sabbath was observed among the Jews as a season of preparation. Sometimes it was designated simply as the 'eve of the Sabbath' (προσάββατον, Jth 8^{6}, Mk 15^{42}); but in the NT oftener as the 'Preparation [day]' (παρασκευή, Mt 27^{62}, Mk 15^{42}, Lk 23^{54}, Jn $19^{14.\,42}$). It was scarcely as yet the fixed name of the day. This it became later as it was taken up by Christian usage, and persists to the present time as the proper name of Friday in modern Greek.

9. The day.—Jewish custom fixed the beginning of the day at sunset. Since that custom prevails to the present time among the Jews it is not likely that it was ever superseded among them. Nevertheless, the Roman way of reckoning from midnight was evidently prevalent at least in official circles. The testimony, however, is limited to the Fourth Gospel, and the point of view may be peculiar to the author (Jn 19^{14}; cf. also 1^{39} 4^{6}). The day was divided into two sections of twelve hours, *i.e.* from midnight to midnight. These two sections might be viewed together as a twenty-four-hour unit (St. Paul spent a νυχθήμερον, 'a night and a day,' in the deep, 2 Co 11^{25}). Of the night-day unit the day is the time for work (Jn 11^{9}) and the night is divided into four military watches of three hours each (Mt 14^{25} 24^{43}, Mk 6^{48}, Lk 12^{38}).

Related to each day stand the day preceding and the day following or the day after. The day preceding ('yesterday,' ἐχθές, Jn 4^{52}, Ac 7^{28}, He 13^{8}) is not so frequently mentioned as the day following ('morrow,' ἡ αὔριον, Ac $4^{3.\,5}$ 23^{20} 25^{22}; ἡ ἐπαύριον, Ac 10^{9} 14^{20} 20^{7}; ἡ ἐπιοῦσα, Ac 16^{11} 20^{15} 21^{18} 23^{11}; ἡ ἐχομένη, Ac 20^{15} 21^{26}; ἡ ἑξῆς ἡμέρα, Ac 21^{1} 25^{17} 27^{18}). The 'day after to-morrow' is spoken of as 'the third day' (τρίτῃ, Ac 27^{19}).

10. The hour.—The primary object of the division of the day into hours is two-fold. It gives a small and convenient unit as a measure of time (the fraction of a day), and at the same time it furnishes a basis for fixing on the exact portion of the day for any important or critical events to be recorded. The system of beginning the day with sunset and counting twelve hours to sunrise, with another set of twelve hours from sunrise to sunset, would result in a variable hour with a maximum of 79 minutes and a minimum of 49, according to the season of the year. Whether this was overcome by the adoption of the Roman method of reckoning from midnight to midnight is not certain. But the question loses its importance from the NT standpoint when it is considered that all mention of hours is general and practical rather than precise and chronological.

Of the hour as a measure of time a clear case occurs in Ac 19^{34} ('for the space of two hours,' ἐπὶ ὥρας δύο; cf. also Mt 20^{12}, Mk 14^{37}, Lk 22^{59}, Ac 5^{7}). Of the hour as giving the time of the day the usage is more abundant (Mt $20^{3.\,5.\,6}$ $27^{45.\,46}$, Mk $15^{25.\,33.\,34}$, Lk 23^{44}, Jn 1^{39} $4^{6.\,52}$ $19^{14.\,27}$, Ac 2^{15} 10^{3} 23^{23}). Besides the designation of the relative place of the hours to each other by numerals, hours are sometimes associated with customary action such as a meal (Lk 14^{17}, ὥρα τοῦ δείπνου), the offering up of incense (Lk 1^{10}, ὥρα τοῦ θυμιάματος), prayer (Ac 3^{1}, ὥρα τῆς προσευχῆς).

The hour, however, though the smallest definite unit in measuring, was not the smallest conceived division of time. An infinitesimal point of time is in the thought of St. Paul when he speaks of the resurrection change (1 Co 15^{52}) as in a moment (ἀτόμῳ, lit. 'indivisible' [fraction of time], explained by the 'twinkling of an eye' which immediately follows). Jesus too is reported as having been shown the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time (στιγμῇ χρόνου, Lk 4^{5}).

LITERATURE.—A. Schwarz, *Der jüdische Kalender*, Breslau, 1872; G. Bilfinger, *Die Zeitmesser der antiken Völker*, Stuttgart, 1886, *Der bürgerliche Tag*, do., 1888, *Die antiken Stundenangaben*, do., 1888; T. Lewin, *Fasti Sacri*, London, 1865; W. M. Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, Oxford, 1895–97; T. H. Key, art. 'Calendarium,' in Smith's *DGRA*; E. Schürer, *HJP* I. [Edinburgh, 1890] i. 87, ii. App. iii.; *HDB* iv. 762–766, v. 473–484.

ANDREW C. ZENOS.

TIMON.—We know nothing of this disciple except that his name appears as one of the Seven in Ac 6^{5}. The list, like that of the first apostles (Ac 1^{13}), may have been kept among the archives of the church at Jerusalem, to which St. Luke had access, or St. Luke may himself have procured it at Antioch.

W. A. SPOONER.

TIMOTHEUS.—See TIMOTHY.

TIMOTHY.—The sources from which to estimate the work and character of Timothy are the Epistles of St. Paul (which for our purpose are to be separated into the earlier Epistles and the Pastorals) and the Acts of the Apostles.

1. The course of his life.—Assuming that 2 Timothy contains reliable historical data, it seems probable that Timothy was born at Derbe or Lystra, his father being a Greek, his mother Eunice a Christian Jewess. His grandmother's name was Lois, and from her he inherited the finest traditions of Hebrew piety (Ac 16^{3}, 2 Ti 1^{5} $3^{14.\,15}$). His name (Τιμόθεος) is no indication as to whether he was regarded as a Jew or as a Greek, but Ac 16^{3} favours the latter view. Under whom he was converted to Christianity it is impossible to say, for there is no contradiction between 1 Co 4^{17} and Ac $16^{1\text{-}3}$. It would appear that Paul on his second missionary journey found in Lystra, somewhat to his surprise, this highly esteemed believer, and, discerning in him an apt pupil and a promising helper, he had him set apart by the presbytery for the work of an evangelist (Ac 16^{3}, 2 Ti $1^{6.\,7}$). The opening years of Timothy were full of promise through his possession of a rich spiritual endowment. In preparation for his missionary work Paul had him circumcised, because the presence in his company of an uncircumcised son of a Greek father would prejudice his influence among the Jews. Much doubt is cast by some upon the motive assigned in Acts for this procedure, which is held to be very different in principle from Paul's action in the case of Titus and towards Peter

(Gal $2^{3.\ 4.\ 11-14}$). We know, however, from 1 Co $9^{19ff.}$ that the Apostle varied his practice to suit circumstances, and we cannot argue unconditionally as to Timothy from Paul's action with regard to Titus, who was a full Gentile and was under challenge as a test case.

Probably Timothy's first missions were near his own home. Soon he became acquainted with the life of hardship and suffering that his master led, and so grew into his spirit that Paul calls him his 'son in the Lord,' and tells the Corinthians that he can interpret to them his mind and practice (2 Ti $3^{10.\ 11}$, 1 Co 4^{17}).

In the narrative of Acts, Timothy comes rapidly into prominence after the Apostle has crossed into Europe, where he now has Silas as his companion. In Philippi Timothy seems to have escaped imprisonment; in Berœa he stays on with Silas to finish the work, and later joins Paul in Corinth. He seems to have soon won his way into the trust and affection of the Corinthians, for when, after the departure of the Apostle to Ephesus, troubles break out in Corinth, Paul first sends Timothy to compose the disorder, giving him authority to speak in his name (1 Co 4^{17}). But the situation was too difficult for Timothy to cope with, and he was replaced by Titus.

The two chief centres of Timothy's subsequent activity were Macedonia and Ephesus (Ac $19^{21.\ 22}$, Ph $2^{19.\ 20}$, 2 Ti $1^{15.\ 18}$ 4^{18}). He took part in organizing the collection for the Church of Jerusalem, though he seems not to have accompanied Paul thither (Ac $20^{4.\ 13-16}$). But he rejoined him shortly after he reached Rome, and in the greetings of the Epistles to the Colossians and Philippians his name is associated with the Apostle's (Ph 1^1, Col 1^1).

The Epistles to Timothy, especially the First, present so many difficulties that they must be taken by themselves (see below). He is addressed as having charge of churches in the neighbourhood of Ephesus, and as being exposed to serious dangers and temptations. In the Second Epistle Paul, who is represented as being in prison, abandoned by his friends, his death impending, urges Timothy to return to Rome at once and bring Mark with him. The last glimpse that we get of Timothy is in He 13^{23}, where it is announced that he has just been set free from prison, into which he may possibly have been thrown on his visit to the dying Paul. He was evidently a friend and travelling companion of the unknown author.

2. In ecclesiastical tradition Timothy is called the first bishop of Ephesus (Eus. *HE* III. iv. 6), and in the *Acta Timothei* of the 5th cent. he is said to have been made bishop of Ephesus by Paul in the reign of Nero, to have become an intimate friend of the apostle John, and to have suffered martyrdom under Nerva on 22nd January, when Peregrinus was proconsul of Asia. These traditions are the weaving of the legendary spirit.

3. The Timothy of the earlier Epistles.—Paul holds Timothy in the strongest affection, and associates him with himself in six of his Epistles (1 and 2 Thess., 2 Cor., Ro 16^{21}, Phil., Col.). As his son in the gospel, he understands fully the Apostle's mind and purpose, and is an example to the brethren of what Paul would have them become (1 Co 4^{17} $16^{10.\ 11}$, Ph 2^{19-23}). He seems to have lacked strength of character, but his failure in reconciling the warring factions of Corinth did not cause him to lose the confidence of Paul or of the churches. He remains to the end lovable and beloved, the most intimate of his disciples, unselfish in his ministry (Ph 2^{19-23}).

4. The Timothy of the Pastorals.—Many of the features of the earlier Timothy remain. He is the Apostle's beloved or true son (1 Ti 1^{18}, 2 Ti 1^2 2^1), a close follower of, and moulded by, his teaching (2 Ti $3^{10.\ 11}$), and the dying Apostle clings to him (2 Ti $4^{9.\ 10}$). In 1 Tim., however, there is also an unfavourable view of his character. He seems to have grown languid in the performance of his duties (1^{18} 4^{14-16} 6^{3-16}), to have yielded to the love of money (6^{11}), to temper (5^1), and to an ill-considered asceticism (5^{23}). Even in 2 Tim. he is presented as timid (1^7), and as shrinking from suffering (2^3). The Apostle addresses him as a youth and with urgency. If this is an authentic attitude, it may possibly contain a reminiscence of disappointment at Timothy's development as a leader and teacher (1 Ti 4^{11-16}), or it may express an old man's fear for a disciple who was diffident and prone to compromise, whom he had always guided as a father guides a son, and whom he knew to be at his best when under a leader.

Jülicher goes too far in saying that in 1 Tim. and 2 Tim. Timothy is addressed as the type of a young bishop. He has not the position of the monarchical bishop of the type of Ignatius or Polycarp. In 1 Tim. he is the representative of Paul in a circle of churches, an apostle with a special commission. In 2 Tim. his function as an evangelist is not unlike that which he exercised in the situations set forth in Acts and the earlier Epistles.

Literature.—See under Timothy and Titus, Epistles to, and, in addition, A. Jülicher, 'Timotheus, der Apostelschüler,' in *PRE*³ xix. 781–788.

R. A. Falconer.

TIMOTHY AND TITUS, EPISTLES TO.—1. Purpose.—The Epistles to Timothy and Titus are conveniently, if inaccurately, called the **Pastoral Epistles**, because, in contrast to Paul's other letters, their object has been thought to be primarily that of equipping his two lieutenants, Timothy and Titus, for pastoral work in two particular regions —Ephesus, with its circle of churches, and Crete. This is, however, too narrow a scope. The letters deal with a situation, and are only secondarily concerned with the personal equipment of Timothy and Titus, whose ministry is not essentially different from that which Paul exercised throughout his churches (1 Ti 4^6, 2 Ti 4^5, 1 Co 4^{17} $16^{10.\ 11}$, Eph 3^7, Col $1^{23.\ 25}$ 4^7, 1 Th 3^2). They cannot be regarded as outlining the character and work of the ideal pastor, but are intended, especially 1 Tim. and Titus, to impress upon the recipients the necessity of taking measures to preserve in its purity and strength the gospel which they had learnt from Paul, in view of special false teaching already present in Ephesus and Crete and threatening to increase. In the face of error, Timothy must boldly preach the gospel, and he and Titus must organize the churches with capable moral and spiritual leaders. The Second Epistle to Timothy is much more personal, and emphasizes his duty as an evangelist in a difficult situation.

The Epistles possess common elements of language, similar features of doctrine, discipline, and organization, and an atmosphere laden with kindred varieties of error, which constitute them a group distinct from the other Epistles of Paul, in fact so distinct that many scholars of varied schools have found difficulty in accepting them as authentic.

2. The text.—For the full discussion of noteworthy readings reference must be made to the standard works. Our purpose will be served by the mention of a few, chiefly from 1 Timothy.

(1) 1 Ti 1^4 (*a*) *οἰκονομίαν*, ℵ A G_3 K L P, most cursives, arm. boh. Chr.
(*b*) *οἰκοδομίαν*, D_2^c and a few cursives.
(*c*) *οἰκοδομήν*, D_2^* Lat. vg. go., syr. pesch., Iren.
Most editors accept (*a*), and with good reason.
(2) 1 Ti 3^{16} (*a*) *ὃς ἐφανερώθη*, ℵ* A* C* F_2 G_3 boh. sah. go. arm. syr. hl.
Origen, Theod. Mops., Cyril Alex.
(*b*) *ὃ ἐφανερώθη*, D_2^* lat. vg., syr. vg., arm.
(*c*) *θεὸς ἐφανερώθη*, *θς* ℵ^c C^c D_2^c K L P.

For treatment of evidence see the notes in Hort's *Greek Testament*, who rightly accepts (*a*) and is followed by nearly all modern editors.

(3) 1 Ti 4^{3} *κωλυόντων γαμεῖν, ἀπέχεσθαι βρωμάτων*. Hort believes that there is a primitive corruption, and suggests that the reading may have been *ἢ ἅπτεσθαι* or *καὶ γεύεσθαι*. Bentley conjectured that *κελευόντων* had fallen out, but Blass finds an ellipsis in which *κελευόντων* is to be supplied from *κωλυόντων*.

(4) 1 Ti 4^{10} (*a*) *ἀγωνιζόμεθα*, ℵ* A C E G.
(*b*) *ὀνειδιζόμεθα*, ℵ^{c} D_2 vg. go. syr. boh. arm.

Most modern editors place (*a*) in the text, and yet (*b*) has much in its favour both externally and intrinsically. That Christians were held in scorn for their unsubstantial hope is an excellent interpretation of the passage.

(5) 1 Ti 6^{7} (*a*) *ὅτι οὐδὲ ἐξ.*, ℵ* A G_3 17 vg. sah. boh. arm.
(*b*) *ἀληθὲς ὅτι οὐδὲ ἐξ.*, D_2* m. go.
(*c*) *δῆλον ὅτι*, ℵ^{c} D_2^{bc} K L P Chr.
(*d*) *οὐδὲ ἐξ.*, arm. Cyr., apparently Cyprian.

Hort seems to be right in accepting (*d*), and he suggests that *ὅτι* may have come in by dittography after *κόσμον*.

(6) 2 Ti 4^{10} (*a*) *Γαλατίαν*, A D G K L P, vg. syr. Chrys., Theod. Mops.
(*b*) *Γαλλίαν*, C 5 cursives, vg. Epiph.

(*a*) is best attested and accepted by most editors, though it may mean European Gaul.

In the text, especially of 1 Timothy, apart from readings there are difficulties, occasioned apparently by some disorder owing possibly to a disarrangement of notes in the hand of an editor. Of this disorder the most evident traces are 1 Ti $5^{1.2.8.16}$ $6^{9.10.17.18.19}$; also 3^{11} 5^{23} $6^{20.21}$ may be later interpolations. Less is to be said for the view, which, however, is plausible, that Tit 1^{7-9} has been inserted by a later hand, and that 1 Tim. originally ended at 5^{16}.

3. Contents.—(i.) 1 TIMOTHY.—$1^{1.2}$. Greeting.—Paul, in the full apostolic authority which he had received from God our Saviour and Christ Jesus, the surety for the Christian hope, formally addresses Timothy, his true son in the faith.

vv.$^{3-7}$. General occasion of the letter.—Formal reminder of warning once given at Ephesus in person against false teaching, which substitutes idle speculation for Christian love, springing out of a pure heart and unfeigned faith, which it is the aim of preaching to produce. Already this error has shipwrecked some would-be teachers of the Jewish Law, who, without understanding it, pervert its meaning.

vv.$^{8-11}$. The right use of the Law.—According to its true spirit the Law is to be invoked against such vices as are condemned by the healthy teaching of the gospel.

vv.$^{12-17}$. Paul's stewardship.—The gospel ministry of Divine power and salvation from sin was granted by an act of God's grace in Christ Jesus to the most unworthy Apostle, whose redemption is an example of many others to come; for all of which the writer makes solemn thanksgiving to God.

vv.$^{18-20}$. Paul recommits this ministry to Timothy. He encourages him that in spite of hard warfare he will not be defeated, because the Holy Spirit had led him to choose Timothy for this service. The fearful example of two apostates excommunicated in the hope that punishment would lead to their reformation.

(*a*) *The furtherance of the ministry of the gospel.*—(1) The ministry of the gospel is furthered by rightly ordered public prayer and worship (2^{1-15}).

2^{1-8}. Since Timothy is to preach the gospel of salvation for all, constant prayer must be made for all sorts and conditions of men, who have one Father and one Mediator of His will for men, Christ Jesus, who gave Himself as a ransom for all. Special supplication is to be made for kings, because if they are favourable the Church will have rest, its worship will continue undisturbed, and salvation will come to all men.

vv.$^{9-15}$. These verses set forth woman's function in the Christian community. She is not to teach or pray in public, but is to be modest in apparel and to adorn herself with good works, performing her function in salvation by her maternal calling, whereby she will, in a life of faith, love, and holy restraint, redress the balance against her through the sin of Eve. (The formula *πιστὸς ὁ λόγος* probably refers to what precedes; if to what follows, it means that in the Church it is a common saying, 'if a man desires the office of a bishop, etc.' An inferior reading, *ἀνθρώπινος*, would be connected with what follows—'It is a common human saying.')

(2) It is furthered also by the appointment of officials of worthy character (3^{1}–4^{6}).

3^{1-7}. The type of man to be chosen as bishop.—This office is eagerly sought after, and Timothy is to employ discretion in choosing candidates. They must be men of irreproachable character, possessing self-restraint, tact, ability to control others, as shown by the control of their own family, given to hospitality, able to teach, not youthful but fortified by experience against dangers to which such an office would expose the immature.

vv.$^{8-13}$. The type of man for the diaconate.—Tested men with personal qualities and administrative powers similar, except for ability to teach, to those of the bishop. Their wives, probably bishops' as well as deacons', must be respected, discreet, and trustworthy (v.^{11} reads in this connexion like an interpolation, and it may refer to deaconesses). Honourable service secures a good degree of honour and greater confidence in the gospel ministry (or a good basis for the next grade, *i.e.* bishop).

vv.$^{14-16}$. The Church holds forth the truth, in opposition to error, of which an example is given (4^{1-6}). After an interjected reference to the possibility of delay in coming to Ephesus, the Apostle states that the purpose of the letter is to instruct Timothy as to his right ordering of the Church, which, as the dwelling-place of the God of Israel, supports and is the foundation of the truth. This truth is a great mystery revealed in a Person only to those who lead godly lives, and is summed up in the words of a Christian hymn setting forth the gospel of the Incarnation.

The Spirit, through prophets in the Church, perhaps also through the words of written prophecy, foretells that there will be a great apostasy, led by teachers under demonic influence, who will enjoin abstinence from marriage and certain foods. But by the gospel the old Jewish distinctions of clean and unclean and heathen asceticism have been abolished, and the Christian may sanctify by prayer, and possibly by a psalm, any meat set before him, and thankfully partake of it.

Timothy is to fulfil his ministry by transmitting to his brethren the wholesome teaching of the Apostle (4^{6}).

(*b*) *Personal advice to Timothy* (4^{7-16}).—4^{7-10}. The man of God must practise piety, and not asceticism. Piety has the sure promise of life here and hereafter; but the pursuit is arduous, and the goal will be attained only as we set our hope on the living God, who will save the believer unto eternal life.

vv.$^{11-16}$. Timothy must overcome his diffidence, which arises partly from his youth, and in the constant exercise of his Divinely inspired gift of teaching become an example in life and doctrine of what the Christian minister should be.

(*c*) *Further advice as to various classes in the Church* (5^{1}–6^{2}).—Evidently there is insubordination, and the Apostle warns Timothy not to allow himself, when he breaks through his diffidence, to be swept into passionate rebuke.

5^{3-16}. Widows in the Church.—(1) Those who have children or other relatives, or who are in the employ of a Christian woman: Christian piety demands that their support must fall upon these (vv.$^{3.4.8.16}$). (2) The real widows above sixty years of age and destitute who have a character for stability, hospitality, and good works are to be enrolled for service in the Church, on whom their support must fall if their relatives are poor (vv.$^{5.6.7.9.10}$). (3) Since younger widows may fall into sin under passion, or into indolent enjoyment, they are advised to marry (vv.$^{11-15}$).

(Note the disordered arrangement of this section, esp. vv.$^{1.2.8.16}$.)

vv.$^{17-25}$. The honourable position of the elder.—The elder who fulfils his function well, especially if he can preach and teach, is to be given double honour (or it may be double pay), and, in accordance with our Lord's instructions, is to be supported for his work's sake. The dignity of the office demands that charges preferred against elders are not to be lightly received; though, if they be substantiated, the rebuke is to be public. Judgment must be well considered and impartial, and no one is to be ordained without careful consideration. In order to be able to give such a judgment and not be involved in the sins of others, Timothy must keep himself pure, though he is not to be an ascetic. (Possibly v.^{23} is interpolated to meet ascetic tendencies.) Such sins as drunkenness and open vice will be evident at once, but secret sins will come out in time. So with men's good deeds. With care he will not make mistakes.

$6^{1.2}$. Slaves.—Service honourable to the faith must be paid to masters unbelieving or believing, in the latter case inspired by the knowledge that it is a service of love to brethren.

(*d*) *Final exhortations* (6^{3-21}).

6^{3-5}. Teach healthy doctrine, based on the teaching of Jesus, which ensures piety.—The befogged teacher of false doctrine does not practise virtue, but by his empty disputations stirs the churches into strife, and in the muddy waters he fishes, using so-called piety as a means of gain.

vv.$^{6-10}$. The practice of godliness in contrast with the pursuit of riches.

vv.$^{11-16}$. Solemn adjuration to Timothy.—The Christian minister must pursue those virtues the possession of which brings life, and Timothy must give a pure testimony to the gospel, even if through suffering. In a liturgical formula he reminds him that the Lord will come to judge.

vv.$^{17-19}$. Advice to the rich as to the use of wealth.

vv.$^{20-21}$. Final exhortation to guard the deposit of Christian faith and avoid the meaningless profanities of men who claim a 'gnosis' falsely so called, the pursuit of which has already caused some to lose their faith.

(This chapter also has a disordered arrangement. Cf. vv.$^{3.20.21}$ and vv.$^{9.10.17.18.19}$.)

(ii.) 2 TIMOTHY.—$1^{1.2}$. Greeting.—Paul, appointed by God as an apostle of Jesus Christ to proclaim the promise of life in Christ Jesus, addresses Timothy, his well-beloved son in the gospel.

(*a*) *Timothy to succeed Paul in the service, suffering, and final reward of the gospel of Christ* (1^{3}–2^{13}).

1^{3-14}. Timothy is exhorted not to be ashamed, through fear of suffering, to preach the gospel for which Paul is a prisoner. Timothy, the thought of whose hereditary faith is a constant source of intense joy and affection to the Apostle, is urged to fan into flame his gift of preaching the gospel of Divine power, which cannot fail, even though thereby he, like Paul, may suffer. Of this gospel of salvation from death unto eternal life in Christ Jesus, Paul is an apostle and teacher, and he has made no mistake in committing himself to God in its service though he is a prisoner; and now Timothy is, by his preaching through the indwelling Spirit, to guard this pure gospel of faith and love in Christ.

vv.$^{15-18}$. Defections of followers in Asia serve as a warning, and devoted service on the part of Onesiphorus towards the Apostle as an encouragement.

2^{1-13}. Timothy is to be Paul's successor in the transmission of the gospel with its suffering, its triumph, its final reward. He is to draw his strength from the grace which is in Christ Jesus, and transmit the gospel to a succession of worthy men. The Christian teacher must, as a good soldier, endure the hard conditions of the campaign, or, like the athlete, obey the rules of the game, suffering being one of the conditions. Only the toiling husbandman gets his reward. When discouraged, Timothy must think upon the gospel that Jesus died and has risen in triumph. Paul also suffers as a malefactor, but these sufferings are for the furtherance of the gospel, and will bring a glorious reward in Christ's Kingdom, as is set forth in a verse of a hymn or a liturgical formula. (The formula πιστὸς ὁ λόγος here refers to what follows.)

(*b*) *Circumstances which demand faithful service in the gospel on the part of Timothy* (2^{14}–4^{8}).

2^{14-18}. Timothy must prove himself a reliable workman, and set forth the gospel according to the pattern laid down by Paul, and avoid profane idle talk which leads to apostasy, and which, like a running sore, will eat into the Church's life. Already some are teaching that there is no bodily resurrection.

vv.$^{19-26}$. The Church of God, however, is built upon a firm foundation, and its members must be pure; but, like a large house, it contains vessels of all qualities: some will have honourable, others dishonourable uses, and Timothy, as the true servant of God, must choose for Divine service vessels cleansed of the vices of the false teachers. Christian virtues are to be cultivated among the faithful as a protection against error, and the disputations of false teachers are to be avoided, though in a gentle spirit, in the hope that some of those who are in error may be granted repentance and be saved.

3^{1-9}. The worst has not come yet. Though already the Church has a commingling of good and evil, in the last days it will be invaded by men who, under the mask of piety, will practise manifold and abominable vices, and will cause some to apostatize, women especially becoming an easy prey. This will be a sign not that God has forsaken His Church, but of the end of the age; and, as was the case with the magicians who resisted Moses, these corrupt men will be detected in their folly.

vv.$^{10-17}$. To this error Paul's gospel and manner of life are the only antidote. He has always been Timothy's example, even in suffering; and with the invasion of these impostors sufferings will multiply. Timothy must abide by Pauline doctrine, which is the fulfilment of what was taught to him as a true Israelite; it is the doctrine of salvation contained in the inspired Scriptures from which the man of God must equip himself for his ministry.

4^{1-8}. Solemn appeal by the dying Apostle.—The Lord will assuredly return to judge the living and the dead, and to set up His eternal Kingdom. Timothy is therefore urged to preach the gospel, whether men are willing to receive it or not, and with much patience to rebuke sin and error. For soon many will refuse to listen to him and will turn to false teachers with their gossipy fables. He must not be discouraged, but must take up and carry to its completion, as far as in him lies, the work which the Apostle is about to lay down, when he will close a life of sacrifice in a martyr's death. St. Paul's bark is about to cast off from the shore of time; having kept the faith he will soon receive the crown of life, a reward which Timothy and all others will also get if they are faithful and eagerly look forward to greet their Lord.

(*c*) *The Apostle's lonely state and his recent deliverance* (4^{9-22}).

4^{9-13}. Only Luke is with Paul. Some have failed him; others have gone on missionary duty. He urges Timothy to hasten and bring Mark to minister to him, also to bring his cloak and parchments from Troas.

vv.$^{14-18}$. Timothy is to be on his guard against Alexander the coppersmith. In spite of his abandonment by men the Lord gave the Apostle a wonderful deliverance from deadly peril which has enabled him to complete his ministry, and now he has received confidence in his final salvation.

vv.$^{19-22}$. Greetings to and from other friends.

(iii.) TITUS.—1^{1-4}. Greeting.—Paul addresses Titus, his son in the Christian faith. This gospel, in the service of which he is an apostle, is the irreversible truth of God revealed according to His promise in Christ Jesus, and brings hope of eternal life to those who hold fast to its truth in a life of godliness.

vv.$^{5-9}$. The character of the men to be chosen by Titus for the eldership.—Titus was left behind in Crete, 'the island of an hundred cities,' to complete Paul's work by appointing elders. These men (also called 'bishops,' though possibly one bishop might preside over a presbytery) must be of blameless reputation, and as stewards of God's House prove their fitness by ruling well in their own families. Self-controlled, hospitable also and pious, they must hold so firmly to healthy doctrine that they will be able to refute perverse teachers.

vv.$^{10-16}$. False teachers.—In these churches, false and insubordinate teachers, of Jewish origin, full of empty talk, have arisen, who for money have perverted many of the Cretan families, inclined as they are by nature to sensuality. (He quotes a hexameter of Epimenides, one of the seven wise men of Greece, giving the Cretans a poor character.) These teachers and perverts must be sharply refuted so as to check the apostasy and to discountenance idle Jewish tales and Jewish precepts as to clean and unclean. Their professed distinctions between clean and unclean are meaningless when the heart is pure, for then outer distinctions vanish; and on the impure heart they have no effect. Though these errorists may profess to believe in God, like good Jews, their defiled lives prove that they are infidels.

2^{1-10}. Titus is to regulate the conduct of various classes within the Church. Old men must be self-restrained and dignified, and set forth healthy Christian virtues; especially must the older women be models of goodness, self-control, and family virtue to the younger women. Titus also must be a pattern of self-restraint, gravity, and sound doctrine for the young men. Slaves are to adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour by faithful service.

vv.$^{11-15}$. The gospel motive.—The saving grace of God in Christ is for all men, and challenges us to a life in this present of self-restraint, justice to our fellows, and reverent holiness towards God; at the same time it creates the hope of the appearing of our Saviour, who died for us that He might redeem us as His true Israel, zealous of good works. These demands of the gospel must be authoritatively set before the people.

3^{1-8}. A life of goodness the fruit of Divine mercy.—These Cretans must defer to authorities and lead lives of gentleness and goodness, as all Christians do who have been converted from disobedient, sensual, and hateful lives. Everything is due to the goodness of God appearing in Christ, who, not for any righteousness of ours but of His grace, saved us from sin, when in baptism the Holy Spirit of renewal was poured out upon us through Jesus our Saviour, so that being justified by His grace we may become heirs of eternal life. It is all-important that believers should be careful to maintain good works.

vv.$^{9-11}$. Final advice as to false teachers.—Titus is to avoid disputations with the false teachers, and if, after warning, the factious man proves obdurate, he must be left alone.

vv.$^{12-15}$. Personal references.—Titus is to come to Paul at Nicopolis as soon as the Apostle can send Artemas or Tychicus to relieve him of his post. Hospitality in general is enjoined, and in particular towards certain visiting brethren.

4. The condition of the churches.—The churches of which Timothy has oversight are within the circle of Ephesus, and those under Titus are in the island of Crete. Their members are drawn from different social strata. Some are rich, and others aspire to become rich, though probably the average is similar to that of other Christian communities. There are masters, and there are slaves. Some were formerly Jews, and Jewish influence is strong (1 Ti 1^{7}, Tit $1^{10.14}$), but the majority are, it would appear, of pagan origin. The Cretans, a people of crude morality and insubordinate temper, have fallen an easy prey to the same kind of error as was working havoc in Ephesus. Envy, strife, blasphemies, and suspicions abound (1 Ti $1^{4.19.20}$ $6^{4.5.21}$, 2 Ti $2^{14.23}$ 3^{6-9}, Tit $1^{11.13}$). The Church has become a commingled body or household with good and bad elements (1 Ti 4^{1}, 2 Ti 2^{20}), the gospel having been cast upon poor soil or choked by evil doctrine. Paul's influence in Asia has been seriously impaired (2 Ti 1^{15}); already there has been apostasy, and worse is yet to come; grievous times are impending (1 Ti 4^{1}, 2 Ti 3^{1}). For such a serious state of affairs the only remedy is a powerful ethical revival, induced by the preaching of the gospel in its purity, and maintained in a healthy church organization, directed by officials of the highest character.

Either as a cause or as an effect of this condition false teaching has vogue in the churches.

(*a*) In form it was a 'knowledge which is falsely so called' (1 Ti 6^{20}), concerned with 'fables and endless genealogies' (1 Ti 1^{4}), 'profane and old wives' fables' (1 Ti 4^{7}, 2 Ti 4^{4}), 'foolish inquiries and genealogies,' 'profane babblings and oppositions' (1 Ti 6^{20}, 2 Ti 2^{16}), 'Jewish fables, and commandments of men' (Tit 1^{14}). It gave rise to 'questionings and disputes' (1 Ti 6^{4}, 2 Ti 2^{23}), 'strifes, and fightings about the law' (Tit 3^{9}), and it was eating into the life of the churches like a cancer (2 Ti 2^{17}).

(*b*) Those who propagated this error seem to have done so by an abuse of the liberty of prophesying, and also by a house-to-house propaganda, which carried away many women. The teachers, who were evidently of Jewish origin, talked much about the Law, but acted in a manner that was contrary to its spirit, turning that which was pure to impure purposes (1 Ti 1^{7-10}, Tit 1^{15}). They clung for self-enrichment to forms of piety (1 Ti 6^{5}, 2 Ti 3^{5}, Tit 1^{11}), some of them perhaps practising magic (2 Ti 3^{13}); but they were indifferent to Christian virtue, being of corrupt minds, consciously insincere, full of lust, reprobate and unholy men (1 Ti $4^{1.2}$ 6^{5}, 2 Ti 3^{1-8} 4^{3}, Tit 1^{15-16}). As might be expected, they revolted against authority, as did Jannes and Jambres, the opponents, according to the Midrash, of the Divine prophet Moses (2 Ti 3^{8}, Tit 1^{10}; cf. also 2 Ti 2^{19}, with quotation from Nu 16^{5} referring to the rebellion of Korah).

(*c*) It is held by some that there were varieties in the form of error, the teachers of 2 Ti 2^{18} being thought to differ from the supposed magicians of $3^{8.9.13}$, and those of 1 Ti 1^{19} 6^{21}, who missed the goal of faith, from the false teachers of the Law (1 Ti 1^{7}). But, while there are not sufficient data to arrive at a confident opinion, it is probable that the differences might be explained as being common elements in a Hellenistic-Jewish type of thought which pervaded the Christian churches of Asia Minor and Crete like an atmosphere. Though the descriptions are vague, certain features stand out connecting this error with tendencies which prevailed during the latter half of the 1st century.

It is frequently assumed that it was a type of Gnosticism—in particular, such a phase as the Ophite sect—and the words *ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως, μῦθοι, γενεαλογίαι* might easily describe their speculations, which were accompanied, as here, by emphasis on knowledge and on the practice of asceticism. It is not improbable, however, that 1 Ti $6^{20. 21}$ is a later addition. W. Bousset holds that '"Gnosis" first appears in a technical sense in 1 Tim. vi. 20.' But the developed characteristics of Gnosticism, as he describes it, are not found in the false teaching condemned in the Pastorals — 'a mystic revelation and a deeply-veiled wisdom . . . the ultimate object is individual salvation, the assurance of a fortunate destiny for the soul after death. . . . The Gnostic religion is full of sacraments. . . . Sacred formulas, names, and symbols are of the highest importance among the Gnostic sects,' . . . in order that the soul may find 'its way unhindered [by demons] to the heavenly home.' The basis of the Gnostic world-philosophy is a dualism and a theory of emanations, including a belief in the Demiurge, who created and rules over this lower world, together with a hostile attitude towards the Jewish religion, which was represented in the later Christian Gnosticism. 'In Gnosticism salvation always lies at the root of all existence and all history, . . . is always a myth, . . . not an historical event' (*EBr*^{11} xii. 152 ff.).* In these Epistles we have no trace of any fundamental philosophic contrast between the Creator God, who is the God of the Law in the OT, and the God and Father of Jesus Christ. As regards the 'mystery' element, there are far fewer indications of the sacramental spirit than in the Epistles of Paul written to Corinth, where the 'Gnostic' tendencies were perhaps less strong than in Ephesus. There is, it is true, a reference to 'magicians,' but the Jewish world was only too submissive to their spells.

A primary fact is that this teaching was more or less of Jewish origin, which is to say that it was not 'Gnostic,' though the Judaism of Asia Minor had been much influenced by the pagan world, and had even yielded to some of the tendencies which were more powerfully expressed in Gnosticism, such as star worship and 'mystery' ideas. Ascetic practices found favour even with such a good Jew as Philo, who held to the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. It is quite intelligible, therefore, that teachers who inculcated a false asceticism, forbidding marriage and enjoining abstinence from foods (1 Ti 2^{15} 4^{3} $5^{14. 23}$, Tit 1^{15} 2^{4}), who also discounted historical facts and taught that there was no resurrection (2 Ti 2^{18}), were Jews of the 1st century or had come under their influence. Indeed, Colossians presents similar teaching on the part of those who extended the old Jewish prescriptions as to clean and unclean, and probably enjoined abstinence from marriage (cf. Col 2^{16-23} with Tit 1^{13-15}). Even in the Roman Church there were those who practised asceticism, which may have been supported by speculative theories (Ro 14; Wendland, *op. cit.*, p. 237). The spiritualization of the resurrection also was, according to Hippolytus, found among the Nicolaitans of Rev $2^{6. 15}$.

Moreover, the Jew of the Dispersion had fallen under the influence of the peripatetic schools of Hellenism and of the Greek lecturer, who played a large part in the Hellenistic world, speculating with empty verbal dialectic and setting forth pretentious moral theories about the simple and ascetic life. They freely used myths, romances, and love-stories for decking out traditions and historical personages, applying them even to the gods. In such 'myths' and 'genealogies,' profane and gossipy legends couched in rhetorical phrases (*ἀντιθέσεις*) with immoral tendencies, there was no reality (*κενοφωνία*). Borrowing the use of allegory from the Greek, perhaps also his frivolous literary methods, the Jew, even the Pharisaic Jew of Palestine, had long before this set to work upon the OT with such an aptitude that in his Haggādic Midrash, full of senseless stories and supposed genealogies of Hebrew heroes, and in the *Book of Jubilees*, which sets forth mythical lines of descent of the families of the Patriarchs, he easily rivalled his master in riotous imagination and subtlety* (Wendland, *op. cit.*, pp. 199–202). This method did away with the reality of the fact; history was turned into phantasy. As applied to the Law, especially by the Hellenized Jew of Asia Minor, and to the facts of gospel history, it would produce similar results—that is to say, a false spiritualization, followed by indifference to the facts of morality; and so these triflers with silly tales may have undermined the reverence for the moral order of the Law which had been the bulwark of the Jew against the pagan world. This evil tendency would be further aided by the widespread influence in Asia Minor of pre-Christian Gnosticism and the mystery-religions, from which even the Jew could not escape; and, though he may not have adopted the pessimistic philosophy that lay at their roots, he often glided insensibly into asceticism or licence.

There are still traces in these Epistles of opposition to Paul on the score of the Law, though it is different from that of the earlier Epistles (1 Ti 1^{7}, Tit 1^{10} 3^{9}). Here it comes from teachers who by their interpretation and method take all the moral meaning out of the Law. These errorists are a piratical crew, who have seized the good ship and kept her in a pestilential harbour till her timbers are befouled and worm-eaten.

It may be that in the emphasis placed upon the conception of God as One and the Saviour of all, and of Christ as the only Mediator (1 Ti 2^{1-7}, Tit 2^{10-14}), there is an allusion to contemporary Gnostic tenets, but it is more justifiable to see in it a veiled protest against the tendency to ascribe divine honours to heroes or local dynasts, to whom, as possessing the manifest power of the Divine presence, the word 'Saviour' was often applied (*ἐνεργὴς ἐπιφάνεια* [Wendland, *op. cit.*, pp. 126, 127]). Quite probably Christians were often tempted to secure favour from their rulers by this homage and to cloke the profession of their faith. When 2 Timothy was written, the confession of Christianity, or at least the preaching of it, seems to have been dangerous (2 Ti 1^{8} 2^{11-13}), and Timothy is warned not to refrain on this account from delivering Paul's message. In 1 Tim. the skies are clearer, and the Christians are bidden to pray for kings and rulers in order that under their governance the Church may have freedom in worship (1 Ti 2^{1-4}). If her testimony is open and unmolested, the gospel will have freer course. Possibly the words may mean that by this time Christianity had penetrated to circles near the throne, and the Church may have been looking for permanent relief. The Cretans, who are urged to obey rulers (Tit 3^{1}), seem to have led a secure life unless they provoked reprisals by violence or a harsh spirit, which might have given them the reputation of being haters of their kind ($3^{2.\ 3}$). There is not sufficient evidence in any of the Pastorals to assume the existence of systematic persecution arising from an Imperial policy.

---

* Cf. Wendland, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur*^{3}, pp. 165, 168, 184 f.

* G. Wohlenberg (p. 31 n.) quotes two relevant passages—Polyb. IX. ii. 1, who says that he will not follow the method of many who deal with *τὰ περὶ τὰς γενεαλογίας καὶ μύθους, καὶ περὶ τὰς ἀποικίας ἔτι δὲ καὶ συγγενείας καὶ κτίσεις*; and Philo, *Vit. Mos.* ii. 8, *τὸ γενεαλογικὸν μέρος τοῦ νόμου*, deals with the history of the human race until the giving of the Law.

5. Organization and worship of the Church.—The Church is the household of God, the successor of the old theocracy, to which the living God had at all times committed His Word (1 Ti 3^{15}, 2 Ti 2^{19} 3^{14-17}; cf. Eph 2^{19}). As the warden of Divine truth, which has been fully revealed in Christ, it must be pure in life, sound in doctrine, and firmly organized. Apostasy from or injury to its fellowship incurs the worst consequences (1 Ti 1^{20} $3^{6.\ 7}$, 2 Ti 2^{18} $3^{8.\ 9}$, Tit $3^{10.\ 11}$). (It is to be observed, however, that, though the Church is to be kept pure by the removal of unclean elements, the excommunication of Hymenæus and Alexander, who were delivered over unto Satan [1 Ti 1^{20}], was intended to have a reforming effect upon them, whereas in other Christian communities, on occasion at least, a similar act had a severer issue [Ac 5^{1-11}, 1 Co 5^{5}].)

In the earlier Epistles Paul addresses his churches both with authority in the name of Christ and with paternal solicitude (1 Co 7^{17} 11^{23} 16^{1}, Gal 4^{12-20}, 1 Th 4^{2}). In the Pastorals also the same notes rise clear in his urgent commands or appeals to Timothy and Titus (1 Ti 1^{18}, 2 Ti $4^{1.\ 2}$, Tit $1^{5.\ 13}$). As formerly he handed on 'traditions' (*παραδόσεις*, 1 Co 11^{2}, 2 Th 2^{15} 3^{6}) and 'injunctions' (*παραγγελίαι*, 1 Th 4^{2}), so now his lieutenants are to guard and transmit the Pauline deposit, which he claims to be the sound teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ (1 Ti 1^{18} $6^{3.\ 14.\ 20}$), committing it to trustworthy and capable successors (2 Ti 2^{2}, Tit 1^{5})—a procedure in which some have discovered, though without sufficient reason, the beginnings of 'apostolic succession' and the mark of later Catholicity, 'quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus.'

The function of Timothy and Titus was to represent the Apostle with the authority of his gospel and of the order which he had established in his churches. Their duty seems to have been, for the time, confined to definite regions, being unlike that of the later monarchical bishop, who presided permanently over the church in one city. On former occasions also they had been sent on missions (1 Co 4^{17} 16^{10}, 2 Co 2^{13} 12^{18}, Ph 2^{19-23}), but it is quite possible that Titus had also evangelized on an independent authority, both he and Timothy apparently being regarded as 'apostles' (cf. Ro 16^{7}, 2 Co 8^{23}; cf. Ph 2^{25}, 1 Th 2^{7}). In Ephesus and Crete, however, their duties are more arduous and more permanent, because of the necessity of getting distracted or turbulent communities into an ordered administration. Their ability to do this was due to the fact that they understood the Apostle's mind and practice as well as his gospel.

In the Second Epistle of Timothy the Apostle recalls to his disciple the fact that he is an evangelist and must speak with the authority of his gospel. When he was ordained this gift had descended on him with power, but its glow seems to have become hidden under a cooled surface; now he is to stir up his gift and to preach a pure gospel with courage, love, and prudence (1 Ti 4^{11-16}, 2 Ti 1^{6} 3^{10-17} 4^{1-5}). Here is a challenge not to missionary evangelism of new regions, but to a revival of faith in old churches; and it rests not on extrinsic authority but on the power of the gospel of Christ.

In 1 Tim. and Titus the function of both these lieutenants is more of an organizing than an evangelizing character. They have great authority, and yet they are to act as brethren (1 Ti 5^{1}, Tit $2^{7.\ 8.\ 15}$ 3^{10}). Timothy is to rebuke even an elder openly, to assign him honour or promotion, and not to invest with office by weak concession the wrong type of man. This authority seems to be personal rather than official.

There was still in the churches a remnant of the primitive charismatic gifts, for apparently it was under the guise of Christian prophecy that false prophets introduced their errors (1 Ti 4^{1}; cf. 1 Co 12^{3}). But the sudden overpowering charism of earlier days seems to have given way to an endowment of more permanent and illuminating inspiration (1 Ti 1^{18} 4^{14-16}, 2 Ti $3^{16.\ 17}$). Against irresponsible, unrestrained, and immoral teachers, who profess to rely on the Spirit, a well-ordered and organized church becomes a bulwark of the faith.

In these Epistles no definite form of organization is prescribed, but an order is accepted as already in existence—one object of the letters being to emphasize the necessity that Timothy and Titus shall secure men of the proper character and qualifications to fill the constituted offices. The first order in government is that of the 'bishop' (1 Ti 3^{2}, Tit 1^{7}), who seems to be identical with the 'presbyter' (1 Ti 5^{17}, Tit $1^{5.\ 7}$), of whom there were probably more than one in each church, though the article (1 Ti 3^{1}, Tit 1^{7}) does not of itself indicate this. The office was invested with peculiar dignity (1 Ti 5^{19-21}) and was much sought after (3^{1}); it was, therefore, the duty of the Apostle's delegates to select from the aspirants those whose character, abilities, and experience fitted them for directing the Church at the present crisis. It cannot be shown that the office was elective, but it may be that the function of Timothy and Titus was that of selecting suitable candidates from whom the brethren would make their choice (cf. 1 Ti $3^{2.\ 10}$ 5^{22}).

The qualifications for the bishop given in 1 Tim. and Titus are almost identical, though their order seems to be casual, and it cannot be assumed that they were meant to be an exhaustive list or had been codified; the emphasis was probably determined by local conditions. The bishop as the steward, with oversight of the house of God, should be a married man of proved capacity to govern, as shown in the lesser sphere of his own family. Free from the faults of youth, he must have won in the eyes of the world a character for uprightness and piety. Great stress is put upon the practice of self-restraint in all its forms, on tact and active goodness—probably to counteract the temptations to an undue exercise of authority. More distinctly official requisites are hospitality, freedom from avarice—needful in one who may have been responsible for finances—and ability to teach. If 'bishop' and 'elder' were identical, it may be inferred from 1 Ti 5^{17} that some elders did not teach, inasmuch as those who did were to receive either double pecuniary support or to be regarded as holding a more honourable office. In Tit 1^{9}, however, the ability to teach and to resist heresy is emphasized as being so essential as almost to suggest that this distinction in the eldership did not exist in Crete. These officials were evidently to be supported by the churches which they served (1 Ti 5^{18}).

It cannot be successfully maintained that already a 'clerical' morality beyond that required of the laity is being required of the bishop. The virtues are ordinary Christian virtues. The expression 'husband of one wife,' for example, if it means prohibition against having a mistress as well as a wife, sets forth the Christian rule, though the mention of it here would indicate how slowly those who emerged from paganism in these districts adjusted themselves to the higher standard. If the words imply that the bishop was not to contract a second marriage after the death of his first wife, as is probably what is intended, they indicate that the bishop must be a man whose manner of life would win for him the highest respect in the Christian community (1 Co $7^{8.\,9}$; cf. Lk $2^{36.\,37}$). On inscriptions of the Augustine age the word *virginius* is applied to a man who had married but once. By the 2nd cent. the standards became much more rigid.

The second rank, the diaconate, which was probably a stepping-stone to the higher office (1 Ti 3^{13}), is mentioned only in 1 Timothy. The deacon seems to have been a younger man, though many of his qualifications are the same as those of the bishop—control over his family, a blameless character, freedom from drunkenness and avarice. No reference is made to the exercise of hospitality or teaching power, but the deacon is warned against being double-tongued, a danger to which he may have been exposed by gossip in his house-to-house visitation.

Opinion is divided as to the meaning of 'women' in 1 Ti 3^{11}. If the integrity of the text be assumed, the more probable view is that it means the wives of bishops and deacons, this being supported by the possibility that in order to counteract a false asceticism (*οἱ κωλεύοντες γαμεῖν*, 1 Ti 4^{3}) Paul may have intended that bishops and deacons should be chosen from among married men. If, however, as is not improbable, the verse be an interpolation, it is a later reference to the order of deaconesses, which was in existence early in some churches (Ro 16^{1}). More is to be said for the view that there was an order of 'widows,' who were assigned a special ministry (1 Ti $5^{3.\,9.\,10}$).

The 'young men' (1 Ti 5^{1}, Tit 2^{6}) seem to have had some official standing, though it is probable that the line that divided between any class and the brethren was not sharply drawn.

Prominent though the idea of the Church and its organization is, the sacramental element does not appear in the Pastorals except in Titus. If it was regarded as an essential condition for the welfare of Christian life, it is strange that the 'mystery' of godliness should be expressed in doctrine (1 Ti 3^{16}). Stress is everywhere laid on teaching, healthy instruction as to the gospel, right conduct; and to do the work of an 'evangelist' is to fulfil the ministry. The sacrament of baptism is, according to Tit 3^{5-7}, the outward act whereby the Divine salvation is consummated. In this bath of regeneration the world beheld the Church cleansed from its old life of heathenism, and thereafter endued with the quickening Holy Spirit. No mention is made of any name or word as of mystical power: nothing is said of the laying on of hands as conveying any supernatural endowment. Whether baptism was a necessary channel of grace, and, if so, in what measure, is left undetermined. As in Ro 6^{1-5} 8^{15-17}, baptism with its concomitants is at least (1) a proof of the effectiveness of Divine grace, (2) a pledge of eternal life. A remarkably similar view of baptism to that of Tit $3^{5.\,6}$ is found in Eph $5^{26.\,27}$, with the addition of 'in a word.'

The public worship of the Church is well developed. Under the direction of presbyters, teaching takes the place held by prophecy in the Corinthian Church (1 Ti 4^{13-16}, 2 Ti $2^{24.\,25}$). There was public reading of the Scriptures accompanied by an exposition of the Word of God, of which perhaps the quotations in the Gospel of Matthew and in the Epistle to the Hebrews are good examples. 2 Ti 3^{15-17} refers to OT Scriptures. In them is Divine wisdom, which, when accompanied by faith, begets salvation; and all Scripture, or every passage of Scripture which is inspired (the false teachers used Jewish fables, etc.), is useful for equipping the man of God for his work. In these Epistles no trace of the canonization of the NT books is discoverable. Prayer also, rich and varied (1 Ti $2^{1.\,2.\,8}$), was regulated, and again restraint appears in place of the freedom of the earlier charismatic days. It seems that, as in 1 Corinthians, only men took part in public prayer (1 Ti 2^{8-12}). Hymns, germs of a creed, liturgical snatches, doxologies—all for public use—are embedded in these letters (1 Ti $1^{15.\,17}$ 3^{16} $6^{15.\,16}$, 2 Ti $2^{11.\,12.\,13}$),[*] everything combining to show that a regulated form of public worship was rapidly displacing the individual charismata of the more primitive days. In private also, prayer was employed to sanctify the daily meal (1 Ti $4^{4.\,5}$).

6. Christian faith and life.—There is already a 'common faith' (*κοινὴ πίστις*) (Tit 1^{4}), the substance of which is set forth in Tit 2^{11-14} 3^{4-7}. God is 'the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords' (1 Ti 6^{15}), but also the Saviour (1 Ti $2^{3.\,4}$ 4^{10}, 2 Ti 1^{9}, Tit 3^{4}) of all men, from whose goodness and 'philanthropy'[†] proceeds saving grace (Tit 2^{11} 3^{4}) in fulfilment of an eternal purpose (2 Ti 1^{9}, Tit 1^{2}). Between God and men there is only one Mediator, the man Christ Jesus (1 Ti 2^{5}), who from a pre-incarnate life came into this world (1 Ti 1^{15}, 2 Ti 1^{10}). This manifestation, 'the mystery of godliness,' and the essential truth held forth by the Church (1 Ti $3^{15.\,16}$), is expressed in a hymn, evidently a common confession of faith, though it does not contain a complete Pauline view of the 'mystery' (Ro 16^{25-27}), omitting as it does the Death, and laying stress on the Ascension rather than the Resurrection. Jesus Christ, descended from David (2 Ti 2^{8}), came into the world to save sinners (1 Ti 1^{15}). He annihilated death and brought life and incorruption to light (2 Ti 1^{10}). By the gift of Himself on our behalf He ransomed the new Israel from sin, and made it pure (1 Ti 2^{6}, Tit 2^{14}). Jesus Christ is the living strength (1 Ti 1^{12}) and hope of the Christian (1 Ti 1^{1}, Tit 2^{13}), who lives his holy life in Him (2 Ti 3^{12}); and the Holy Spirit, who is seldom mentioned, is given through Christ (2 Ti 1^{14}, Tit 3^{6}). The appearing of Christ, who will come to judge, is not far distant, and is longed for by the believer (1 Ti 6^{14}, 2 Ti $4^{1.\,8}$, Tit 2^{13}). Then will be the final salvation unto eternal life (2 Ti 4^{18}, Tit 3^{7}).

The Church, built upon this solid foundation of Christian teaching, holds aloft the truth which shines forth in the lives of believers as a light in the darkness, and against such a beacon the waves of error will break in vain.

In 1 Tim. the Church, the house in which God dwells, takes a place of great importance as the organized body which guarantees the Truth. This Truth is healthy doctrine, but in 1 Ti 3^{16} it is also equivalent to 'the mystery of godliness,' and is set forth in a hymn which contains the salient features of the historic manifestation of Jesus Christ, what we might term an outline 'gospel.' The hymn seems most simply interpreted as referring to the Incarnation; the recognition of Divine sonship in the Baptism, Temptation, Transfiguration; the revelation of the historic Jesus to the heavenly world, as *e.g.* to the celestial choir at His birth, the Transfiguration, Gethsemane (Lk 22^{43}), the Resurrection (Lk $24^{4.5}$; cf., for same idea, Jn 1^{51}); the preaching to the Gentiles; the founding of the Church in the world; and the culmination of His triumph in the Ascension.* This survey fits into the scheme and purpose of the Gospel of Luke and the Book of Acts. According to 1 Ti 3^{16}, this tradition of the historic Jesus, this mystery which is the Truth, is preserved in the Church of the living God, which must, therefore, be regulated by Timothy with a due sense of his responsibility. It is true that in the earlier Pauline Epistles we find the conception of the Church and the necessity of its organization (1 Co 12^{28} 15^{9}, Gal 1^{13}), but there is no such emphasis on it as here. These verses remove us from the Pauline atmosphere of the gospel of the Risen and Living Christ, who Himself is the source of truth, the Person in whom through His Spirit the body of believers is held together. Instead of the Spirit, we find organization and order.

---

[*] Zahn finds traces of a fixed baptismal creed in 1 Ti 6^{12-16} and 2 Ti $2^{2.\,8}$ 4^{1}, though F. A. Loofs, while admitting that *ἡ καλὴ ὁμολογία* and the reference to the *μαρτύριον Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πειλάτου* (1 Ti 6^{13}) may be an allusion to a baptismal confession (which he thinks had its origin in Asia Minor, where also he places the home of the Pastorals at the end of the 1st cent.), does not believe that it was the original of the Roman symbol (*Symbolik oder christliche Konfessionskunde*, Tübingen, 1902, p. 28).

[†] 'There was hardly any virtue so often commended in the Hellenistic sovereign as *φιλανθρωπία*' (Wendland, *op. cit.*, p. 407, note 4).

When the gospel is preached and is received in a pure heart, a good conscience, and with faith unfeigned, the moral life will manifest itself in the pursuit of righteousness, piety, love, patience under suffering, endurance never embittered whatever evil may befall, peace and hope in the living God who gives life eternal (1 Ti 1^{5} 4^{10-12} 6^{11}, 2 Ti 2^{22} 3^{10}). This is similar to the righteousness of the Kingdom as it is set forth in the Gospels. Good though the soil may be, it must be tilled with care; vigorous effort is required of the Christian, in co-operation with the saving grace of God in Christ: true godliness must manifest itself in good works (1 Ti 2^{10} $6^{11.17}$, 2 Ti $3^{16.17}$, Tit $2^{11.12}$ $3^{8.14}$). This side of the Christian life is emphasized in these Epistles both by the words employed to describe the effort and by the moral quality of the result. The word 'discipline' (*παιδεία, παιδεύω*) occurs four times in the Pastorals, and only three times in the other Pauline letters, but seven times in Hebrews and twice in Acts, where it is employed for the education of the child. A similar idea lies in the word 'exercise' (*γυμνάζειν*, 1 Ti 4^{7}). As might be expected, teaching plays a large part in the discipline of a Christian character. The word 'teaching' (*διδασκαλία*) occurs fifteen times in these Epistles, being often qualified by the attributes 'good' (*καλή*) and 'healthy' (*ὑγιαίνουσα*), and only six times in the rest of the NT. Occasionally it is almost equivalent to the concept of 'faith' as the objective belief of the Christians (1 Ti $6^{1.3}$, Tit 2^{10}). In the early Epistles of Paul the gospel, which is a Divine mystery hidden from the wise and prudent, is revealed unto the saved by the Spirit as the power of God (1 Co $1^{18ff.}$); but in these Epistles healthy doctrine may be taught to and understood by reasonable and moral men. It is one of the necessary qualifications of the bishop that he be 'apt to teach' (1 Ti 3^{2}), and Paul himself is a 'teacher of the Gentiles in faith and truth' (1 Ti 2^{7}, 2 Ti 1^{11}).

The thoroughly disciplined Christian, instructed in sound doctrine, will deny 'worldly lusts' and 'live soberly and righteously and godly in this present world' (Tit 2^{12}). The frequent occurrence of the term 'godliness' (*εὐσέβεια*) and its associated forms constitutes one of the features of these Epistles (1 Tim. ten times, 2 Tim. twice, Tit. twice). Outside the Pastorals they are found most frequently in Acts, in which also the phrase 'God-fearers' (*οἱ σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν, οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν*) is used of the proselytes who have discovered in the God of the Christians the true Jahweh and the object of reverent worship leading to a holy life. The terms are also very characteristic of pagan thought in the Hellenistic age. The root idea of the word is reverence, primarily as directed towards God, who is recognized as holy and must receive His due in worship, and then as shown in the conduct of a man who performs towards others what piety demands. The good man must be godly (*εὐσεβής*). His godliness must manifest itself in the performance of practical duties and in goodness towards all men in their several stations. 'Godliness' is almost synonymous with the righteousness of the citizen of the Kingdom of God, who has the promise both of this life and of that which is to come. It brings contentment with one's lot, and willingness to take all blessings from God's hand, surpassing by this religious motive the old Stoic virtue of contentment or independence of external goods. There was need of the practice of this virtue, because even in the Christian world of Ephesus riches had already become a root of manifold evils (1 Ti 6^{6-10}). Other words from the same root peculiar to the Pastorals (with the exception of Ph 4^{8}) are *σεμνός* and *σεμνότης* (cf. *αἰδώς*, 1 Ti 2^{9}), which signify a reverent type of life becoming to the Christian and winning respect for him from his neighbours (2^{2} $3^{4.8}$, Tit 2^{7}).

From 'godliness' (*εὐσέβεια*) it is not a long step to 'self-control' (*σωφροσύνη*) and its cognates, ten instances of which out of sixteen in the NT occur in the Pastoral Epistles. Self-restraint is a chief virtue for youth, and with reverence is the adornment of pious women (1 Ti 2^{9}, Tit $2^{5.6.12}$). Many parallels to the three virtues *σωφροσύνη, δικαιοσύνη, εὐσέβεια* are to be found in ancient ethics, *σωφροσύνη* in particular being the Greek ideal of a harmonious, well-ordered life as opposed to the character divided against itself by its passions. In contrast to the ecstatic worship or ascetic practices of the pagan religions, and even to the inspiration of the primitive Christian, the believer of the Pastorals is self-controlled, having disciplined his moral life into reverence and dignity. His character, however, has a supernatural source, Jesus Christ Himself being the fountain of piety, faith, and love (2 Ti 1^{13} 3^{12}). But the emphasis is different from that of the major Pauline Epistles. There the Christian life is the fruit of the indwelling Spirit, from whom as the outcome of full liberty in Christ springs a splendid luxuriance of virtues. In these Epistles discipline and teaching prune the moral life, which shows itself in a reverent and restrained piety.

7. Relation of the Pastoral Epistles to the other books of the NT.—(i.) THE PAULINE LETTERS.—(*a*) *1 Timothy*.—There is undoubtedly a strong Pauline basis underlying this Epistle.

Romans: 7^{12} and 1 Ti $1^{8.9}$; 16^{27} and 1 Ti 1^{17}; 13^{1} and 1 Ti $2^{1.2}$; $3^{29.30}$ $5^{6.10}$ and 1 Ti $2^{4.5.6}$; 14^{14} and 1 Ti 4^{4}.

Corinthians: 1 Co 5^{5} and 1 Ti 1^{20}; 1 Co $11^{8.9}$ 14^{34} and 1 Ti $2^{11.12}$; 2 Co 11^{3} and 1 Ti $2^{13.14}$; 1 Co 12^{3} and 1 Ti 4^{1}; 1 Co $16^{10.11}$ and 1 Ti 4^{12}; 1 Co $7^{8.9}$ and 1 Ti 5^{14}; same quotations in 1 Co 9^{8}, 2 Co 13^{1}, and 1 Ti $5^{18.19}$; 1 Co $9^{25.26}$ and 1 Ti 6^{12}.

Ephesians: the conception of ministry, the need of unity and sound doctrine similar in Eph 4^{11-14} and 1 Ti 3^{1}–4^{6}; cf. also Eph $2^{19.20}$ and 1 Ti $3^{5.15}$; 4^{21} and 1 Ti $3^{15.16}$; 2^{2} and 1 Ti 4^{1}; 6^{5} and 1 Ti 6^{1}.

Philippians: 4^{13} and 1 Ti 1^{12}; 2^{25} and 1 Ti 1^{18}; 4^{6} and 1 Ti 2^{1}; $4^{11.12}$ and 1 Ti 6^{6-8}; 1^{1} and 1 Ti $3^{2.8}$.

Colossians: 1^{23-27} and 1 Ti $1^{1.4.11.12}$ $3^{15.16}$.

These parallels do not exhaust the likeness. Only a writer extremely familiar with Paul's writings or thought could have written 1 Ti 1^{8-20} 2^{1-7} 6^{11-16}, though the distinctively Pauline notes of justification, life in Christ, and the work of the Spirit have been toned down in the Epistle at large. Frequently also a word or conception strange to the Pauline soil is turned up by the critical ploughshare, *e.g.* the application of the attribute 'Saviour' to God. Further, the emphasis is changed. 'Teaching,' especially 'healthy' teaching (*ὑγιαίνουσα διδαχή*), is much commoner than in the earlier Epistles (1 Co 4^{17}, Col 1^{28} 2^7 3^{16}), and in 1 Ti 6^1 it is almost convertible with the gospel. Christian faith is spoken of less from the personal side than from the objective as a body of doctrine, twice, indeed, being synonymous with 'truth' (though, of course, this use of 'faith' is also found in the earlier Epistles) (1 Ti 1^{19} 4^1 $6^{10.\ 21}$); and Christian life and doctrine are the new law (*ἐντολή*) (v.^{14}). As has been remarked above, the prevalence of the idea of discipline and of the word 'godliness' (*εὐσέβεια*) is a feature of these later Epistles. Again, the use of the phrases 'faithful is the saying' (*πιστὸς ὁ λόγος*, 1^{15} 3^1 4^9) and 'the good confession' (1 Ti 6^{13}) involves a measure of fixed creed, or at least of traditional formulæ, which seems alien to the originality of Paul's mind. Possibly also the 'words of our Lord Jesus Christ' (1 Ti 6^3) were *logia* such as Luke and the other Evangelists used.

---

* For the use of the aorist to express the completeness of an event that may have recurred see F. W. Blass, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, Göttingen, 1896, § 57 f.

(*b*) *2 Timothy*.—The affinities are much closer than in 1 Timothy.

Romans: 8^{15} and 2 Ti 1^7; 1^{16} and 2 Ti $1^{8.\ 12}$; 16^{26} and 2 Ti $1^{9.10}$; 6^{17} and 2 Ti 1^{13}; 1^3 and 2 Ti 2^8; $1^{29.\ 30}$ and 2 Ti $3^{2\text{-}4}$; 2^{20} and 2 Ti 3^5; $4^{23.\ 24}$ 15^4 and 2 Ti 3^{16}.

1 Corinthians: similar relationship of Paul to Timothy: 1 Co 4^{17} $16^{10.\ 11}$ and 2 Ti $1^{2\text{-}6}$ $2^{1.\ 2}$ $3^{10.\ 11}$; $9^{7.\ 25.\ 26}$ and 2 Ti $2^{4.\ 5}$; 3^{12} 8^3 and 2 Ti 2^{19}; $9^{9.\ 10}$ and 2 Ti 3^{16}.

2 Corinthians: the idea of the ministry in 2 Co 3^{16}–4^2 is similar to that in 2 Tim., though in the latter it is less powerfully expressed; cf. 2 Co $4^{11.\ 12}$ and 2 Ti 2^{10}.

Ephesians: $3^{3.\ 5.\ 9.\ 10}$ and 2 Ti $1^{9.\ 10}$; $1^{19.\ 20}$ and 2 Ti 2^8; $3^{1.\ 13}$ and 2 Ti 2^9; 4^{11} and 2 Ti 4^5; 6^{21} and 2 Ti 4^{12}.

Philippians affords the closest parallels: 3^5 and 2 Ti 1^3; $1^{29.\ 30}$ $2^{19\text{-}22}$ $3^{10.\ 11.\ 17}$ 4^9 and 2 Ti $1^{8\text{-}13}$ $3^{10\text{-}14}$; 1^{20} and 2 Ti 1^{12}; 3^{10} and 2 Ti 2^8; $1^{12\text{-}14}$ 2^{17} and 2 Ti $2^{9.\ 10}$; 2^{17} 3^{14} and 2 Ti $4^{6\text{-}8}$.

There are no passages in 1 Tim. that ring so truly Pauline as 2 Ti $1^{3\text{-}5.\ 8\text{-}12}$ $2^{1\text{-}13}$ $3^{1\text{-}5.\ 10\text{-}12}$ $4^{1.\ 2.\ 5\text{-}8}$. But even in these sections non-Pauline words such as *ἐπιφάνεια*, *εὐσέβεια(ῶς)* occur, and their style and language conform in general to 1 Timothy, though this alone would not cast a serious suspicion upon 2 Timothy were it separated from its companion Epistles. Its vigòur and personal references show that it takes its rise near the source of the Pauline stream. The form of the letter also resembles the earlier Pauline Epistles more than 1 Tim. or Tit. does. After the address comes a thanksgiving, as in Rom., Cor., Phil.; at the close a doxology, greetings, and blessing, which is very Pauline. See Wendland, *op. cit.*, p. 413 ff.

(*c*) *Titus*.—There are here, as in the other Epistles, affinities in detail and in general.

Romans: $16^{25.\ 26}$ and Tit $1^{1\text{-}4}$; 5^2 and Tit 2^{13}; $13^{1\text{ff.}}$ and Tit 3^1; 8^{24} and Tit 3^7; $16^{17.\ 18}$ and Tit 3^{10}.

1 Corinthians: 4^1 and Tit 1^7; 1^7 and Tit 2^{13}; 6^{11} and Tit 3^3.

Ephesians: in Eph $4^{11\text{-}14}$ $5^{25\text{-}27}$ and Tit $1^{5\text{-}11}$ there are similar ideas as to the necessity of the ministry in order to maintain the purity of the Church against false doctrine; cf. also Eph $1^{9.\ 10}$ and Tit $1^{1\text{-}4}$; $1^{7.\ 14}$ $5^{2.\ 25\text{-}27}$ and Tit 2^{14}; 2^3 5^8 and Tit 3^3; $2^{8.\ 9}$ $5^{26.\ 27}$ and Tit 3^5.

Philippians: 3^{20} and Tit 2^{13}; 4^5 and Tit 3^2; 3^9 and Tit $3^{5.\ 7}$.

Pauline doctrine is found in $1^{1\text{-}3}$ $2^{11\text{-}14}$ $3^{1\text{-}8}$, though there is an inworking of non-Pauline ideas and language similar to that of 1 Timothy. Christianity is a recognizable form of piety to be adorned, observed, and taught (2^{10}). Titus stands midway between 1 and 2 Timothy; it is more personal than the former, and is more closely related to the latter in its parallels to the Pauline letters and in its emphasis on the evangelical doctrines, but in $1^{5\text{-}9}$ $2^{1\text{-}10}$ $3^{9.\ 10}$ it is connected more closely with 1 Timothy ($3^{2\text{ff.}\ 11}$ $5^{1\text{ff.}}$ $6^{1.\ 3\text{-}5}$).

(ii.) HEBREWS.—Several expressions and a few turns of thought, not found in Paul, are common to the Pastorals and Hebrews—the conception of the death of Christ, and the use of the term 'mediator,' He 8^6 9^{15} 12^{24} and 1 Ti 2^5, 2^{14} and 2 Ti 1^{10}; cf. 12^2 and 2 Ti 2^8.

(iii.) 1 PETER.—This Epistle affords even more close resemblances than Hebrews: $3^{1\text{-}6}$ and 1 Ti $2^{9\text{-}11}$, Tit $2^{3\text{-}5}$; $5^{1\text{-}4}$ and 1 Ti $3^{2\text{-}7}$, Tit $1^{5\text{-}9}$; $3^{18.\ 22}$ and 1 Ti 3^{16}; 4^5 and 2 Ti 4^1; $2^{13\text{-}15}$ and Tit 2^8 $3^{1.\ 2}$; 3^{13} and Tit 2^{14}.

(iv.) THE LUCAN WRITINGS.—There are remarkable points of contact between the Pastoral Epistles and the Gospel of Luke, and especially the Book of Acts. The attributes applied to God—'King of kings and Lord of lords' (1 Ti 6^{15}), 'Saviour' (3 times in 1 Tim., once in 2 Tim., 6 times in Tit.), His *χρηστότης καὶ φιλανθρωπία* (Tit 3^4) and *μεγαλειότης* (cf. Lk $1^{15.\ 32}$ 9^{43}, Ac 8^{10} $19^{27.\ 28}$, Tit 2^{13})—show a striking similarity to the religious terminology current in Hellenistic Judaism and in Hellenistic cults (see Wendland, *op. cit.*, p. 221; Dibelius on Tit 2^{14}). In this respect the language of Luke and Acts is much more akin to contemporary Hellenistic usage than is that of Paul. The Gospel of Luke opens with a promise of what is really an *ἐπιφάνεια* of the Most High ($1^{32.\ 35.\ 76.\ 79}$). The term is frequent in contemporary religious language and occurs 5 times in these Epistles. Ac $14^{16.\ 17}$ $17^{24\text{-}26}$ are a partial comment on the Divine *χρηστότης καὶ φιλανθρωπία*. Jesus is the Saviour of sinners (Lk 2^{11}, Ac 5^{31} 13^{23}); Christ is Redeemer (*λυτρῶσθαι*, 1 Ti 2^6, Tit 2^{14}; cf. Lk 1^{68} 24^{21}, Ac 7^{35}), Judge (2 Ti 4^1, Ac 10^{42} 17^{31}). Cf. the gift of the Spirit (2 Ti 1^6, Ac $13^{2.\ 3}$; cf. 18^{25}); similar conceptions of the relation of the New to the Old Covenant and of Paul to Judaism (2 Ti $1^{3.\ 5}$, Ac $24^{14\text{-}16}$ $26^{6.\ 22}$); hostility to the gospel traced to ignorance (1 Ti 1^{13}; cf. Ac 3^{17} $17^{23.\ 30}$); the Church the family of God, and its relation to the household (1 Ti $3^{5.\ 15}$, 2 Ti 2^{20}, Ac 10^2 11^{14} 16^{31} 18^8); recognition of the widow (1 Ti $5^{3\text{ff.}}$, Lk 2^{37} $18^{3\text{-}6}$, Ac 6^1); evil effect of riches (1 Ti $6^{9.\ 10.\ 17}$, Lk 8^{14} $12^{16\text{-}21}$ 16^9); frequent use of 'good (or other adj.) conscience' (6 times in Pastorals, Ac 23^1 24^{16}, common in Hellenistic usage); similar use of *δικαιοσύνη* for proper conduct (1 Ti 6^{11}, Ac 10^{35} 13^{10} 24^{25}). Acts, like the Pastorals, exhibits the influence of 'teaching' in the spread of the gospel, and also of the favourable disposition of rulers upon the growth of the Church, which, indeed, may be said to be one of its minor motives. Prayer for those in authority was in the synagogues of the Jews an equivalent for worship of the Emperor and a proof of loyalty (see Dibelius on 1 Ti 2^2). For lesser parallels see 2 Ti 1^{12}, Lk 23^{46}, Ac 7^{59}; 2 Ti 2^{19}, Lk 13^{27}; 2 Ti 3^{14}, Lk 1^4. Very close resemblances are found between the address of Paul to the elders at Miletus (Ac $20^{17\text{-}38}$) and the Pastorals, especially in the closing scene in 2 Timothy. Paul reminds them of his blameless career (cf. 2 Ti $1^{13.\ 14}$ $3^{10.\ 11}$ 4^7). The joy of finishing his course makes his own life of small account since he is fulfilling the commission of Jesus Christ (Ac 20^{24}, 2 Ti $1^{11.\ 12}$ $4^{6.\ 7.\ 8}$). In spite of dangers that the preaching of the gospel brought upon him, he has been faithful, serving the Church without gain, and his example will strengthen his successors in the troublous days that are ahead (Ac $20^{29.\ 30.\ 33\text{-}35}$, 1 Ti $6^{5\text{-}10}$, 2 Ti 1^8 2^4 $3^{10.\ 11.\ 14}$, Tit 1^{11}). The impending visitation of evil teachers creates the necessity of elders maintaining discipline and oversight (Ac $20^{17.\ 28.\ 29.\ 30}$, 1 Ti 3^{15} 4^1 6^5, 2 Ti $3^{1.\ 6}$, Tit $1^{5.\ 11}$ 3^{11} [*ἐξέστραπται*; cf. Ac 20^{30}]). Cf. Ac 20^{35} (*λόγος τοῦ κυρίου*) and 1 Ti 6^3. The quotation (1 Ti 5^{18}, Lk 10^7) is given in the exact words of Luke, whereas in other cases, *e.g.* 1 Co 9^{14}, Paul does not use the Gospel Sayings of Jesus (cf. 1 Ti 5^{21} with Lk 9^{26}).

It is just possible that the Book of Tobit may serve as a link between the Pastorals and the Lucan writings. Cf. especially 4^9 and 1 Ti 6^{19}; 4^{21} and 1 Ti 6^8; 13^6 and 1 Ti 1^{17} (see R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, Oxford, 1913).

If Rendel Harris is correct in his view that the words of Ac 17^{28}, 'In him we live, and move, and have our being,' are taken from Epimenides, the Cretan poet, who is evidently the author of the hexameter verse in Tit 1^{12}, there is another subtle connexion between the Pastorals and Luke (*Exp*, 7th ser., ii. [1906] 305).

The hymn quoted in 1 Ti 3^{16} seems to follow the themes of the Gospel of Luke and of the Acts—the Incarnation, Baptism, Temptation, Transfiguration and other angelic manifestations, Mission of Seventy, the carrying of the gospel to Gentiles (in Acts), the foundation of the Church, and the Ascent through death into glory. See also under § **6**.

In regard to the character of Timothy, A. Jülicher says: 'It is the Timothy of the Acts of the Apostles somewhat flattened out and diminished that the Pastoral Epistles show us' (*PRE*^{3} xix. 786); cf. Wendland: 'Many ecclesiastical customs and regulations bring [the author of Acts] into the neighbourhood of the Pastoral Epistles' (*op. cit.*, p. 333).

8. References in post-apostolic literature.—While the witness of the earliest non-canonical writers is not so strong for the Pastorals as for Romans and Corinthians, it compares favourably with that for Galatians and Philippians, and is much better than that for 1 and 2 Thessalonians. The fact that they were addressed not to churches but to private persons may account for the silence.

Clement.—There is a fair degree of probability that the Pastorals, especially Titus, were known to Clement: Clem. *ad Cor.* i. 3 and Tit $2^{4.5}$, ii. 7 and Tit 3^1 being the closest parallels; but cf. xxix. 1 with 1 Ti 2^8; xxxii. 3. 4 with 2 Ti 1^9, Tit 3^{5-7}; xlv. 7 with 2 Ti 1^3, 1 Ti 3^9; lx. 3. 4, lxi. with 1 Ti 6^{15} 2^2, Tit 3^1.

Ignatius contains, it is highly probable, frequent reminiscences of 1 and 2 Timothy. Cf. *Eph.* xiv. 1, xx. 1, *Magn.* viii. 1 with 1 Ti 1^{3-5}; *Polyc.* iii. 1 with 1 Ti 1^3 6^3, iv. 3 with 1 Ti 6^2, vi. 2 with 2 Ti $2^{3.4}$; *Rom.* ii. 2 with 2 Ti 4^6, ix. 2 with 1 Ti 1^{13}; *Smyrn.* iv. 2 with 1 Ti 1^{12}, 2 Ti $2^{11\text{ff.}}$. For Titus: cf. *Magn.* vi. 2 with Tit 2^7, viii. 1 with Tit 1^{14} 3^9; *Polyc.* vi. 1 with Tit 1^7. The evidence for Titus is weaker than for the others. Zahn asserts that scarcely a single chapter of the three Pastorals is without more or less marked parallels with Ignatius; Jülicher also admits that they are used in Ignatius and Polycarp.

Barnabas seldom, and with less probability, has traces of the Epistles (cf. *Ep. Barn.* i. 4 with Tit 1^2, v. 6 with 1 Ti 3^{16}); but *Polycarp* is undoubtedly indebted to them. Cf. Polyc. *ad Phil.* iv. 1 with 1 Ti $6^{7.10}$; iv. 3 with 1 Ti 5^5; v. 2 with 2 Ti 2^{12}, Tit 3^8; ix. 2 with 2 Ti 4^{10}; xi. 2 with 1 Ti 3^{2-5}; xi. 4 with 2 Ti 2^{25}; xii. 1 with 2 Ti $3^{14.15}$; xii. 3 with 1 Ti $2^{1.2}$ 4^{15}.

Justin, the Gnostic *Acts of Paul*, *Hegesippus*, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, and *Clement of Alexandria* know these Epistles. They are regarded as Pauline and canonical in the *Muratorian Fragment*, though, strangely, *Marcion* omits them from his Pauline group, probably on his own doctrinal grounds. Marcion had written a book with the title *ἀντιθέσεις*, and in 1 Ti 6^{20} the readers are warned against *ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως*. It may be also that he rejected them because they were not addressed to churches, for Tertullian seems to see an inconsistency in his admitting Philemon. The silence of Marcion is difficult to explain clearly, but is insufficient for Jülicher's theory that the Epistles were not known before his time as Pauline and could not have appeared before A.D. 100.

9. Language of the Pastoral Epistles.—(*a*) The three letters are related to one another by the use of a large common vocabulary. Among the most distinctive words and phrases are *εὐσέβεια* and cognates, *σώφρων* and cognates, *διδασκαλία* often with *ὑγιαίνουσα* or *καλός* (*καλός* elsewhere in Paul only 16 times and then usually as a predicate, but in the Pastorals 24 times and as a rule attributively), *παραθήκη*, *καθαρὰ* or *ἀγαθὴ συνείδησις*, *πιστὸς ὁ λόγος*, *ἐπίγνωσις ἀληθείας*, *δι᾿ ἣν αἰτίαν*, and *χάριν ἔχειν*. Some 170 words are found nowhere else in the NT, 70 occur only in 1 Tim., 40 in 2 Tim., and 25 in Titus.* 1 Tim. and Tit. are more nearly related to each other than either is to 2 Timothy.

(*b*) At the same time there is a fundamentally Pauline vocabulary, though some of the most distinctively Pauline words and particles are not found, *e.g.* *ἄδικος*, *ἀποκαλύπτειν*, *ἐνεργεῖν*, *καυχᾶσθαι*, *παράδοσις*, *περιπατεῖν*, *περισσεύειν*, *σῶμα*, *τέλειος*, *ἄρα*, *διό*, *διότι*. The absence from the Pastorals of the rhetorical expressions *τί οὖν*; *τί γάρ*; *ἄρα οὖν*; *οὐκ οἶδας*, which occur in the greater Epistles, is not so remarkable, because they are found rarely in the Epistles of the Captivity; but the style has become less vigorous than that of these later letters. It never bursts its bounds or swirls aside into parentheses, though the intenser note of 2 Tim. seems to indicate a recent experience.

(*c*) Many words of these Epistles, while occurring occasionally in the Pauline letters, are more frequent in Luke and Acts,† *e.g.* *ἁμαρτωλός*, *ἀναλαμβάνειν*, *ἀποδοχή* (*ἀποδέχεσθαι*), *διαμαρτύρεσθαι*, *ἐπαίρειν*, *ἐπέχειν*, *ἐπισκοπή*, *ὅσιος* (Hebrews, not in Paul), *παρατιθέναι*, *παρέχειν*, *συνείδησις ἀγαθή* (in Paul *συνείδησις* absolutely), *χήρα*.

(*d*) Many other words are found elsewhere in the NT only or mainly in Luke and Acts, or occasionally in non-Pauline books, *e.g.* *ἄνοια*, *ἀχάριστος*, *βίος*, *βυθίζειν*, *δρόμος*, *δυνάστης*, *ἐξαρτίζειν*, *ἐπιμελεῖσθαι*, *ἐπίστασθαι*, *ἐπιφαίνειν*, *εὐεργεσία*, *εὐσέβεια*, *ζήτησις*, *ζωγρεῖν*, *ζωογονεῖν*, *κακοῦργος*, *λείπειν*, *μελετᾶν*, *μεταλαμβάνειν*, *νεώτερος*, *νομικός*, *νομοδιδάσκαλος*, *παρακολουθεῖν*, *περίεργος*, *περιιστάναι*, *περιποιεῖσθαι*, *πρεσβυτέριον*, *προδότης*, *προπετής*, *προσέχειν*, *προσμένειν* (cf. Ac 11^{23} with 1 Ti 1^3), *σωματικός*, *ὑγιαίνειν*, *φιλανθρωπία*, *φιλάργυρος*.

Further parallels with Lucan language are the use of *πνεῦμα*, 2 Ti 1^7 (found also in Ro 8^{15}), Lk 8^{55} 13^{11}, Ac 6^{10} 7^{59} 17^{16}; *ὅστις*, relative of indefinite reference (1 Ti 3^{15}, Lk 8^{26}); *ἐπὶ πλεῖον* (2 Ti 2^{16} 3^9, Ac 4^{17} $20^{9\text{f.}}$ 24^4); *ἐν* with *γίγνεσθαι* (1 Ti 2^{14}, 2 Ti 1^{17}, Ac 13^5 22^{17}); *ἐν* with *εἶναι*, a rare construction (1 Ti 4^{15}, Lk 2^{49}).

(*e*) Other words are common with Hebrews, *e.g.* *ἀφιλάργυρος*, *βέβηλος*, *γυμνάζειν* (except once in 2 Pet.), *ἐκτρέπεσθαι*, *ὀρέγεσθαι*.

10. Situation of Paul as given in these Epistles.—Attempts have been made to find a place for these Epistles within the record of the life of Paul as it is given in the Book of Acts, but without success; and, if they are from his hand, they must be assigned to a later period, after his acquittal at the trial impending at the close of Acts. That he was acquitted seems probable to the present writer, but this solution of the question does not necessarily carry with it the authenticity of the Pastorals. 2 Timothy alone affords chronological data. Paul is now a prisoner in Rome. Active profession of Christianity brings one into a danger-zone. Suffering accompanies service—not that it is the acute result of systematic persecution, though in 2 Timothy this hovers on the horizon (2^3)—and it has been sufficiently severe to cause wholesale defections in Asia and in Rome (1^{15} 4^{16-18}), and to check the energy of a timid heart ($1^{7.8}$). The author compares Timothy's sufferings with his own in Antioch, Iconium, and Lystra ($3^{10.11}$). It is, however, not hazardous for Timothy and Titus to visit Paul at Rome, good friends like Onesiphorus, who had helped him in Ephesus, having apparently of late sought out the Apostle there ($1^{16.17}$), which might imply that he was in concealment, though 4^{21} shows that he kept in touch with the Christians of the city, even if, as may be inferred from $4^{10.\,11}$, the Apostle had his own small intimate circle apart from the larger church of Rome. It is for Ephesus and its environment, the churches of his earlier years, that he is most anxious, as the signs point to a gathering storm (2^{16} $3^{1ff.}$). When Paul wrote Philippians and Colossians he was expecting an immediate and favourable decision of his case, and, if this was the result, during the interval that elapsed between Philippians and 2 Timothy he paid a visit to Ephesus, possibly also to Crete (Tit 1^{5}). When he wrote Philippians and Colossians, he had with him Timothy (whom he hopes to send to Philippi, and in fact he may have sent him away before the close of the first trial), apparently Epaphroditus, Tychicus (who with Onesimus has just been sent to Colossæ), Aristarchus a fellow-prisoner, Mark (who is soon to go to Colossæ), Justus, Epaphras, Luke, and Demas. At the time of 2 Timothy, Demas has forsaken Paul and gone to Thessalonica, perhaps on worldly business, and Luke only is with him. He asks Timothy to bring Mark, which he has made possible by sending Tychicus to Ephesus. He seems to have been in prison for some time, and ‘the first defence’ most likely refers to a preliminary trial which involved danger to his disciples. Alexander the coppersmith, who may have led in the great defection from the Apostle (2 Ti 1^{15}), possibly the same person as Alexander the Jew of Ac 19, may have followed him to Rome and brought against him some specious charge, which told powerfully before the Imperial court, now suspicious of the new sect, which was evidently different from and hated by Judaism. Apparently Paul is sending Timothy late news about Ephesus, whither he may be about to come, possibly from Macedonia, or, as Zahn suggests, from his old home in Lystra, where he may have been when Paul was last in Ephesus. The natural inference is that Erastus remained behind in his own home at Corinth when Paul came on to Rome, and that Trophimus had been left not long before at Miletus (2 Ti 4^{20}). This Trophimus, an Ephesian, had been a fellow-worker with Timothy before and was evidently known to Luke (Ac 20^{4} 21^{29}).

---

* Most of these, Wendland thinks, belong to the literary stratum of the *Koine*, and the influence of the LXX is small (*op. cit.*, p. 364, note 5).

† The language of Luke and Acts also has more affinities with the literary *Koine* than that of any book of the NT but Hebrews.

11. Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles.—Of all the letters which profess to have come from the apostle Paul these are the most disputed. A formidable account is laid against them, to wit—(*a*) the false doctrine which is said to be Gnostic teaching of the end of the 1st cent.; (*b*) the emphasis placed upon the Church, its organization and worship, in which are traced the beginnings of the monarchical episcopate, a clergy in due succession from the apostles with a higher standard of morality than the laity, liturgical forms and creeds; (*c*) fundamental changes from earlier Pauline doctrine both in emphasis and in conception—orthodoxy having supplanted faith, some indeed discovering the germ of the doctrine ‘quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus’; good works as the outcome of moralism having taken the place of the fruit of the Spirit; justification by faith being no longer vital as against legalism; and the eschatology of the earlier days having lost its vividness; (*d*) a marked change of language and style, the original language coined by Paul for the expression of the facts of salvation having been displaced to a great extent by terms drawn from the current Jewish-Hellenistic religious terminology, and the old vigour having yielded to smooth or loose commonplace; (*e*) the fact that Paul, speaking in old age, addresses Timothy as though he were not yet a fully matured man; (*f*) the extreme difficulty of finding a place for these letters in the recorded life of Paul. As a result, many scholars suppose that they were written about the end of the 1st century.[*]

It has, however, been shown that the false doctrine of these letters is most easily explained as the result of tendencies both Jewish and pagan which were at work towards the end of Paul's life, and that it does not distinctively resemble what is called ‘Gnosticism,’ such as was prevalent at the end of the 1st century. The ecclesiastical order is not unlike that found in Philippians and Acts; there is no evidence of a clergy practising a higher morality and enjoying a distinctive privilege by transmission from the apostles. The view of the Church itself also and of its sacraments is very similar to that which is found in 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, and Acts. The Epistles, therefore, fit a period quite as early as Acts, and do not inherently need to be put later than A.D. 70 or 80.

There is, however, as we have seen, much force in the arguments urged against their authenticity which are drawn from the changes in the emphasis and formulation of doctrine, as well as from the remarkable differences between the early Pauline Epistles and these in style and language. Perhaps also the attitude of an old man to a youth assumed by Paul to Timothy, especially in the First Epistle, is somewhat artificial, though it may be justified by the Apostle's relation to him as given in 1 Co 4^{17} $16^{10.\,11}$, Ph $2^{20\text{-}22}$. These difficulties are most obvious in 1 Tim., less so in Tit., and many of them disappear from 2 Timothy. As has been already remarked, if 2 Tim. had stood alone, its authenticity would probably not have been questioned.

Attempts have been made to discover Pauline fragments in these Epistles, but without much success, *e.g.* a genuine letter written towards the close of the Roman captivity, in 2 Ti $1^{3\text{-}5.\,7f.\,15\text{-}18}$ $4^{6\text{-}19.\,21\text{-}22}$ and in Tit $1^{1.\,4}$ $3^{12\text{-}15}$ (see especially Moffatt, *LNT*, p. 403 f.); but, as Jülicher remarks, ‘the impression of unity given by the whole, especially of the close connexion originally existing between all the parts referring to the discipline of the Church, outweighs arguments in favour of division of material among several authors’ (*Introd. to the NT*, Eng. tr., p. 199). There seem to be, however, in 1 Tim. and possibly in Tit. some interpolated passages (see under § 2).

The remarkable similarities in language and ideas, religious and ecclesiastical, that exist between these Epistles and the writings of Luke, combined with their Pauline substance, may be best explained by supposing that Luke had a large share in their composition. He was alone with Paul at the time of his approaching death, and may have composed the ‘second’ Epistle to Timothy in such circumstances during the imprisonment of Paul that it was a reproduction of his ideas and even of his language rather than the work of an amanuensis. In that case, it may be called Pauline. It was almost certainly the earliest of the three.

Some years after the Apostle's death Luke, or one of his circle, may have put together, from his notes or reminiscences and from Pauline material, the first letter to Timothy and that to Titus almost simultaneously. His purpose in doing so was to strengthen the authority of Timothy and Titus in the face of a widespread and increasing invasion of the error referred to in 2 Tim., which was undermining the churches of Ephesus and Crete. Such a theory would account for most of the features of these Epistles, as, *e.g.*, the disorder and lack of logical development of themes in 1 Tim., which may be due to a substratum of refractory materials. If Luke had written a free composition, it would have been a better literary product.

---

[*] ‘The Pastorals sprang from the need of fixing in literary form the church ordinances which had grown up spontaneously and organically and thereby setting forth fixed statutes for the individual life of the church. The attempt is made to bring these rules under the authority of St. Paul and so to provide them with a more general validity’ (Wendland, *op. cit.*, p. 365).

LITERATURE.—(1) Commentaries: J. H. Bernard, *Cambridge Greek Testament*, 'The Pastoral Epistles,' Cambridge, 1899; N. J. D. White, in *EGT* iv. [London, 1910]; B. Weiss, *Die Briefe Pauli an Timotheus und Titus*^{7} [H. A. W. Meyer, *Kommentar*, xi.], Göttingen, 1902; H. v. Soden, in *Handkommentar zum NT*, iii.^{2} [Freiburg, 1911]; F. Köhler, in *Die Schriften des NT* [Göttingen, 1908]; G. Wohlenberg, in T. Zahn's *Kommentar*, xiii.^{2} [Leipzig, 1911]; M. Dibelius, in H. Lietzmann's *Handbuch zum NT* [Tübingen, 1913].

(2) Introduction: In addition to treatment in above Commentaries, see H. J. Holtzmann, *Einleitung in das NT*^{2}, Freiburg, 1886; C. v. Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age*^{2}, Eng. tr., London, 1897–99; A. Sabatier, *The Apostle Paul*, do., 1891, Essay by G. G. Findlay, p. 343 ff.; F. J. A. Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, Cambridge, 1894, and *The Christian Ecclesia*, do., 1897; T. M. Lindsay, *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries*, do., 1902; A. Harnack, *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur*, i. [Leipzig, 1897]; A. Jülicher, *An Introduction to the NT*, Eng. tr., London, 1904; W. Lock, in *HDB* iv. *s.vv.*; T. Zahn, *Introduction to the NT*^{3}, Eng. tr., 3 vols., Edinburgh, 1909; J. Moffatt, *The Historical NT*^{2}, do., 1901, *LNT*, do., 1911; W. M. Ramsay, in *Exp*, 7th ser., viii. [1909], ix. [1910], 8th ser., i. [1911]; P. Wendland, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur und die urchristlichen Literaturformen*^{3}, Tübingen, 1912.

R. A. FALCONER.

TITHES (δέκαται).—It is admitted universally that the payment of tithes, or the tenths of possessions, for sacred purposes did not find a place within the Christian Church during the age covered by the apostles and their immediate successors. In the Hebrew religious community tithes possessed a two-fold character. They were either a charitable and regularly recurring contribution placed at the disposal of the humbler Levites and other poor or a yearly impost designed for the upkeep of the central house of worship and of the ministering priests (see W. Robertson Smith, *OTJC*^{2}, London, 1892, pp. 383 n., 446 f.; see also *RS*^{2}, Edinburgh, 1894, pp. 246–253).

Those who maintain that tithes are due *de jure divino* to the Church give as the reason for their non-existence in the Apostolic Age that the conditions of the infant Church in the initial stages of its growth raised insuperable difficulties against the practice of such systematic payments during that period (see Bingham, *Antiquities*, v. v. 1 ff. [*Works*, Oxford, 1855, vol. ii. p. 176 ff.]). As soon as the condition of the Church permitted, it is contended, the payment of tithes began as a duty obligatory on all individual Christians. Not only, however, is there no evidence of the truth of this contention, but such testimony as we possess from the pages of the NT goes to disprove it. Not that the duty of Christian giving was not recognized as binding, or that the discharge of that duty was considered outside of, or an unspiritual encroachment upon, the region of Christian ethics. On the contrary, as we shall see, it occupied an extremely important part in apostolic instruction and ideals. Its reason and purpose are raised to a loftier plane than they had ever occupied, and translated into language of the profoundest moral and spiritual content. 'The perfect law, the law of liberty' (Ja 1^{25}), reigns here as it does elsewhere (Gal 5$^{1. 13}$, 1 P 2^{16}, Jn 8^{32}, etc.), and the Christian's joyous liberality, like his other graces, may be characterized from the teaching of the NT as the expression of the individual's consciousness of his love of, and moral obligation to, his brethren.

The social and economic conditions of the early Church in Jerusalem demanded extraordinary efforts on the part of its wealthier members. Whatever be the source of the narrative embodying the history of the attempt to establish the life of that body on a communistic basis, there can be no doubt that it is in harmony with what we understand from other sources (see art. COLLECTION) to be the state of extreme poverty in which the humbler Christians of Jerusalem were sunk. The attempt to relieve this prevailing distress was essentially voluntary, as the questions said to have been addressed by St. Peter to Ananias testify: 'Whiles it remained, did it not remain thine own? And after it was sold, was it not in thy power?' (Ac 5^{4}). Nor is it otherwise with the Antiochian Church, which organized a relief fund for the Jewish Christians some years later; 'every man according to his ability' (Ac 11^{29}) contributed, and we have no reason to believe that their giving was not free and spontaneous (ὥρισαν). In reminding the Ephesian elders, gathered at Miletus, of his own example, St. Paul emphasizes (note the words κοπιῶντας δεῖ) the duty of the follower of 'the Lord Jesus' by the quotation, 'It is more blessed to give than to receive' (Ac 20^{35}). His exhortation 'to help the weak' (cf. 1 Th 5^{14}) includes in its scope that charitable disposition of our wealth, whether it be 'silver, or gold, or apparel' (Ac 20^{33}), which will meet the needs of poverty or misfortune. In formulating his scheme for the collection of funds for the poor 'saints' of Jerusalem, he laid down the rule for the guidance of the Corinthian Christians: 'upon the first day of the week let each one of you lay by him in store, as he may prosper' (1 Co 16^{2}); and his enthusiastic praise of the Macedonian Churches for their earnest and liberal response to his appeal he justifies by the circumstances in which their single-minded generosity (τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς ἁπλότητος αὐτῶν, 2 Co 8^{2}) displayed itself. These attached supporters of the Apostle gave joyously (ἡ περισσεία τῆς χαρᾶς αὐτῶν) in a time of sore trial (ἐν πολλῇ δοκιμῇ θλίψεως; cf. 1 Th 1^{6} 2^{14}), and from their own deep poverty (ἡ κατὰ βάθους πτωχεία αὐτῶν). We are reminded of Jesus' words in praise of the widow's giving 'all the living that she had' (πάντα τὸν βίον, Lk 21^{4}; cf. παρὰ δύναμιν, 2 Co 8^{3}).

Not only did the Christians of Macedonia give of their own accord (αὐθαίρετοι), but they were even clamorous to be permitted to share in the work which lay so near to the Apostle's heart. His profound joy is intensified by the fact that he is able to recognize in their generosity the outcome of their previous complete self-surrender to the cause and Person of the Lord (note the emphatic phrase, ἑαυτοὺς ἔδωκαν πρῶτον τῷ κυρίῳ of 2 Co 8^{5}). Even in writing to the church in Rome, which he had not at the time visited, he is careful to remind his readers that the duty of giving to their poorer brethren is fundamental to the outward expression of a true Christian faith (Ro 12^{13}; cf. 15^{27}); and, if we accept the Epistle to the Ephesians as St. Paul's, he makes this duty a grace to be anxiously sought and laboured for (note the ἵνα in Eph 4^{28}). This teaching was, indeed, not peculiar to the Apostle of the Gentiles. Liberality to the needy is the infallible test of the genuineness of Christian love (1 Jn 3^{17}) and of a living faith (Ja 2$^{15f.}$). It is a sacrifice evoking a Divine response to him who offers it (He 13^{16}) and constitutes the foundation stone upon which to build that perfect character which alone can appropriate for itself (ἐπιλάβωνται; cf. Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, London, 1889, p. 54 f.) 'the life which is life indeed' (1 Ti 6^{19}).

In all the cases referred to, the essential freedom of Christian action is implied. There is no legal code formulated for the guidance of those whose love of the brethren is thus tested (οὐ κατ' ἐπιταγὴν λέγω, 2 Co 8^{8}). On the contrary, each one has the choice and determination as to his attitude (ἕκαστος καθὼς προήρηται τῇ καρδίᾳ, 2 Co 9^{7}). There is no external compulsion (ἐξ ἀνάγκης) to detract from the joy, or to set a mechanical boundary to the inclination, of the Christian's giving to the poor. We thus recognize the truth of Irenæus' words: 'Whilst they [the Jews] used to hold the tithes of their property as consecrated, they, on the other hand, who have grasped freedom, dedicate to the use of the Lord all things which they possess, giving joyfully and freely in greater abundance, because they have a greater hope' (*Hær.* iv. 34).

The other purpose for which tithes were paid was the maintenance of the Temple services and of the attendant priests and Levites. Now there can be no doubt that the apostles and those who spent themselves in the propagation of the gospel from the first considered it their due to be supported by the gifts and contributions of their followers and converts. The aphorisms, 'The labourer is worthy of his hire' (cf. Mt 10^{10}), 'Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn' (1 Co 9^{9}, 1 Ti 5^{18}), are quoted as applicable to the Christian missionary and his work. The fact that St. Paul so emphatically refused to accept any monetary aid from the Corinthian church (see Ac 18^{3} [cf. 20^{33}], 2 Co 11^{7-10}, 1 Co 9^{18}) makes all the stronger the words in which he asserts and presses the just rights of all the Christian teachers 'to live out of the gospel' (*ἐκ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ζῆν*, 1 Co 9^{14}). The Apostle is insistent that he is forgoing with purpose his most elementary right in maintaining his financial independence. The scathing irony of his question, 'Did I commit a sin in debasing myself [by working for his daily bread] in order you might be raised up?' is followed by the startling emphasis of his expressions (note the collocation *δωρεὰν τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγέλιον*, and his use of the military terms *ἐσύλησα, ὀψώνιον*, 2 Co $11^{7f.}$; cf. 1 Co 9^{7}). He had accepted his 'wages' from others in order that they might have his labours free of charge (*δωρεάν*). The force of his claim as a teacher is strengthened by his determination to act as he thought best, and refuse what he had a perfectly well recognized right to and what his detractors were in the habit of receiving. If the Corinthians chose to make his refusal a handle to accuse him of conscious charlatanry, he vehemently avers that what he did he did out of pure love for them (see the questions *διὰ τί; ὅτι οὐκ ἀγαπῶ ὑμᾶς*; and the solemn assertion *ὁ θεὸς οἶδεν*, 2 Co 11^{11}) and for their benefit (*ἐν παντὶ ἀβαρῆ ἐμαυτὸν ὑμῖν ἐτήρησα*, 2 Co 11^{9}). Whatever may have been the original reason for this line of conduct on the part of the Apostle, we know that he solemnly reminded other churches of his own foundation that the recognition of this obligation to their spiritual teachers was an essential feature of true discipleship (*μὴ πλανᾶσθε, θεὸς οὐ μυκτηρίζεται*, Gal 6^{7}), and his touching gratitude to the Philippians for their loyal and repeated support when he was in want (Ph $4^{14ff.}$) is sufficient proof that he was willing to accept what was due to him (*πλὴν καλῶς ἐποιήσατε*) not only for his own sake but still more for theirs (*ἐπιζητῶ τὸν καρπὸν τὸν πλεονάζοντα εἰς λόγον ὑμῶν*, 4^{17}). Not only is the general principle of maintaining the clergy a decided feature of the early Apostolic Church, but towards the close of the period we have evidence that there were gradations in the payment given, proportionate to the value of the work accomplished (*οἱ καλῶς προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι διπλῆς τιμῆς ἀξιούσθωσαν*, 1 Ti 5^{17})—a not unexpected development of the old law, 'the labourer is worthy of his hire' (Lk 10^{7}).

In all this there is no evidence of a giving which is not free and spontaneous and which has not a moral and spiritual basis. No allusion is made to the necessity for the continuance of the Mosaic law of tithes. This is all the more remarkable as we have in St. Paul's case a distinct reference to the parallel between the Levitical priesthood and the Christian ministry in this respect (1 Co 9^{13})—a parallel which is involved, consciously or otherwise, in the ordinance of Jesus (*ὁ κύριος*) that His missionaries were to be supported by the objects of their labours.

The relation between tithes and Christian giving may be apprehended as that between the law and the gospel as incentives and forces in life. It is the relation between a legal enactment which enforces by objective sanctions and a spiritual ideal which draws out all that is best and highest from those who recognize the significance of the blessedness of self-sacrifice for the sake of others.

Literature.—A. Plummer, *ICC*, '2 Corinthians,' Edinburgh, 1915; A. Robertson and A. Plummer, *ib.*, '1 Corinthians,' do., 1911; Foulke Robartes, *The Revenue of the Gospel is Tythes*, Cambridge, 1613; G. Carleton, *Tithes Examined and Proved to bee Due to the Clergie by a Divine Right*^{2}, London, 1611; J. Selden, *History of Tythes*, do., 1618.

J. R. Willis.

TITUS.—Titus, one of the apostle Paul's chief lieutenants, was a Greek, born probably in Antioch or its neighbourhood, and converted to Christianity perhaps by the Apostle himself (Tit 1^{4}). He was among the earliest Gentile leaders in the Christian Church, and it has been suggested, not without plausibility, that the question of Gentile circumcision was first raised when he, along with others, was brought into the Church. In any case, Paul chose Titus to go with him to Jerusalem in order that the question might be decided by the apostles on appeal to a concrete case. Titus was almost certainly not circumcised (Gal 2^{5}).

Henceforth he is a leader under Paul in work which made him well known to the churches of Galatia (2^{1}). When affairs had reached a dangerous climax in the church of Corinth during Paul's sojourn in Ephesus, Timothy was first dispatched by the Apostle to restore peace; but he failed, and Titus was then sent. Paul was confronted with a revolt of one of his important churches, the seriousness of which may be estimated by the tension of the Apostle as he awaited news of the mission of Titus (2 Co 2^{13} $7^{5.6}$). Titus was quite successful: the rebellious element was suppressed. As a result of his service, there sprang up between Titus and that church a deep affection, and he championed them in the matter of their liberality towards 'the saints' at Jerusalem, claiming that they would not be behind Paul's favourite churches of Macedonia (2 Co $8^{6.16-19}$).

Titus was evidently a man of stronger character than Timothy, and may have been sent further afield on more independent missions; but nothing is known of his later activity apart from the Epistle addressed to him by St. Paul. It may be reasonably assumed that historical material lies embedded in this letter; and, if so, Titus continued to be Paul's 'partner and fellow-helper' (2 Co 8^{23}) until the end of his life, and retained his confidence as one who was able to carry out difficult tasks to the Apostle's liking (Tit 1^{5}). Crete, to which Paul took Titus, must have been in itself one of the hardest fields to evangelize ($1^{12.13}$), and the appearance of the false teachers, who seem to have gained a foothold after Paul left, made a strong hand all the more necessary. These teachers were men 'of the circumcision' ($1^{10.14}$), who possibly made use of the fact that Titus was an uncircumcised Greek to undermine his authority. Paul does not fear, as he does in the case of Timothy, that Titus will yield to pressure; but he may have dreaded that, not being a Jew, he would pay too much heed to the prestige of Judaism, and attach a fictitious importance to these Jewish teachers and their fables (1^{10-16} 3^{9}). He, therefore, bids him make short work of unruly men and exercise his own authority (2^{15} 3^{10}). His position in Crete is similar to that of Timothy in the churches of Ephesus—a representative of the Apostle holding a local commission. His function is that of an apostle, such as we find it in the Epistles, and cannot be identified with that of the monarchical bishop.

Paul at the end of his life's work turns towards his disciple, though no reason is given in Tit 3^{12}; but, as the churches of Crete need a present director, he promises to send Artemas or Tychicus to relieve Titus and permit him to join the Apostle in Nicopolis.

Jülicher thinks that Titus may have been the first Greek missionary to Crete and Dalmatia (*PRE*³ xix. 800). No reliance is to be put upon the later ecclesiastical tradition, which, working upon the Epistle, calls him the first bishop of Crete (Eus. *HE* III. iv. 6).

LITERATURE.—See under TIMOTHY AND TITUS, EPISTLES TO; A. Jülicher, art. 'Titus,' in *PRE*³ xix. 798–800.

R. A. FALCONER.

TITUS (Emperor).—Titus, who was officially styled sometimes Imperator Titus Cæsar Vespasianus Augustus, sometimes Imperator Titus Vespasianus Cæsar Augustus, was originally named Titus Flavius Vespasianus. He was the son of a man of the same name, the Emperor Vespasian (see under VESPASIAN), and of Domitilla, and was born at Rome on 30th December, A.D. 39. Titus was brought up and taught along with Britannicus, son of the Emperor Claudius (*q.v.*), at the Court of the latter. He was early distinguished for bodily strength and manly beauty, and was accomplished not only in boxing and riding, but also in oratory, music, and verse composition. He gained his first military experience as *tribunus militum* (colonel) in Germany and Britain, and served with distinction. Afterwards he followed the usual career in the law courts, and at the same period married Arrecina Tertulla, daughter of the knight M. Arrecinus Clemens, who had been prefect of the prætorian cohorts under Caligula. After her death he married Marcia Furnilla, a lady of high birth, who bore him a daughter Julia and was later divorced by him. Titus was quæstor about the year 65, and in the beginning of 67 he was in command of a legion. From that time till the middle of 68 he assisted his father in the conduct of the Jewish War. He began the work by bringing the fifteenth legion (Apollinaris) from Alexandria to Judæa in a very short time, considering that it was winter, and successfully besieged Jaffa and Jotapata. Later he retired to Ptolemais, then to Cæsarea on the coast, and afterwards to Cæsarea Philippi, Scythopolis, and Tiberias. He gallantly besieged Tarichea, Gamala, and Gischala. In fact, all through the war his determined and skilled generalship was indispensable to his father. In quick succession Gadara, Peræa, western Judæa, Idumæa, and the neighbourhood of Jericho were besieged by the Romans. Afterwards the attack on Jerusalem was prepared. In the troublous period following the death of Nero, Titus played an important part. He has the chief credit of the reconciliation of Mucian, governor of the province Syria, and Vespasian. Titus was also adopted by the old king Agrippa, and both visited Achaia in the winter of 68–69. The attitude of these powerful men in the East towards the kaleidoscopic changes in the West was complicated by the long delay in the arrival of news. The news of the death of Galba (15th Jan. 69) and the arming of Vitellius led Titus to hope that he would succeed his father, and he returned by Asia Minor, Rhodes, and Cyprus to Syria. Already the attractions of the Jewish princess Berenice had begun to influence him. Meanwhile Vespasian and Mucian had got the Jewish and Syrian army to swear allegiance to Otho. However, on the news of Vitellius' success against Otho, the soldiers forced Vespasian to undertake the Empire. There is no doubt that the popularity of Titus helped them to this decision, and later Titus accompanied Vespasian to Alexandria to strengthen his position there. In the year 70 Titus was commander-in-chief, in which year also he held his first consulship, along with Vespasian. The details of the final attack on Jerusalem and of the preliminaries to it are well known from the pages of Josephus, *BJ* v. and vi. This author had for some time been on friendly terms with Titus. The siege was one of the most stubborn in history, but the Jews were eventually defeated. Return home by sea was impossible during the winter, and Titus went from Cæsarea Philippi to Cæsarea Stratonis, then to Berytos. His visit to other Syrian cities was made all the more pleasant by the report of the splendid reception which his father had received in Italy. By Syrian Antioch he went to Zeugma on the Euphrates, where he received an embassy from the Parthian king. From Zeugma he returned, probably *via* Tarsus, to Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria (reached probably in May 71). After sending the fifth and fifteenth legions back to their former garrisons and selecting 700 captives for his triumph, he took the usual route by sea from Alexandria past Rhegium to Puteoli (see ROADS AND TRAVEL), and thence to Rome. The joint triumph of Vespasian and Titus took place probably in June, the month of his arrival. Some of the most conspicuous objects in the triumphal procession are represented on the reliefs of the still existing Arch of Titus in the Forum at Rome (see art. ROME).

There had been originally a question among the soldiers in the East whether Vespasian or Titus should be made Emperor. Their decision was for Vespasian, with the full understanding that Titus should succeed his father. Titus' military success, with the plunder thence accruing, made him popular with the soldiers, but he remained on the best of terms with his father. Already in 69 both Titus and Domitian received Imperial titles from their father, and early in Vespasian's reign, in 71, Titus was recognized as co-emperor. It is not necessary to follow here the details of his official career and the titles he held in the course of that part of it which lies within his father's period as *princeps*. In 79 Titus crushed a conspiracy against his father by putting the ringleader Alienus, a friend of his own, to death. The Jewish queen Berenice had come to Rome with her brother Agrippa in 75. Titus' fondness for her, though she was thirteen years his senior (see BERENICE), was notorious; but the Romans had still much of the same strong feeling against close association between their rulers and foreign women that they had shown in the days of Julius Cæsar and Cleopatra, and Titus felt compelled to dismiss her.

At the commencement of his reign anticipations were not pleasant. For he had shortly before shown signs of tyranny as well as of licentiousness. It is highly probable that disease had already begun its work on him. Vespasian having died on 24th June 79, Titus was thirty-nine years old when his sole rule as Emperor began. At once he named his brother Domitian his partner and successor; but this did not imply the double rule of two equals, as Domitian seemed to expect it would. He gave an unanticipated impression of mildness, and seems in every way to have realized his responsibility and reformed his previous manner of life. The great Stoic philosopher, Musonius Rufus, whose fragmentary writings (ed. O. Hense, Leipzig, 1905) preach the noblest ethics of classical antiquity, was recalled to Rome, though Vespasian had banished him. Agricola's success in Britain continued (see under VESPASIAN). It was in this reign that the great eruption of Vesuvius took place, on 24th August 79. Herculaneum (better form Herculanum), Pompeii, and Stabiæ were overwhelmed (see Herrlich, in *Klio*, iv. [1904] 209 ff.). Titus journeyed to Campania and remained there till next year, doing all that he could to help. His action provides an ancient counterpart to the services of King Victor Emmanuel on the occasions of the earthquakes of Messina and Avezzano. The great aqueduct, Aqua Marcia, which had fallen into ruins, was repaired, and the Roman supply of pure water thus notably increased (cf. Statius, *Silvæ*, I. v. 26 ff.). Titus also superintended road-building in Italy, Dalmatia, and Numidia, as inscriptions prove. In the year 80, during the absence of Titus in Campania above referred to, a great part of Rome was destroyed by fire. A considerable number of the most splendid buildings were destroyed in the conflagration. Large sums were put at the disposal of the Emperor by private persons, princes, and towns, to enable him to restore them. He did not hesitate to furnish some of them from the Imperial palaces. A pestilence having broken out in Rome, the Emperor was as instant in help as he continued to be in face of the distress in Campania. Amidst great festivities the wonderful amphitheatre, which we know as the Colosseum (see art. ROME), was dedicated, along with public hot baths. The combats of wild beasts and gladiators, the mimic naval battles, and the exhibition of gifts lasted one hundred days. To this year belong also various improvements to roads in Italy, Spain, Galatia, and Lycia. Agricola acquired additional territory for Rome in Britain. In the same year in the East a false Nero appeared, and obtained considerable support for a time. The impostor was in reality a certain Terentius Maximus, a native of the province Asia, who was like Nero in appearance. To this episode there may be a reference in Rev 13[3]. In the year 81 we learn of further repairs to aqueducts in Italy, and of new roads in Cyprus. The Emperor's health had begun to fail seriously in the preceding year. The ancient authorities mention an attack of fever. Domitian, it was rumoured, had poisoned him, or at least had hindered his recovery from illness by neglecting the orders of the physician. Certainly Domitian left Titus' bedside in the Sabine land for Rome before the end, which took place on 13th September in the forty-second year of his age, after a reign of two years, two months, and twenty days.

LITERATURE.—The ancient authorities are: Josephus, *BJ*, bks. iii.–vii.; Tacitus, *Histories*, bks. i.–v.; Xiphilinus' epitome of Dio Cassius, bks. lxv. and lxvi.; Suetonius, *Titus*; Sextus Aurelius Victor, *de Cæsaribus Liber*; numerous inscriptions collected to 1901 in H. C. Newton, *The Epigraphical Evidence for the Reigns of Vespasian and Titus* (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, xvi., 'Coins'), Ithaca, N.Y., 1901.

Modern works: K. Weynand, in Pauly-Wissowa, vi. 2695 ff.; H. Dessau, in *Prosopographia Imperii Romani*, Berlin, 1897, ii. 79 (no. 264); M. Beule, *Titus und seine Dynastie*, ed. E. Doehler, Halle, 1875; also the relevant parts of the following histories: V. Duruy, *History of Rome*, Eng. tr., 6 vols., London, 1883–86; J. B. Bury, *Student's History of the Roman Empire*, do., 1893; H. Schiller, *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*, i. [Gotha, 1883] 518 ff.; A. von Domaszewski, *Geschichte der römischen Kaiser*, ii. [Leipzig, 1909] 155 ff.

A. SOUTER.

TITUS, EPISTLE TO.—See TIMOTHY AND TITUS, EPISTLES TO.

TITUS JUSTUS (so in the MSS ℵE.; B reads 'Titius Justus' as do the Vulgate and the Memphitic Versions).—The name is mentioned only once in the NT, Ac 18[7]. He was a Gentile who had been brought under the influence of the Jewish synagogue in Corinth. As a proselyte, he heard St. Paul preach there. Evidently he was favourably impressed; and, when the opposition of the Jews drove St. Paul 'to the Gentiles,' Titus offered him the use of his house (which was practically next door to the synagogue) as a meeting-place. It is extremely likely that he became a convert to Christianity. Attempts have been made to identify him with several people, as, *e.g.*, with Titus (the recipient of St. Paul's Epistle), and—by W. M. Ramsay, on much better grounds—with Gaius. Gaius was an early convert in Corinth (1 Co 1[14]); and St. Paul refers to him in Ro 16[23] as 'my host and of the whole church,' which might mean the person in whose house the church met. But no identification can be established.

A. C. Headlam describes Titus Justus as 'evidently a Roman or a Latin, one of the *coloni* of the colony Corinth' (*HDB* ii. 829[b])—*i.e.* a descendant of the colonists 'established there in B.C. 46, who would on the whole constitute a sort of local aristocracy' (W. M. Ramsay, *ib.* i. 481[a]). Evidently his social position was good; and probably St. Paul accepted the offer of his house not because it was so near the synagogue as to be a rival meeting-house, but because it afforded the Apostle access to the more educated classes of the Corinthian population. Although St. Paul used an exasperating gesture when he broke with the Jews in the synagogue, there is no need to charge him with being deliberately non-conciliatory. But the opportunity of preaching in the house of such a citizen as Titus Justus overbore all other considerations. Codex Bezæ describes St. Paul as leaving the house of Aquila to lodge with Titus; but this is due to the reviser's misunderstanding of the text.

LITERATURE.—A. C. Headlam, art. 'Justus' in *HDB* ii. 829[b]; W. M. Ramsay, art. 'Corinth,' *ib.* i. 481–482; W. Lock, art. 'Titus,' *ib.* iv. 782[a]; W. M. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, London, 1893, p. 158, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, do., 1895, pp. 256–257; *Exp*, 8th ser., i. [1911] 341, v. [1913] 354 n.; *EGT*, '1 Corinthians,' do., 1900, p. 730; C. von Weizsäcker, *The Apostolic Age*, Eng. tr., i.[2], do., 1897, pp. 308–309.

J. E. ROBERTS.

TOKEN.—This word occurs three times in the Pauline Epistles, and nowhere else in the EVV of the apostolic writings. The passages are 2 Th 1[5], Ph 1[28], 2 Th 3[17], AV and RV giving identical renderings in each. In 2 Th 1[5] the Greek ἔνδειγμα is translated by 'manifest token'; in Ph 1[28] ἔνδειξις is translated by 'evident token'; in 2 Th 3[17] 'token' renders σημεῖον. The two first passages may conveniently be taken together, both because of their general resemblance and because the two Greek words which 'token' represents are closely related. In 2 Th 3[17] it represents a different word, occurring in a totally different context.

1. In 2 Th 1[5], St. Paul, speaking for himself and his associates, says to the Thessalonians: 'We ourselves glory in you in the churches of God for your patience and faith in all your persecutions and in the afflictions which ye endure; which is a manifest token of the righteous judgement of God.' The word ἔνδειγμα ('manifest token') occurs only here in the Greek Bible; its general significance is 'proof' or 'evidence' (not *exemplum* as the Vulgate, but rather *indicium* as Beza). The interpretation of the passage involves a two-fold question: (*a*) What is meant by 'the righteous judgement of God'? (*b*) What is the 'manifest token' (ἔνδειγμα) of it? The 'righteous judgement' is the future and final judgment referred to in vv.[6-10], based on the principle of compensation laid down by our Lord in Lk 16[25], that the sufferers of this world shall rest hereafter, and the persecutors shall suffer. It is not, however, suffering *per se* that can look forward to this future rest and joy but suffering that comes of faith, and is endured for the Kingdom of God (v.[5]). This suffering, inspired by faith in God and endured with the conviction that He reigns and will ultimately exhibit His 'righteous judgement,' is itself the 'evidence,' the 'manifest token' of the coming of that judgment.

The word ἔνδειγμα as related to ἔνδειξις indicates strictly the concrete *result* in contrast with the *process*. In meaning, however, the two words are practically indistinguishable. This becomes apparent from a consideration of the passage in which the latter word occurs.

2. In Ph 1^{28}, St. Paul bids his converts be 'nothing affrighted by the adversaries: which is for them an evident token (ἔνδειξις) of perdition, but of your salvation, and that from God'; *i.e.* if the Philippians do not waver before the attacks of the adversaries, but maintain their ground, this steadfast attitude in itself will be an 'evident token,' a 'proof' that the adversaries will suffer defeat, while the Philippians will enjoy the Divine salvation. Ἔνδειξις, like ἔνδειγμα, is a Pauline word, and does not occur in the Greek Bible apart from his Epistles. It is an Attic law term and appears to mean, more distinctively, 'proof' that rests on an appeal to facts, as contrasted with mere logical demonstration. 'Token' coupled with the adjectives 'manifest' or 'evident' is an adequate rendering of either ἔνδειγμα or ἔνδειξις.

3. In 2 Th 3^{17}, St. Paul, referring to the concluding salutation written by his own hand, says that it 'is the "token" (σημεῖον) in every epistle.' An exhaustive account of these interesting words would require a general examination of the epistolary methods of the contemporary Græco-Roman world. It must suffice here to say that St. Paul, in accordance with the common practice of his age, probably dictated his Epistles to an amanuensis (cf. Ro 16^{22}), adding a few words at the end, in his own writing, to vouch for the authenticity of the document. These authenticating words might consist of the bare salutation, as in the present passage, or might contain other words in addition (cf. 1 Co 16^{22}, Col 4^{18}, Gal 6$^{11-17}$; Deissmann goes so far as to hold that in 2 Cor. the apostolic autograph begins at 10^{1}). The probability is that the Apostle would authenticate every Epistle by his autograph greeting at the end. In the cases where he calls special attention to the fact (1 Co 16^{21}, Col 4^{18}, and the present passage; cf. too Gal 6^{11}) he may have been anxious to certify the letter, as against any forgeries that might be circulating in his name. The use of the word σημεῖον here, followed by the elucidating οὕτως γράφω (almost like our English 'signed') is closely parallel to the σεσημείωμαι (generally contracted into σεση.) with which many papyri and ostraca close. An alternative method of certifying a letter was to give to the bearer a 'token' (σύμβολον) as proof of his commission (cf. S. Witkowski, *Epistulæ Privatæ*, Leipzig, 1906, no. 25).

LITERATURE.—J. B. Lightfoot, *Notes on Epistles of St. Paul*, London, 1895, p. 135 f.; A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, Eng. tr.^{2}, do., 1911, p. 153; G. Milligan, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians*, do., 1908, Note A, 'St. Paul as a Letter-Writer,' pp. 121–130.

DAWSON WALKER.

TOMB.—See SEPULCHRE.

TONGUE.—Physiologically, the tongue (γλῶσσα) is accessory both to the sense of taste and to the faculty of speech, but in the literature of apostolic Christianity (*e.g.* 1 Co 14^{9}) it is connected with speech alone.[*] Here, as in primitive thought generally, to which the nervous system and the more minute structure of the tissues were unknown, the tongue was thought to possess an inherent faculty of speech, and the ethical qualities attaching to what was said were attributed to the organ itself (ethnic parallels in J. G. Frazer, *GB*^{2}, London, 1900, ii. 421, 422, note). As, in the OT, the tongue is said to concoct deceit (Ps 50^{19}), and iniquity is said to be in it (Job 6^{30}) or under it (Ps 10^{7}), so, in the NT, it is said to defile the whole body, to be a restless evil, full of deadly poison (Ja 3$^{6.8}$). This vivid language is not adequately characterized by saying, with Mayor, 'The tongue is of course merely the innocent instrument employed by the free will of man' (*The Epistle of St. James*^{3}, London, 1910, p. 220). That which seems to us to be 'odd and exaggerated' in the language of St. James really marks the difference between ancient and modern psychology. When joy (Ac 2^{26}, 1 Clem. xviii. 15), arrogance (1 Clem. lvii. 2), deceit (Ro 3^{13}, 1 Clem. xxxv. 8) are connected with the tongue, a psycho-physical idea underlies the usage, which springs from the conception of the organ as an integral part of the whole personality.

Early Christian ethics seems to have found it necessary to emphasize the control of the tongue; it is even made the *sine qua non* of religion (Ja 1^{26}) and the condition of life (1 P 3^{10}, 1 Clem. xxii. 3; cf. Ps 34^{13}). It is particularly urged on women (1 Clem. xxi. 7, Hermas, *Vis.* II. ii. 3). Evidently 'the scourge of the tongue' (1 Clem. lvi. 10; cf. Job 5^{21}) was a very real evil in early Christian communities. We may also note the rebuke of hypocrisy and insincerity, as shown by the contrast between the inner life and its outer expression: 'let us not love in word, neither with the tongue' (1 Jn 3^{18}). On confession itself great emphasis was naturally placed (Ro 14^{11}; see also art. MOUTH); it is felt that the truth of the inner life will instinctively utter itself in the testimony of the spoken word: 'As the fountain gushes out its water, so my heart gushes out the praise of the Lord and my lips utter praise to Him, and my tongue His psalms' (*Odes of Solomon*, xl. 4, 5).

The word 'tongue' occurs in a figurative sense in Ac 2^{3} (tongues of fire; cf. Is 5^{24}) and Rev 5^{9}, etc. (=language). On the phenomena of *glossolalia*, which St. Paul regards chiefly as a sign to unbelievers (1 Co 14$^{21\text{f.}}$), see artt. TONGUES, GIFT OF, and HOLY SPIRIT.

LITERATURE.—The Commentaries; see also artt. MAN and MOUTH.

H. WHEELER ROBINSON.

TONGUES, GIFT OF.—The chief authority in apostolic literature for the gift of speaking with tongues (γλωσσολαλία) is 1 Co 14. What happened on the day of Pentecost is described (Ac 2^{4}) as speaking 'with other tongues' (λαλεῖν ἑτέραις γλώσσαις). The emphasis lies on the distinguishing ἑτέραις. The speakers spoke in languages other than their own: under the stress of spiritual emotion they lapsed into a foreign tongue; it was a special phenomenon peculiar to a special occasion. In Ac 10^{46} 19^{6} the same phenomenon according to some authorities re-appears; but, as the distinguishing ἑτέραις is absent, it is open to us to regard these passages as parallel to 1 Co 14 and as indicating a phenomenon other than the Pentecostal.

What are the chief features of *glossolalia* in the Corinthian church? (1) Like 'prophecy,' 'speaking with tongues' was one of the gifts of the πνευματικοί: it was reckoned among the charisms as an inspiration or endowment originating with the Holy Spirit. (2) It was unintelligible to others (1 Co 14^{2}, 'no man understandeth'). (3) It was personal to the speaker, who edified himself and not the church (v.^{4}). (4) It is described in the case of an individual as γλώσσαις λαλεῖν (v.^{5}) and again in the singular γλώσσῃ (vv.$^{13.27}$) or ἐν γλώσσῃ (v.^{19}) (διὰ τῆς γλώσσης, v.^{9}, refers to the instrument of speech). It is evident that 'tongue' in this connexion is used of a specific utterance. It is an open question whether it was deliberate, on the ground that ordinary language was unsuitable for prayer or fellowship or testimony regarding the spiritual life, or was produced apart from the volition of the speaker under the influence of spiritual excitement or emotion. The evidence is in favour of the latter view: in other words, that the speaker was the subject of a Spirit-possession which moved him to speak 'with the tongues of men and of angels' (1 Co 13^{1}). The distinction in the latter passage points to an ecstasy which on occasions appeared to be more than human, as if the Spirit used a human medium for angelic speech (cf. 2 Co 12^{4}). It was used only in prayer (1 Co $14^{2.\ 14}$). It was speech 'not unto men, but unto God.' To the outsider it appeared a species of soliloquy. Intellect or νοῦς was passive or ἄκαρπος (14^{14}). There were many types of tongues (γένη γλωσσῶν $12^{10.\ 28}$).

---

[*] Similarly, in the OT, taste is not specially connected with the tongue (Job 20^{12} refers to the mouth as a whole), but with the palate (חֵךְ). For the more scientific Greek view, see Aristotle, *de Anima*, ii. 10.

Undoubtedly St. Paul recognized it as a spiritual gift, but inferior, as, *e.g.*, compared with prophecy. It was of no value to an unbeliever, because it could not lead to faith: cf. St. Paul's application of Is $28^{11f.}$ in 1 Co 14^{21}. Indeed, to both the outsider and the unbeliever (v.^{23}) it would appear a kind of madness. Nor to the believer was it of real benefit unless there was an interpretation (v.^{13}); and the speaker-with-tongues was counselled to pray for such an interpretation, as if his utterance *per se* were of little value. St. Paul was no believer in unintelligibility (v.^{11}): hence his emphasis on a εὔσημος ('capable of being expounded') λόγος (v.^{9}). He claimed the gift as one of his own (v.^{18}), but preferred five instructive words spoken with the understanding to ten thousand in a tongue (v.^{19}). If his words were not understood, it was like pouring words into the empty air (v.^{9}). Hence an interpretation was essential, though this was a gift by itself and was not necessarily exercised by the speaker-with-tongues himself.

It is obvious that the Corinthians were specially susceptible to such abnormal powers; with a considerable section of the church γλωσσολαλία was more popular than teaching and prophecy, in spite of the fact that as a purely subjective phenomenon it was of no value to the outsider (ἰδιώτης), who could not even say 'Amen' to the formula of thanksgiving (v.^{16}). The common sense of St. Paul was undoubtedly tried by its ineffectuality ('your thanksgiving may be all right, but then—the other man is not edified!' [v.^{17} in J. Moffatt, *The New Testament: A New Translation*^{3}, London, 1914]).

There is no need to look for the origin of this experience among contemporary ethnic cults. That the atmosphere of the Hellenistic world of St. Paul was full of the phenomena of mysticism and ecstasy is clear to all students of the mystery-religions. But the ecstatic manifestations of the Corybantic or Dionysiac devotee or the worshipper of Isis and Osiris are simply parallels with the Corinthian Christian phenomena; they are not sources of it. Κορυβαντιᾶν (to use Philo's word, *Quis Rer. Div. Heres*, 69, quoted by Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions*, p. 66) is a convenient generic term for Divine possession as found in the revivals of ancient and modern religions. To Huxley the Salvation Army appeared to be a kind of 'Corybantic Christianity,' judged by its external phenomena of religious excitement and enthusiasm. At the same time, the phenomena that have accompanied revivals such as early Methodism, the Salvation Army, and the recent Welsh revival have rarely been of the type of γλωσσολαλία: there have been sobs and ejaculations, but not unintelligible continuous speech. In a valuable appendix to his *Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*^{2} (London, 1914) K. Lake ('Glossolalia and Psychology,' ch. iv. app. ii.) finds traces of *glossolalia* in the *Testament of Job* and in the magical papyri, *e.g.* the Leiden papyrus, where Hermes is invoked in unintelligible symbols. The use of strange words in magical formulas or charms which is to be found in circles alien to the apostolic communities may properly be adduced as parallels to *glossolalia*; but it would appear that *glossolalia* speedily vanished from apostolic Christianity. There is no reference to it in the Apostolic Fathers. The passages quoted from Irenæus (*Hær.* V. vi. 1) and Tertullian (*c. Marc.* v. 8) are not convincing proofs that the practice was in vogue in their own times, while Chrysostom in the 4th cent. is unable to explain what its real nature was. Lake notes the case of the Camisards, a sect of French Protestants in the early 18th cent., who are known under stress of religious emotion to have 'uttered exhortations in good French, although, in their ordinary state of consciousness, they were incapable of speaking anything but the Romance patois of the Cévennes' (*loc. cit.*, p. 245). A clearer parallel to *glossolalia* is the more familiar case of the Irvingites, whose ecstatic utterances were an unintelligible jargon. Lake's examination of the phenomena as a whole demonstrates that from the standpoint of psychology there is nothing in itself unreasonable in uncontrolled or uncontrollable speech. When the subliminal consciousness is called into play or energy by religious emotion, there results a *paraphasia* which may take the form of speaking languages previously not known by the speaker, or uttering speech unintelligible to the hearer. The whole subject is invested with renewed interest by the modern study of religious pathology and psychology. It would now appear that speaking with tongues, like so many other phenomena of the spiritual consciousness, whether in the records of the Scriptures or in non-canonical writings or in the general annals of the Christian life in all ages, is capable of reasonable explanation on psychological lines, even if all the data fail to yield a satisfactory meaning to the inquirer.

LITERATURE.—In addition to the works named under GIFTS and PROPHECY, the following may be consulted: K. Lake, *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*^{2}, London, 1914; H. A. A. Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions*, London, 1913; J. Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, Göttingen, 1910; F. G. Hencke, 'The Gift of Tongues and Related Phenomena at the Present Day,' in *AJTh* xiii. [1909] 193–206; W. James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience*^{5}, London, 1903, lects. ix. and x.; E. Mosiman, *Das Zungenreden, geschichtlich und psychologisch untersucht*, Tübingen, 1911 (contains an excellent bibliography).

R. MARTIN POPE.

TOPAZ (τοπάζιον).—Topaz is the ninth foundation-stone of the New Jerusalem (Rev 21^{20}). The topaz of modern mineralogy was almost unknown to the ancients, and the stone denoted by τοπάζιον was probably that variety of olivine which is now termed chrysolite or peridot. It was found in the τοπάζιος νῆσος of the Red Sea. Pliny (*HN* xxxvii. 8) speaks of it as held in very high estimation, 'e virenti genere,' and Strabo (XVI. iv. 6) says:

> 'The topaz is a translucent stone, sparkling with a golden lustre. It is not easy to distinguish in the daytime, because it is outshone, but at night it is visible to those who collect it. Placing a vessel over the spot as a mark, they dig [the stones] up by day. A body of men is appointed and maintained by the kings of Egypt to guard the place where they are found, and to superintend the collection of them.'

This ancient topaz was soft and easily engraved: 'eadem sola nobilium limam sentit' (Pliny, *loc. cit.*). The modern topaz, on the contrary, is nearly as hard as a diamond.

JAMES STRAHAN.

TORMENT.—The noun 'torment' is the tr., in all passages except one, of βασανισμός, a Gr. word found in the NT only in Rev. In 1 Jn 4^{18} κόλασις is so tr. in AV (RV 'punishment'). The cognate verb *βασανίζω* is rendered 'torment' in four out of six passages, the exceptions being Rev 12^2 (AV 'pained,' RV 'in pain') and 2 P 2^8 (AV and RV 'vexed'). In AV *κακουχέομαι* is in one of the two cases of its occurrence rendered 'torment' (He 11^{37}: RV 'evil entreat'). In *4 Ezr.* 'torment' is the rendering of *cruciamentum* in ix. 9, xiii. 38 (AV and RV), of *cruciatus* in vii. 67 (RV), of *tormentum* in vii. 36, 38 (RV), of *supplicium* in vii. 66, 80, 84, 86 (RV), of *cruciamentum* in ix. 12 (RV; AV 'pain'). *Cruciare* is tr. 'torment' in xiii. 38 (AV and RV) and *torquere* in v. 34 (RV).

Torment is physical, or mental, or both. Of mental torment we have instances in 2 P 2^8, where Lot is said to have 'vexed' (RVm 'tormented') his soul with the lawless deeds of his neighbours; in Rev 11^{10}: 'These two prophets tormented them that dwell on the earth'; in *4 Ezr.* v. 34: 'My reins torment (*torquent*) me every hour while I labour to comprehend the way of the Most High'; and in vii. 64: 'By reason of this we are tormented (*cruciamur*), because we perish and know it.'

Of physical torment in this life we have a few instances. In one passage the pangs of childbirth are likened to 'torment.' The woman arrayed as the sun was 'travailing in birth, and in pain to be delivered' (*βασανιζομένη τεκεῖν*, Rev 12^2). Such men as have not the seal of God on their forehead are tormented by the scorpions five months; 'and their torment was as the torment of a scorpion, when it striketh a man' (Rev 9^5). Of scorpions G. E. Post says (*HDB*, *s.v.*), 'Their sting is very painful, frequently causing a night of agony, which nothing but a large dose of morphine will assuage.' The torments of Babylon the Great consist of plagues, death, mourning, famine, and burning with fire (Rev $18^{7f.}$), especially the last ($18^{10.\ 15}$). The heroes of Israel were 'tormented' (He 11^{37}, RV 'evil entreated').

To torments after death we have fairly numerous references in Rev. and *4 Ezra*. Those who worship the Beast and his image shall be tormented with fire and brimstone; and the smoke of their torment shall ascend for ever and ever, there being no rest for them day or night (Rev 14^{9-11}). A similar punishment awaits the devil, the Beast, and the False Prophet, who, after being cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever (Rev 20^{10}). Those who have cast away despitefully the ways of God 'shall dwell in torments' (*4 Ezr.* ix. 9). Those who have scorned God's law must know it (or Him) after death by torment (ix. 12). The Messiah shall show the evil multitude 'the torments wherewith they shall be tormented, which are likened unto a flame' (xiii. 38). It is better with beasts than with men, for they know not of torments promised them after death (vii. 66). Fire and torments await the wicked (vii. 38). The apostates shall be tormented (vii. 72). The torments begin in the Intermediate Abode (vii. 75, 80, 86, 99), and are increased after the Final Judgment (vii. 36, 38, 84). The pit of torment is synonymous with the furnace of hell (vii. 36). Other instances of future torment are found in 2 Bar $36^{10f.}$ 51^6 52^3 $54^{14f.}$ $55^{2.\ 7}$ 56^{13} $59^{2.\ 11}$ 78^6 83^8 85^9.

LITERATURE.—R. H. Charles, *The Apocalypse of Baruch*, London, 1896; P. Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie*, Tübingen, 1903, § 39; *Libri Apocryphi Veteris Testamenti*, ed. O. F. Fritzsche, Leipzig, 1871; *DCG*, *s.v.* 'Torment.'

WILLIAM WATSON.

TOWN-CLERK.—The town-clerk of Ephesus (Ac 19^{35-41}), who displays tact and also points out the illegality of the whole proceedings of the crowd, with the proper means of redress if there be a real grievance, was a typical official of a Greek city with the Athenian type of constitution. In cities like Ephesus, which were the headquarters of a Roman governor, the town-clerk appears to have acted also as a kind of intermediary between the proconsul (with his staff) and the municipal authorities. The Acts narrative is in fact a precious document for the understanding of the town-clerk's position. With the advent of the Empire the free democratic constitution of most provincial cities was suspended. The assemblies could be held only with the permission of the governor, who was an Imperial official (cf. 19^{38-41}). No longer could a citizen bring a proposal before the assembly personally, but only through the presiding official. The old council of annually elected citizens remained, as did the old magistracies. These offices were held only by the rich, as no salary was attached to them. The *στρατηγοί* (see MAGISTRATE, PRÆTOR) and the *γραμματεὺς τοῦ δήμου* formed the magisterial board of the city. Every measure to be brought before the people must first have had their approval and support. These magistrates seem to have presided over the assembly in rotation. A decree passed by the assembly required the confirmation of the governor before it could become law. The high importance of the town-clerk appears from the fact that his name alone is frequently given as a means of dating a decree, and, if it is his second period of office, inscriptions indicate that in the usual way. An inscription of Branchidæ in the same province of Asia as Ephesus (*Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum*, no. 921) provides the best illustration of the import of this riotous assembly in Ephesus (C. G. Brandis, in Pauly-Wissowa, ii. [1896] col. 1551). A citizen of Branchidæ in 48 B.C. is celebrated on it as having gone on an embassy to Rome and restored to the people of Branchidæ their former assembly and laws. Under the Empire privileges were apt to be taken away from cities if they were abused. This had happened in the case of Branchidæ, and only the intervention of a prominent citizen, who took the journey to Rome and doubtless spent a large sum of money, was able to recover their old rights for the populace. So in Ephesus and elsewhere the local officials were most careful to avoid punishment from the Roman authorities on account of assemblies illegally summoned.

LITERATURE.—O. Schulthess, *s.v.* *γραμματεῖς* in Pauly-Wissowa, vii. [1912] cols. 1708–1780; J. Menadier, *Qua condicione Ephesii usi sint inde ab Asia in formam provinciæ redacta*, Berlin, 1880; H. Swoboda, *Die griechischen Volksbeschlüsse*, Leipzig, 1890; W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, London, 1895, pp. 281 ff., 305.

A. SOUTER.

TRADE AND COMMERCE.—1. Introductory.—Trade and commerce occupied almost as great a place in the life of ancient communities as they do in modern times. Indeed, apart from such developments as the railway, the steamship, the telegraph, and the telephone have introduced, the chief difference between the two periods might be found in the somewhat changed attitude of the leisured and professional classes towards them. The attitude which the philosopher Plato adopts towards manual industries as *βάναυσοι*, 'base, ignoble, vulgar,' was only too faithfully followed by the whole class of writers, Greek and Roman. It is wonderful how long the absurd hypocrisy has persisted in Europe, by which the very processes which bring the necessaries of life within our reach, and the very sources from which directly or indirectly many draw their income, are despised.

It would have been hardly necessary to mention this attitude except for the reason that it affords a ready explanation of the scant mention which trade and commerce receive in the ancient authors. The extreme meagreness of our information makes it impossible to give any comprehensive or detailed account of the subject. The inscriptions are here more valuable than the authors, and even they as a rule make mention of commercial matters rather by accident than of set purpose. The everyday experience of life is not as a rule that with which writers earlier than our own period have thought fit to deal. The obvious is avoided, and we are often left to inference more or less hazardous. There is one way, however, in which the permeating influence of trade makes itself everywhere felt, and that is in the language of metaphor. The Roman writers, for example, constantly employ metaphors from book-keeping.

The Jewish attitude to trade was altogether healthier than that of their Western neighbours. It was the custom to have every Hebrew child, whatever his station, taught a handicraft. The advantage of such a system from the mere health point of view, as a prevention of exaggerated mental development, is obvious. The prudential gain, under altered circumstances, is no less so. St. Paul, though a Pharisee, had been taught the trade of making tents out of rough Cilician material, and this enabled him to be independent of his churches. The valuable fruit of this independence was seen in his power to rebut charges that were levelled at fellow-apostles, who accepted a lawful material recompense for evangelistic work. The true Christian attitude has always given labour, however humble, an honourable place. It could hardly be otherwise, seeing that the Master Himself was a carpenter by trade, and that a large proportion of the early converts gained a livelihood from manual labour, whether as free men or as slaves.

2. In the NT.—The NT contains a considerable body of references to trade in one aspect or another, some of which may be mentioned here, while others are reserved for later mention. St. Paul (2 Co 2^{17}) contrasts himself with the many who 'hawk (make merchandise of, *καπηλεύοντες*) the word of God.' 'Christ has *bought* us (*ἐξηγόρασεν*) from the law's curse' (Gal 3^{13}; cf. 4^{5}, 1 Co 6^{20} $7^{23.30}$); we are advised 'to buy up,' 'make a market of' (*ἐξαγοραζόμενοι*) the opportunity (Eph 5^{16}, Col 4^{5}; cf. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, London, 1895, p. 148 f.). One of St. Paul's favourite words is *λογίζομαι*, 'reckon,' 'calculate' (literally) (cf. Ro $4^{3.4}$: of some forty instances in the NT, only seven belong to other authors; cf. the rarer word *ἐλλογάω*, *ἐλλογέω*, Ro 5^{13}, Philem ^{18}). He constantly uses *πλοῦτος*, *πλουτέω*, *πλουτίζω* (*e.g.* 2 Co 8^{9}, 1 Co 1^{5}, Ro 2^{4}, Eph 1^{7}) of spiritual *wealth*; cf. *θησαυρίζω* (Ro 2^{5}). A metaphor from the testing of coin, etc., is *δόκιμος*, 'approved,' and cognates (Ro 14^{18}, 2 Co 10^{18}, etc.); a metaphor from the earnest, the large portion of the price paid as a first instalment of a debt, is *ἀρραβών* (2 Co 1^{22} 5^{5}, Eph 1^{14}), and *βεβαιόω*, *βεβαίωσις* (1 Co 1^{6}, Ph 1^{7}) are supposed by some to be connected with surety. Partnership in business is suggested by *κοινωνός* (2 Co 1^{7}, etc.), *κοινωνία*, *μετοχή* (2 Co 6^{14} 8^{4} 9^{13}, Ph 1^{5}), *συνκοινωνός*, *συνκοινωνέω*, *συνμέτοχος* (Eph 3^{6} $5^{7.11}$, Ph 4^{14}, Ro 11^{17}). Profit, gain, is suggested by *κέρδος* (Ph 3^{7}), by the constant use of *περισσός* and its derivatives, by *πλεονάζω*, *πλεονεξία* (2 Co 8^{15} 9^{5}, etc.), and perhaps by *καρπός*. Indeed, the language of St. Paul especially constantly suggests a mental background of trade and commerce, only natural in one brought up in great cities like Tarsus and Jerusalem. (On the subject of St. Paul's metaphors, see J. S. Howson's *Metaphors of St. Paul*, new ed., London, 1883, and W. M. Ramsay's *Luke the Physician and Other Studies in the History of Religion*, London, 1908, ch. x.)

3. Trade and the Roman army.—Trade in the Roman Empire both preceded and followed the eagles of the Roman army. That it preceded is a natural inference from the invariable practice of traders, who seek for every market that they can get, even at great personal risk. The ancient authors naturally say little of this phase of activity. But the facilities for greater trade activity opened up by the legions enormously increased its volume. The armies helped trade not only by keeping the population of a conquered country in subjection, but also by the building of those splendid military roads which, constructed for military purposes, benefited trade no less, by the rapidity and the security of movement which they made possible. The requirements of the army itself also brought trade to remote parts of the Empire. The soldiers were in time of peace citizens accustomed to the use of certain commodities and comforts. Traders, in order to supply these, settled at the armed camps and outposts, and the rows of their shops helped to convert the camps into towns. They at the same time served as valuable agents of Romanization, and helped the provincials to become Romans, in externals at least, in a very short time. Fifty years after Gallia Narbonensis became a province, all the business done by the provincials was done through the Roman merchants. The vast numbers of these in the rich Roman province of Asia as early as the beginning of the 1st cent. B.C. are revealed by the statistics of the Italians murdered by Mithradates, variously given as 80,000 and 150,000. Later evidence with regard to Asia points the same way. So with regard to Africa in the same century, our authorities show the abundance of Roman merchants, bankers, and commercial companies. In London, about the time of the death of St. Paul, the merchant class was already large, though the province Britain was then new. The importance of such merchants is also seen from the fact that, being Roman citizens, they constituted the aristocracy of every provincial community in which they lived.

4. Inter-provincial trade.—Not only were Italian traders to be found in all parts of the Empire, but provincials from one part are found established in trade in another part. At a place like Aquileia, a *Knotenpunkt* and distributing centre of commerce between the North-East provinces, Italy, the East, and Africa, there was a cosmopolitan population. But the Orientals were the great traders. The great Phœnician and Syrian cities had factories in Italian cities like Puteoli and Rome. Alexandrian commerce found ready markets in the great coast towns of the Black Sea. The officer who had charge of St. Paul found an Alexandrian trading vessel at Myra in Lycia (Ac 27^{6}). The graves of Syrian merchants in particular are to be found all over the Roman Empire, and there is abundant evidence of their importance as bankers in the 5th and 6th cent. records of Gaul. There is, strangely, no evidence for commercial settlements of Jews.

5. Coins and bills.—As mediums of exchange coins and bills were in universal use, and the system of banking had reached a very considerable development. The coinage system of the Roman Empire was based on a settlement made between the senate and Augustus (15–11 B.C.). The right of coining gold and silver in Rome was reserved to the Emperor, but the senate was authorized to issue copper and brass coins, with the letters SC (=*senatus consulto*) stamped on them. The governors of senatorial provinces had the right to issue coins, which after A.D. 6 bore the portrait, not of the governor, but of a member or members of the Imperial family. The weight of the *aureus*, or gold coin, was reduced by Augustus from $\frac{1}{40}$ of a pound (=126 grammes), the weight of Julius Cæsar's, to $\frac{1}{42}$ (=120 grammes). The weight of the silver *denarius* remained as before, 60 grammes.

In the senatorial coinage brass (*aurichalcum*, used to render *χαλκολιβάνῳ* in certain Latin versions of Rev 2^{18}, copper alloyed with 20 per cent of zinc) was used as well as copper. The supervision of the senatorial coinage was nominally under the charge of three commissioners of senatorial rank, *tres uiri auro argento ære flando feriundo* ('for the melting and striking of gold, silver, copper'). The Imperial mint was a branch of the Imperial household, supervised by the *a rationibus*, or Keeper of the Privy Purse. The coinage from the Roman mint was inadequate to meet the needs of the great Empire, and was supplemented by other issues, which were also legal tender. Settlements of Roman citizens outside Italy (*coloniæ*) might, if the Imperial permission were granted, issue bronze coins, a privilege which apparently was withdrawn about A.D. 70. A number of cities and unions of cities (*κοινά*) in the Eastern provinces were allowed to issue coins. Syrian Antioch and Cæsarea in Cappadocia (now Kaisarieh) issued large numbers of silver coins, and the *cistophorus* of republican times (cf. Cic. *Att.* II. xvi. 4) in Asia was replaced by a coin of the value of three Roman *denarii*. An enormous quantity of bronze was also coined in the East. The needs of the East were further in great part provided for by an Imperial mint at Alexandria. Besides these, smaller Imperial mints existed throughout the provinces, and the senate had a mint at Syrian Antioch; Lugudunum (Lyons), for example, served as a mint for the Gallic provinces.

An *aureus* was equivalent in value to 25 *denarii*. Under Nero both were reduced in weight, the *aureus* to $\frac{1}{45}$ of a pound, and the *denarius* to $\frac{1}{96}$ of a pound; the quality of the *denarius* was also debased. The *victoriatus* (so called because it has Victory crowning a trophy as reverse) deserves mention. It was a silver coin, originally $\frac{1}{96}$ of a pound in weight, in reality a Greek drachma, adopted by the Romans for purposes of trade with the Greeks of Southern Italy. Half *victoriati* and one double *victoriatus* have been found. Its weight was at least twice reduced. The senatorial coins in the baser metals, above mentioned, were the brass *sestertius* (four *asses*), brass *dupondius* (two *asses*), the copper *as*, and the copper *semis*. The original value of the *denarius* was, as the name indicates, ten *asses*. The *denarius* was the standard coin in the Empire, and in it all legal payments were made.

6. Bonds and bankers.—The bond (*syngrapha*) and the banker (*trapezita, tarpessita* [Plaut.]) were Greek institutions, as their Greek names show (*συγγραφή, τραπεζίτης*; cf. Mt 25^{27}, Mk 11^{15}, and ‖). In early Roman times a man's word was his bond. Contracts (*sponsiones, stipulationes*) were verbal, made in the presence of witnesses, and not written down. The whole system of credit had been elaborated by the Greeks of the Hellenistic period. The universality of the Greek language was accompanied by the Greek commercial system. The Romans readily adapted themselves to it. *Syngrapha* was used to indicate a bond, *permutatio* a bill of exchange, and *perscriptio* a cheque or banker's draft. The men who engaged in financial operations were called *negotiatores*, and are originally to be distinguished from the *mercatores*, merchant princes; but in Imperial times the distinction became obliterated. Two instances of the value of the *negotiatores* may be given. Cicero, in spite of his good government of the large province of Cilicia (the name included in his time Cilicia, Cilicia Tracheia, Pamphylia, Lycia, Pisidia, Isaurica, Lycaonia, Phrygia, and part of Galatia [Ramsay, *Historical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*, London, 1899, map opposite to p. 103]), was able to acquire about £18,000, which he deposited at Ephesus on his return journey (*Correspondence of M. T. Cicero*, ed. R. Y. Tyrrell and L. C. Purser, 7 vols., Dublin, 1879–1901, vol. iii. p. xxxvi). If he had not been so anxious for a triumph he could doubtless have entered Rome and cashed a cheque there. As it was, Pompey annexed Cicero's savings for the civil war. It is highly probable, also, that the great collections of the Pauline churches in the four provinces (Galatia, Asia, Macedonia, Achaia, Ac 20, etc.) for the poor Christians at Jerusalem were conveyed there, not in coin, but in the form of bank drafts on Jerusalem. The risk of conveying large sums by land and sea was considerable.

7. Profits.—With regard to the profits made by Roman traders not much can be said. Friedländer (*Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire*, i. 305) estimates that modern profits of European trade range between 10 per cent in Europe and 66 per cent in Japan, and is of opinion that Roman profits must have been still greater. The state of universal peace and the security of travel in the 1st cent. must certainly have conduced to the quicker circulation of money and the expansion of trade.

8. Travel.—In modern times correspondence and advertisement play a much larger part than they did in ancient times. If even we, however, have been unable to dispense with the personal interview (and indeed German foreign trade has been built up mainly by the persuasiveness and resource of German commercial travellers), in the 1st cent. it played an important part. The merchant prince himself made long journeys by sea and land from end to end of the Empire to sell his wares. Horace makes several allusions to the hardship of constant travel undergone by them in the pursuit of wealth (*Carm.* I. i. 15–16, xxxi. 10–11, III. xxiv. 39–40, *Serm.* I. i. 4–6, 16–17, *Ep.* I. i. 45, xvi. 71, *Ars Poet.* 117). The *mercator* seems to have impressed him as one of the greatest of fools. Other authorities are in accord with him as to the daring and tireless activity of the class.

One or two specimen voyages may be referred to in illustration. The best known case is that of a merchant Flavius Zeuxis of Hierapolis in Phrygia, an inland city, be it observed, who voyaged from Asia to Rome seventy-two times (*CIG*, 3920), taking the dangerous route by the south of the Peloponnese on each occasion, instead of the easier method of trans-shipment over the Isthmus of Corinth. A certain Gaius Octavius Agathopus at Puteoli mentions that place as his final home after many wearisome journeys East and West (*CIL* x. 2792). The Black Sea ports, Britain, and Ireland were known to such traders. The love of Christ led St. Paul to take the same risks as the merchants took for less worthy motives. Besides the classic account of the great voyage in Ac 27, we learn from 2 Co 11^{25-26}, which of course antedates, and does not post-date, as Pelagius imagined, the narrative in Acts, that St. Paul had suffered shipwreck three times, and had spent a night and a day in the deep, also that he had been in perils in (on) the sea.

9. Merchant ships. — There were, of course, various kinds of merchant vessels. There were the heavy merchantmen, or *onerariæ naves*, the *ponto* and the *corbita*, of which the first appears to have been Gallic in origin (cf. Cæs. *de Bell. Ciu.* III. xxix. 3, xl. 5). A mosaic found in the province of Africa shows us a *ponto* with a mainmast and a square sail, and with a foremast which appears to be dipped; it is also provided with long planks (wales) outside the bulwarks on either side, to protect the steering paddles. The stern is sharply pointed. The *corbita*, or basket-shaped vessel (from *corbis*, 'basket'), was, as its name indicates, a much dumpier structure and a very heavy craft. These two kinds of vessel would of course be more useful for river traffic. Lighter craft, more suitable for the open sea, were the *actuaria* (from *ago*) and *myoparo*. They are represented in the mosaic referred to as having a single mast and oars in addition to sail. They were designed for rapid rowing, and had a bank of oars, numbering from ten to thirty. Their character made them useful as dispatch-boats, and we hear of them as also used by pirates. They, however, used the *myoparo* (*μυοπάρων*, from *μῦς*, 'rowing-boat,' and *παρών*, 'light ship') more frequently. Other craft which may be mentioned are the fishing-boat, very much like our own salmon-coble, called *horeia*, *horicula*, and carrying nets; the *stlatta*, greater in breadth than in length, used for river traffic; and the *celox*, a light rowing-boat.

10. Roman docks, etc.—Rome was itself a harbour-town, the quays for landing merchandise being at the foot of the Aventine Mount on the Tiber, and called the Emporium (*ἐμπόριον*). This quarter became more and more covered with large warehouses (*horrea*). Much, perhaps most, of the traffic which came to Rome by water did not come in ships direct. The great sea-harbour of Rome was at the mouth of the Tiber, at Ostia (lit. 'mouths'). Ostia is now a mile or two from the sea, owing to the silt thrown up throughout centuries by the yellow river (*flauus Tiberis*), but the thorough excavation which the site is now undergoing at the hands of the Italian Government has revealed its importance. *Horrea* were long buildings bounded by a street on each of the longer sides, and divided by a wall longitudinally into two rows of store-rooms, placed back to back. Sometimes they formed the boundaries of a *platea* (square). At Ostia they were used to receive the heavy goods, pending their transportation up the Tiber on barges to Rome. From the warehouses in Rome, which were partly public and partly private, and not all situated in the Emporium quarter, the goods found their way to the *tabernæ* (shops), and thus to the private purchasers. There must have been large warehouses at Alexandria and Puteoli in connexion with the great corn traffic between Egypt and Italy, as well as at other ports (cf., in fact, the name Emporiæ, of a Greek city in N.E. Spain). We find instances of factories in the West belonging to Easterns. For example, various Syrian and Phœnician cities had factories at Puteoli, Rome, Naples, Portus, Ravenna. The Alexandrians had them at Perinthus (modern Eregli) in Thrace, and at Tomis (near modern Constantza) on the Black Sea.

11. Fairs.—The great fairs held in various parts of the Empire played their part in the dissemination of trade. The Mysteries of Eleusis near Athens and of Samothrace, the Feasts of Dionysus at Argos and of Pythian Apollo at Delphi, the Isthmian Games at Corinth, and the Olympian Games in Elis (Peloponnese), all attracted countless visitors and stimulated trade, being the ancient counterparts of the Stourbridge, Leipzig, and Nijni Novgorod fairs of more modern times. Thus the pursuit of athletics and of religion benefited trade.

12. Customs dues.—The harbour or customs dues in our period are not known. They were probably not high. The Empire was divided into large customs districts, and an *ad ualorem* duty was charged on goods passing from one of these to another. A *uicesima* ($\frac{1}{20}$, *i.e.* 5 per cent) duty is known for Sicily and Africa, and was probably general; a *quadragesima* ($\frac{1}{40}$, *i.e.* $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent) duty was also in use, for example, in the province of Asia, in the Bithynia-Pontus and Paphlagonia group, and in the 'Three Gauls' (Gallia Lugudunensis, Gallia Belgica, Gallia Aquitanica).

13. Trade with distant countries.—(*a*) *Egypt and India.*—Some account may now be given in detail of the distant countries with which trade was carried on by the Mediterranean peoples. Egypt holds a very important place. Not only did that country supply a third of the corn consumed in Italy; it was also the home of the papyrus plant, so extensively used as writing material. From there also were exported various building stones (cf. Stat. *Siluae* II. ii. 86, Assouan), linen, glass, embroidered stuffs, etc. It was, further, the way to East India, the source of pepper, pearls, etc. From Alexandria the journey to Coptos up the Nile took twelve days, with a favourable wind. At Coptos the goods were laden on camels and Berenice-Troglodytice to the S.E. was reached in eleven or twelve days. Berenice with its warehouses was a centre for Arabia, India, and Ethiopia, and the trade-routes were guarded by Roman garrisons, which had also dug wells. Doubtless this was the route taken by the eunuch of the Candace mentioned in Ac 8. Thirty days were required to go from Berenice to Ocelis in Arabia at the south end of the Red Sea, or to Cane on the south coast of Arabia. From Cane it was forty days to Muziris on the coast of Malabar, whence goods went to Barace (Barygaza), their ultimate destination. The unloading and loading took little time, and in December they started the return journey. The whole journey from Alexandria to Barace and back took six months. From South Arabia, especially through Adane (Aden), came incense (cf. 'grana turis unius assis, Arabicæ arboris lacrimas,' Tert. *Apol.* 30) and other perfumes, spices, and precious stones. From the Great Lakes, East Africa, and Somaliland ivory was brought *via* Abyssinia to the Nile.

(*b*) *Syria.*—Syria was itself an important centre of production. The purple dyes of Tyre and Sidon are constantly referred to in ancient literature (cf. Stat. *Siluae* III. ii. 139, 'qua pretiosa Tyros rubeat, qua purpura suco Sidoniis iterata cadis,' and especially Mayor on Juvenal, *Sat.* i. 27). Artistic work in glass was also associated with Sidon, and throughout Syria fine linen (Lk 16^{19}, Rev $18^{12.\ 16}$ $19^{8.\ 14}$) was woven from the flax of the country. But Syria's chief significance was as a halfway house for the merchandise of the Further East. In addition to the Indian route mentioned in the last paragraph, goods from India could be brought by the port of Charax at the mouth of the Persian Gulf, by the Euphrates, and then by the caravan route passing through Palmyra to Damascus. The importance of Palmyra (cf. W. Wright, *An Account of Palmyra and Zenobia*, London, 1895) was very great. The tariff levied by that city brought it the greatest material prosperity (cf. Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, vol. i. ch. xi., ed. J. B. Bury, London, 1905, p. 306). Another trade-route which passed through Syria was that by the head of the Arabian Gulf to Petra through Bostra to Damascus or, for southern Syria, to the port of Gaza.

(*c*) *China.*—Silk from China also reached Italy in part through Syria. Yellow silk from Cos (*Coæ uestes*) and from Assyria (*bombycinæ uestes*) made from the cocoon of the wild silk-worm (*bombyx*) was the first kind known to the Romans, and references to these products abound from the beginning of the Augustan Age to the seventh decade of the 1st cent. A.D. But this sort was ousted from the market by the superior pure white silk of China (*sericæ* [from *Seres*, the Chinese] or *holosericæ* ['all-silk'] *uestes* [to the examples of the latter word in Lewis and Short's dictionary add pseudo-Augustine, *Sermons*, cclii. 1, cclxii. 1]).

Raw silk and silk thread were also exported. Four trade-routes brought the silk products of China to Rome: (*a*) the overland route from Northern China through Chinese Turkestan to Bactria, by the Caspian gates to Media and the Euphrates; (*b*) a branch of this, crossing the Pamirs from Kashgar and descending the valley of the Indus to Karachi, thence by sea to the Persian Gulf; (*c*) from Central China through Tibet and Nepal to Palibothra on the Ganges, down the Ganges, and then by sea to Egypt; (*d*) from Cattigara (Tonkin) (Jones, *A Companion to Roman History*, p. 320).

(*d*) *The Baltic coast.*—The amber trade opened up the north of Europe and the Baltic coast. From the latter district it was brought to Italy by a route which eventually passed through Carnuntum, an important military station (now Petronell, near Vienna) on the upper Danube. The discovery of various hoards of Roman coins and articles in Northern Europe suggests that there was a trade in other commodities as well. Certainly timber, iron ore, and gold were obtained in the northern provinces.

(*e*) *Gaul and Britain.*—The Romans had entered Gaul, even before Cæsar's conquest of it, from the old province of Gallia Narbonensis up the Rhone valley from Marseilles (later from Arles), and from Italy by the Great St. Bernard Pass. A cask of Italian or Narbonese wine bought a Gaulish slave, and it seems to have been chiefly wine that the Roman traders brought. Gallic clothing and pottery were also bought by the Romans. At the other northern corner of the Empire, at Dioscurias or Sebastopolis in the Caucasus, there was a great trading centre, at which the products of Southern Russia were exchanged. The lead-mines of the Mendip hills and North Wales were worked by the Romans. Iron was extracted in the Weald and the Forest of Dean, and gold in West Wales. A trade-route existed from Britain to the mouth of the Loire. But the most important country for the supply of minerals was Spain, from which copper, lead, silver, gold, and tin were obtained. From this short account, pieced together from scanty data, it is difficult to realize the tremendous commercial activity of Rome in every direction open to her.

14. Centres of distribution.—Not much is known of the distribution of the goods. Juvenal's words, 'iam pridem Syrus in Tiberim defluxit Orontes' (*Sat.* iii. 62), are typical of the whole Empire. At Rome was the greatest distributing mart of the world. There everything that could be bought for money was obtainable. Other great distributing centres were Corinth (the most natural explanation of 'they of Chloe' [1 Co 1^{11}] is that they were business agents of a house trading between Corinth and Ephesus), Alexandria, Syrian Antioch, Arelate (now Arles). Alexandria was a distributing centre for paper, spices, etc. Tin was in stock almost everywhere, though found only in the West in a natural state. Amber was to be found everywhere. Iron goods—for example, Roman-made weapons—were universally known. The Italian pattern of stewpan or casserole has been found in various parts of Northern Europe. Greek pottery from the islands of the Ægean was sold widely, but Western was no less important (the classic work is that by J. Déchelette, *Les Vases céramiques ornés de la Gaule romaine—Narbonnaise, Aquitaine et Lyonnaise*, 2 vols., Paris, 1904; see also the literature referred to in P. Gwynne, *The Guadalquiver: its Personality, its People, and its Associations*, London, 1912). Each maker had his own hall-mark; the wares of Saguntum, Arretium, Mutina, Lyons, and other centres can thus be traced over the Western Empire. So also Alexandrian glass articles, Syrian fine linen fabrics, Italian wines, sausages, and hams, African carpets, Gaulish, Numidian, Rhætian, and British clothing, Tarentine wool, Cartagena fish-sauce, etc., were on sale in the most unlikely places.

15. Articles of commerce.—(*a*) *Slaves.*—But it is now time to pass to a more detailed account of the articles of commerce themselves. The most important of them were the slaves. Of these some of course were born in the house (*uerna*, *ancilla*, *οἰκέτης*, *οἰκέτις*) of mothers who were already house-slaves, and had for fathers either the master or another slave. By law every such child was a new slave for the master. But the household of slaves was also, and perhaps mainly, added to by purchase. All slaves were valued as representing so much capital, as well as for the service they rendered. Hardly a household existed without one, and no person of the slightest consequence would go out into the street unattended by one or more slaves. There were also grades of slaves, the more important having at their beck and call under-slaves, *uicarii*. They also varied in standing and cost according to the purpose for which they were bought. For instance, the beautiful boy-slave (*puer delicatus*; Stat. *Siluae* II. i. vi., laments for the death of such), as a luxury of the rich, sometimes, if not always, used for immoral purposes (cf. *μαλακοί*, 1 Co 6^{9}), was exceedingly costly. But the rough farm labourer class of slave could be obtained cheap. Town service was much more highly appreciated by the slave class than country service, and a refractory town slave could think of no greater punishment than to be sent to his master's country estate (Horace, *Sat.* II. vii. 118). The slave born in the house grew up with the master's lawful children, and thus a close relationship was established between them, a sign of which is the fact that the house-slave referred to his master by his 'Christian' name, *prænomen*. The earliest purchased slaves were obtained directly through war, for the word *mancipium* comes from *manu capere*, but later through the medium of the slave market, a regular institution of all the ancient States; slaves reached this slave market generally as booty taken in war. Every successful war in which Rome took part brought in a number of captives as an essential part of the booty. After a victory or the capture of a town, thousands of captives were sold by the *quæstor*, either on the spot or at the nearest market. Another source of slaves was the robbery of defenceless persons committed by pirates and highwaymen, but this source had greatly dried up by the 1st cent. A.D. Different nationalities were associated with different aptitudes and held in various esteem. Phrygians, like Onesimus (in Philemon), were little esteemed, and were commonly employed to wait at table. Many interesting facts with regard to slaves must be omitted here, as we are concerned with them merely as articles of merchandise.

(*b*) *Wild beasts.*—The purchase of beasts for gladiatorial shows has some interest owing to the (metaphorical) expression of St. Paul (*ἐθηριομάχησα*, 1 Co 15^{32}) and the experience of Ignatius, who was condemned to face the beasts in the arena at Rome (Ignatius, *Ep. ad Rom.*; Irenæus, *adv. Hær.* v. xxviii. 4). Beasts wild and tame were exhibited, or hunted by trained men. The wild beasts fought with one another or with men. The animals appearing in such exhibitions were elephants, lions, panthers, leopards, and bears from foreign parts, especially from Africa, besides stags, boars, and bears from Europe. Later in becoming known to the Romans were the hippopotamus, crocodile, rhinoceros, anthropoid ape, Gallic lynx, giraffe, tiger, zebra, elk, and bison.

Governors levied these contributions on the subjects of Rome, as is shown by the reiterated appeals of Cælius in Rome (*Cic. ad Fam.* viii.) to Cicero in Cilicia, to send him panthers for a show which he wished to give. The variety of the beasts shown is surpassed by the vast and incredible numbers in which they are said to have appeared. Augustus records that 3,500 African beasts were killed at his shows; at the dedication of the Colosseum in A.D. 80, 9,000 tame and wild beasts were killed, while in A.D. 107, after Trajan's second Dacian triumph, the number totalled 11,000. Details of all the means of acquiring these animals would be of the greatest interest, but they have not come down to us.

16. Food supply.—(*a*) *Bread.*—Something must be said of the Roman food supply. The corn was separated from the chaff either by animals, commonly horses, or by threshing machines worked by animals (cf. 1 Co $9^{9.10}$, 1 Ti 5^{18}), or by flails. On the threshing floor, carefully prepared for the purpose, the corn was shaken out from the husk. The chaff of *far* (spelt) adhered so closely to the grain that it could be separated only by pounding. If the wind was not strong enough to blow away the chaff, a wicker basket (*πτύον*, *uannus*, Mt 3^{12}) was used for winnowing. The staple food of the early Roman was porridge (*puls*) made of pounded *far*. The pounding process gave rise to the name *pistor*, which thus came to have the meaning 'baker.' *Triticum* (*tritticum*), 'winter wheat,' was grown in dry soils; of this, a variety *siligo* was the source of the finest flour. Barley (*hordeum*) was little used as human food except by slaves and gladiators. Millet (*panicum* or *milium*) was grown chiefly in Campania, and oats (*auena*) were sown only for green fodder (for which the general word was *farrago*). Other crops grown for fodder were lucerne, vetches, and tares. Peas and beans of various types were largely cultivated, especially lupines. The production of bread was long, as in Britain and elsewhere, a purely household matter. For *boulangerie* one depended on the work of the slaves at home; for *pâtisserie* one had to resort to the shops, probably most of them Greek. The handmill or quorn (*mola*), worked by women, was a feature of every house; the larger houses had mills worked by asses or mules. Water-mills were also known. The loaves were for the most part much smaller than those to which we are accustomed in Britain, being more like large rolls. Leaven (*ζύμη*, Latin *fermentum*) was usually employed in baking, unleavened bread being regarded as less health-giving. The resulting paste (*φύραμα*, *massa*, 1 Co 5^{6}, etc.) was formed on the baking-board, either by hand or in a mould.

(*b*) *Olive-oil.*—The use of butter seems to have been very rare, except for medicinal purposes. Its place as a food was taken by olive-oil. It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of the olive in the ancient world. The extent to which it was grown in Mediterranean lands is vividly shown by a map published in Deissmann's *St. Paul: a Study in Social and Religious History*, London, 1912. In Italy the olive area commonly begins where the uppermost part of the vineyard stops, on the mountain slopes. St. Paul refers in a well-known simile to the difference between the wild olive (*ἀγριέλαιος*, *oleaster*) and the cultivated olive (*ἐλαία*, *olea*) and to the grafting (Ro 11^{17-24}) of the former on the latter, a process probably less frequent than the reverse. The cultivated olive was introduced by Greek colonists to Italy. The Sabine country provided the largest yield, and the best oil came from Venafrum (modern Venafro) in Samnium. Young trees were not removed from the seed-plots till they were five years old. They attain considerable age, and do not bear to their full capacity for a number of years. Olive-growing was therefore a trade for the capitalist, who could wait for his returns. Before the fruit was fully ripe it was picked, and the first process in the obtaining of the oil was to separate the pulp from the kernel. This was done by putting the olives into the oil-mill (*trapetum*), by which they were crushed. The pulp when separated was put into the oil-press (*ληνός*, *torcular*), and crushed there to obtain the oil. It was caught in a cistern (*lacus*) and afterwards strained of its impurities. Then it was ready for the large earthenware jars (*dolia*) in the oil-cellar.

(*c*) *Wine.*—The culture of the vine was of the highest importance, wine being then, as now, the staple drink of the Mediterranean peoples. Corn-growing in Italy had been largely abandoned in favour of the cultivation of the olive and the vine. Wine was rare and costly in early times in Italy; even in the 3rd cent. B.C. it was poor in quality, and till near the end of the Republic Greek wines, especially those of the Ægean islands, Chios, Cos, Lesbos, Rhodes, and Samos, held almost undisputed place among the citizens of the Italian cities. Even in Italy, however, the vineyard was the source of greatest profit to the agriculturist. We first hear of Falernian wine under Julius Cæsar, but only as two-fifths of the total supply provided at a Gargantuan banquet to the Roman people. Under the Empire, the vine-growers of Latium and Campania had so perfected their vintages that they were sought for even in India. In Pliny's time (died A.D. 79) two-thirds of eighty well-known brands were Italian; of these the best were the Alban and Cæcuban from Latium, and the Massic and the Surrentine (the latter recommended by physicians, *e.g.* Cælius Aurelianus, *de Celeribus vel Acutis Passionibus*, ii. 37). Columella, the agricultural writer of the 1st cent. A.D., shows that a profit of rather over 6 per cent was obtained from a vineyard of about 4 acres, but there is evidence in a favourable locality of as much as ten times that percentage.

(*d*) *Vegetables and fruit.*—Root-crops were not very commonly raised except in Cisalpine Gaul, where the turnip was used, as to-day, for the winter food of cattle. Flax (*λίνον*, *linum*) yielded large profits; hemp (*cannabis*) required a rich soil. Of fruit trees the lemon and the orange, now so characteristic of Italy, were unknown. Peaches and apricots were introduced in the course of the 1st cent., the pistachio nut in its first third, and about the time of the destruction of Pompeii the first melons aroused the interest of students and growers. Every town was surrounded by orchards and kitchen-gardens. The flower-gardens produced little but several varieties of lilies, roses, and violets, grown both for natural use and for the manufacture of perfumes. Each town was supplied with vegetables from its own environs, but these were sometimes also exported further afield; for example, Pompeii exported cabbages, figs, and onions, and Rome obtained peaches from Verona, asparagus from Ravenna, and roses from Pæstum. It was in the *forum holitorium* that fruit and vegetables were purchased at Rome. Varieties of fruit not already mentioned, which could be obtained there, were apples (Italian, African, Syrian), pears (Italian, Greek, and African), plums, quinces, medlars, chestnuts, grapes, walnuts, hazel-nuts, filberts, almonds, pomegranates, cherries. Of dried fruits, damsons, Carian figs, dates, and raisins (from Spain) were on sale. Of vegetables, in addition to those mentioned above, the following were to be found in the Roman market: squills, garlic (still so characteristic of Southern Europe), leeks, celery, artichokes (*e.g.* from Carthage and Cordoba), endives, elecampane, radishes, cucumbers, gourds, lettuce, cress, mallow, sorrel (cf. the *soupe à l'oseille* of modern France), rue, mustard, anise, fennel, coriander, cummin, dill, etc.

(*e*) *Fish.*—Fish was the real delicacy of the ancient table. This is seen in the history of the word ὄψον (*opsonium*), which originally indicated any sort of relish taken with bread, and latterly meant 'fish' exclusively (cf. Jn $6^{9.11}$ $21^{9.10.13}$). At first little fishing seems to have been engaged in, but in the 1st cent. B.C. there were many aristocratic fish-breeders, who in their private ponds fed various sorts of rare fish for the enjoyment of the table. Among the fish eaten by the Romans were the sturgeon, bass, mullet, sea-mullet, the 'ruminating' parrot-fish, pearl fish, turbot, eel, conger-eel, murry (a sea-eel), sheath fish, trout, salmon-trout, pike, prickly flounder. The common people esteemed the mackerel, the anchovy, the tunny, and the sand-smelt. Certain of the latter were used in making sauces. The pearl fish was common in the Mediterranean; the sheath fish was obtained in the Nile, Danube, Moselle, and Dnieper; the best murries were obtained from Tartessus, Messana, and the Carpathian Sea; the best turbots were caught off Ravenna; most eels were caught at Verona. The common fish abounded in the Italian seas.

(*f*) *Meat.*—In the meat-market (*macellum*, μάκελλον, 1 Co 10^{25}; cf. Ital. *macelleria*) were to be found beef, goat's flesh, lamb, mutton, and pork. Pork was especially in demand, particularly for roasting on festal days. The parts of the animal most appreciated were the womb, udder, liver, ham, and toes, and there was also a great sale for salt beef and various kinds of sausages. A considerable portion of the meat sold in the meat-market had been sacrificed to gods by their priests. The inferior parts of the animal might then be burnt, but what the priests did not require for personal consumption was sold in the meat-market (cf. Ac 15^{29} 21^{25}, 1 Co 8 [whole chapter] 10^{19}, Rev $2^{14.20}$). Salt- and smoked-meat were imported into Rome from Gallia Cisalpina, the Pyrenees, the Cantabri, and the Sequani. In addition to domestic animals, game, whether obtained from hunters or from zoological gardens, was also sold, wild boar, sometimes served whole (as at Queen's College, Oxford, to-day), hare, venison, dormouse. Nor was poultry overlooked. Birds of various sorts were obtained in all parts of the Roman world, and preserved in aviaries for the table: pigeons of costly and rare types, fattened birds, particularly the diseased goose liver become abnormally large (cf. the modern *pâté de foie gras*), also the ptarmigan, woodcock, francolin or black partridge, fieldfare (fattened on pounded figs), partridge, quail, peacock, Guinea-fowl, pheasant, black grouse, capercailzie, crane, stork, and flamingo.

It is enough to mention milk and various kinds of cheese, of which the Alpine was the most famous (smoked cheese being also in demand), and honey.

17. Markets and retail dealers.—The various kinds of food were to be obtained in the large *fora*, or markets, but probably most of the business done in them was wholesale, at least in the great cities. From the *fora* retail dealers in all kinds of food obtained their supplies. Marquardt (*Privatleben der Römer*, p. 448 ff.) divides these retail dealers into ten classes: (*a*) corn-dealers, bakers, and millers; (*b*) greengrocers; (*c*) fruiterers; (*d*) butchers, game-dealers, and poulterers; (*e*) fishmongers; (*f*) wine-merchants; (*g*) oil-dealers; (*h*) honey-dealers; (*i*) salt-merchants; (*j*) cooks and innkeepers.

18. Textile fabrics.—(*a*) *Production of wool.*—We pass now to textile fabrics. By far the most important were those made from the wool of sheep, the earliest use of which is prehistoric, like the arts of spinning and weaving. Great care was shown in the breeding of sheep, and the varieties of wool, which was in some cases prepared on the spot, and in others exported as rough material, were very numerous. Different breeds of sheep were valued according to the fineness or thickness of their wool, or according to their colour. Cross-breeding was freely employed to improve the quality of any particular wool. The best Italian wool was that from Tarentum, and the epithet Tarentine thus became a trade description for fine wool. On being obtained, commonly by shearing, sometimes by plucking, the wool was prepared for the spinner. Almost all the processes connected with wool were carried out by the women of the household from the beginning down to the Middle Ages. It was the Roman matron's proudest boast that she *lanam fecit*. In fact, a very large amount of the clothing used by the Romans and the ancients generally was made in the house. Costly carpets, hangings, coverlets, etc., were naturally manufactured by experts in factories. With the progress of time factories got more and more of the manufacture of clothing also to do. The wool was washed in hot water with soap, then spread out to dry, then picked and carded. All these processes were a necessary preparation for spinning and weaving.

(*b*) *Fulling.*—Fulling (cf. Mk 9^{3}) was a very important trade in ancient times, both in the preparation of a new fabric and in the cleaning of soiled clothes. Only the simplest washing was done at home, except in very large houses. A number of gilds of fullers, as of other trades, are mentioned. It appears that water, for which they paid specially, was a necessary part of their equipment, and that they did not employ 'dry-cleaning,' at least exclusively. Soap, 'fuller's earth,' and sulphur were also used. Cutting and pressing concluded their work.

(*c*) *Preparation of stuffs.*—The same processes essentially were employed with flax (linen, Rev 15^{6}; cf. Ac 10^{11}, Lk 24^{12}, Jn 19^{40}, etc.), cotton, hemp, and other vegetable stuffs, as also with silk, etc. Flax was treated much as it is to-day. Rough linen was used for bath-towels, ordinary towels, etc., while it is generally believed that fine linen is indicated by the word βύσσος. Cotton, or tree-wool, as the Greeks, like the Germans, call it, came from a plant which was in ancient times indigenous only in East India and Upper Egypt, and it seems to have been prepared specially on the spot. Of its preparation we in consequence know almost nothing. Greeks and Romans did not use hemp for weaving, but the Thracians are recorded by Herodotus to have done so. The fibres of the wild mallow were woven into garments probably only on the banks of the Indus, but these garments were known to the Romans for a long period. Silk as a material for clothing has been referred to above (**13** (*c*)). Of skins used by the ancients, goat-skin was the most important. Especially in Spain, Africa (near the Syrtes), Phrygia, and Cilicia it was the custom to shear the long-haired goats and to weave rough material out of the hair. From the chief place of manufacture (Cilicia) fabrics of such material were known among the Romans as *cilicia* (St. Paul's 'tents' may have been made of this stuff, Ac 18^{3}), while the Greeks gave them the name of σάκκος. Out of it were made cloaks, towels, bed-covers, hangings, shoes, and sacks.

19. Sewing.—Sewing did not in ancient times play the part with which we are now familiar. It was mostly in the addition of extra parts to a garment already woven practically complete that sewing was employed. The modern practice of weaving a whole bale of cloth, out of which a number of different garments are to be cut, was not known to the ancients. Among the Romans the use of the needle would appear to have been commonest with leather; otherwise it is difficult to understand how *sutor* ('sewer') came to mean 'shoemaker.' Needles of various sizes and thimbles were in use. An important part of ancient industry was the manufacture of cushions and bolsters, which were more extensively used than among ourselves, not only for sofas and beds, but also for seats of all kinds. The covers were of linen, wool, or leather, and the stuffing, which was in early times, and later also among humble people, straw, consisted at a later period also of rushes, seaweed, tufts of reeds, and soft leaves of plants, the commonest being flocks of wool, cotton, and feathers. Horsehair was never used. Embroidery of various kinds was practised, especially in Phrygia. For the making of felt, sheep-wool in particular was used.

20. Dyeing.—Dyeing was well understood from an early period, especially in purple, and this process seems from the first to have been carried out, not at home, but in the factory. The characteristic word for 'to dye' is *βάπτειν* (cf. *tinguere*) from the dipping of the garment in the dye (cf. Rev 19^{13}), and for 'the dye' *φάρμακον* (*medicamen*, *medicamentum*). As a rule, the stuff was dyed not as a fabric, but previously to weaving. The Egyptians, however, followed a practice akin to modern cotton-printing. The chief demand, of course, in all dyeing was that the dye should be lasting and proof against washing. Alum and other substances were used in dyeing, and animal and vegetable, but not mineral, dyes. They distinguished between herbal and snail dyeing. From the former were obtained madder, saffron, weed, woad, litmus, gall-nuts, etc.; from the latter, purple and scarlet. The most important, the subject of constant mention, is dyeing with purple. Purple- (or rather violet-) dyeing, properly so called,—that is, dyeing with the juice of certain kinds of snails,—was a discovery of the Phœnicians, especially those of Tyre, whose products remained by far the best (and the dearest). Phœnician purple was always understood to have been produced in this way, while imitations from other countries were sometimes made from plants. Thus it is that the Latin and Greek words for shell-fish, with their derivatives, are very often used for purple-dyes. Three different types of shell-fish (*murex*, *πορφύρα*, *purpura*) were employed, one obtained at Tarentum and other places in the Adriatic for Tarentine purple, another obtained off the African coast for Gætulian or African purple, and the third off the Phœnician coast for Phœnician purple. Πορφύρα, though properly the name of only one shell-fish, came to be used quite generally for purple, and from it the derivatives came: *e.g.* *πορφυρόπωλις* (*purpuraria*), Ac 16^{14}, applied to Lydia of Thyatira, means a dealer in purple dyed wool and fabrics of all sorts. The name of another shell-fish, *murex*, was similarly used to describe purple in general. The means by which the dye was obtained need not be here described in detail. Several varieties of purple were produced by the mixture of the juices of various shell-fish. Tyrian (and Laconian) purple was always double-dyed (*δίβαφον*). The wool was first dipped in one dye (*pelagium*), while the latter was still half-boiled, and then dipped in another (*bucinum*). The colour thus gained was like that of coagulated blood, blackish and shining, especially in sunlight. In addition to the genuine purple, brighter dyes were produced by the weakening of it through the use of various other substances.

Something must be said of dyeing with other materials. Crimson dye was obtained from the insect kermes (*coccum*), the female *coccus* of the kermes oak, in form like a berry, native of the northern shores of the Mediterranean. This dye is alluded to in the adjective *κόκκινος* (Mt 27^{28}, He 9^{19}, Rev $17^{3.4}$ $18^{12.16}$). Yellow dye-stuff was obtained from the styles and stigmata of the saffron (*κρόκος*, *crocus*), which grows in S. Europe, from Italy eastwards, and Western Asia. The finest was obtained from Corycus in Cilicia, and Sicily was also noted for it. As a perfume at public shows and funerals it was well known. The mention of other ancient dyes may be here omitted.

21. Clothes and cloth-merchants.—The commonest colour in Greece for the *χιτών* and *ἱμάτιον* was white, but artisans wore darker clothes: gay clothes were worn only at festivals. So also with the Roman *toga* and *tunica*; the brighter colours came in later, especially for the *lacerna* and similar garments. The bright colours always found acceptance with Roman women, both of good and of bad character, both married and unmarried. At the same time, good taste forbade the use of glaring colours. Such colours as were employed had nearly always some natural model—stone, flower, plant, animal, or sky. The ancients certainly knew a wide variety of colours.

Some account of the number and cut of the garments worn by *men* may now be given. In historical times the dress of the Roman man consisted of an under garment (*tunica*, *χιτών*, Ac 9^{39}, Jude ^{23}, as well as Gospel references) and an upper garment or wrap (*toga*, from *tego*, 'I cover,' *ἱμάτιον*, Ac 9^{39} 7^{58} 12^{8} 14^{14} 16^{22} 18^{6} $22^{20.23}$, Rev $3^{5.18}$ 4^{4} 19^{13}, etc., from which the general word *ἱματισμός*, 'clothing' [Ac 20^{33}, 1 Ti 2^{9}, and often in papyri] comes). The *toga* was worn only outside the house. The tunic was a shirt consisting of two parts, a breast piece and a back piece, which were sewn together. It had sometimes no sleeves, and at other times they reached only to the elbow. Commonly it was girded over the hips, so that it reached only to the knees: soldiers and travellers wore shorter tunics (cf. Ac 12^{8}). The tunic could be worn loose in the house. Already in Plautus' time it was the custom to wear a *tunica interior* (*subucula*) under the *tunica* proper, and like it of wool. The *toga* was a white woollen garment of elliptical form, while the corresponding Greek garment (*ἱμάτιον*) was rectangular. The length was three times the height of the man up to the shoulder, but the breadth varied. The method of wear does not here concern us. The working classes, who wore only the *tunica*, not the *toga*, used the *pænula* (2 Ti 4^{13}) as a protection against rain, wind, snow, and cold. It was the dress, for example, of muleteers, and of slaves who had to work in the open, as well as of soldiers, travellers, and others who had to face the elements in bad weather. It was made of shaggy frieze or leather, dark-coloured and thick, without sleeves, sticking close to the body. The characteristic great-coat of the soldier, *sagum*, had sleeves. The *lacerna*, a light cloak with a hood, was sometimes worn over the *toga*, and was variously coloured. Of the *synthesis*, or dinner dress, also of various colours, little is known, except that it was coloured and that several could be worn at a time showing off the variety of colours at the neck. The two varieties of head-dress, the felt cap (*pileus*), worn in Greece by fishermen, sailors, and artisans, and the flat hat (*petasus*), were also usual in Italy. As a rule, however, one appeared in public without a hat. Thessalian hats were worn in the theatre as a protection from the sun's heat, as also Macedonian *causiæ* with broad turned-up brims.

Women's dress showed considerable variety, both because matrons, girls, slaves, and prostitutes wore distinctive garments, and because foreign women and freedwomen introduced foreign, and especially Greek, fashions with absolute freedom according to their own taste. All women wore the *fascia*, a sort of corset, then a *tunica interior* (*subucula*, *interula*), and above it the *indusium*, or *tunica indusiata*. It was in the character of the outer dress worn above these that the difference of status was shown. The *stola*, the distinctive dress of the matron or lawful wife, was a tunic, reaching to the feet, with sleeves to the elbows. At its lower end it had a train or flounce, and the whole garment was girt at the waist. About it the *palla* could be worn, and indeed in a special way to mark the class, for it was worn differently by maidens and foreign women, who did not wear the *stola*. Married women commonly covered the head out of doors (1 Co 11).

The *traders* associated with clothing were (1) the providers of raw material, such as wool, goat's hair, flax, the purple fishers, and the mussel fishers; (2) the dealers in raw material and the importers of foreign wares: dealers in wool, goat's hair, linen, silk, etc.; (3) manufacturers, felt-makers, wool-carders, dyers (including dyers in blue, wax, saffron, brown, purple), weavers (including weavers of wool, linen, damask), fullers, embroiderers, gold-beaters, lace-makers, corset-makers, shirt-makers, tailors and tailoresses, and *centonarii* (*i.e.* makers of garments out of *centones*, or old patches); (4) traders in stuffs and finished garments (*uestiarii*), who sometimes did business in shops, sometimes by means of touts (*circitores*); their chief business was in hangings, bed-covers, etc. (*uestes stragulæ*, from *sterno*).

22. Skin and leather wares.—Nothing has hitherto been said of skin or leather wares. Covering with the hides of beasts was the earliest kind of dress. In the Empire skins were used for personal wear as well as for carpets and covers. Hides were imported from the Black Sea, Cyrene, Sicily, Asia Minor, Germany, and Britain, and tanning was known in Rome from the earliest times. The method appears to have differed but little from that now in use. Before the hair was removed, the skin was prepared by the leaves of the mulberry tree soaked in wine, or by the red-fruited white bryony. Of tanning proper the four modern methods appear to have been all current: (*a*) by the use of pine and alder bark, pomegranate skins, and sumach leaves, gall-nuts, acorns, the roots and berries of the wild vine, the fruit of the Egyptian acacia, etc.; (*b*) by the use of alum and salt, which produces fine leather (*aluta*); (*c*) by the use of oil or chamois dressing; and (*d*) by the plain method of cleaning, removing the hair, and scraping. In the colouring of leather also the ancients showed great skill. For this process they used, for instance, the bark of the lotus tree, madder, scarlet, and especially sulphate of copper (blue vitriol). Among hides used were those of sheep, goats, lambs, hyænas, roes, stags, wild sheep, wolves, martens, beavers, bears, jackals, seals, leopards, lions. Furs were not introduced into Rome till late times.

The finished leather was used by shoemakers, saddlers, and the makers of jerkins, belts, gloves, tents, wineskins, etc. It was cut with various types of knife, pierced with the awl, and shaped on lasts; the soles were made often of wood or cork, being sometimes studded with nails, and were sewn according to requirement. The use of oil to make the leather flexible and of blacking was also known. The shoemakers were divided into classes, according to the type of shoes that they sold. The prevailing type of boot among the senators had four latchets; there was also the ordinary *calcius*, sold by *calciarii*, like a slipper with two upper flaps, one folded over the other and both knotted together. For indoor use sandals (*soleæ*, *sandalia*, Ac 12^{8}), sold by *solearii*, were used, but they were taken off at dinner. Among other types was the military *caliga*, sold by the *caligarii*, studded with nails, but really little more than a sole, laced to the foot by a network of thongs.

23. Hairdressing and cosmetics.—Hairdressing and cosmetics need some reference (1 P 3^{3}). The hairdresser, wig-dealer, perfumer did much business in the great cities. The hairdressing of the richer and idler Roman women in the 1st cent. was often of so elaborate a nature that great skill and much time were required for the preparation of the wonderful structures piled upon their heads. There was also a large sale for cosmetics, including white-lead and rouge. Wigs were commonly blonde in the 1st century. The barbers' shops were centres of gossip, just as George Eliot represents them centuries later in Florence. The decoration of women's hair and faces was done at home by specialist slaves.

24. Goods and utensils.—The subject of goods and utensils is much too large to be treated in full detail here, but it cannot be passed by. Such manufactured goods can be distinguished as the work of workers in hard substances—stone, metal, wood, ivory, glass—or that of workers in soft substances, such as clay or wax. The former are the work of the *fabri*, the latter of the *figuli* (Ro 9^{20}). Adjectives were added to the term *fabri* to indicate the special branch to which they belonged. Workers in timber, builders, shipwrights, carpenters, smiths (including silversmiths), ivory workers, etc., were all *fabri*. The *figuli* produced two classes of pottery—*opus figlinum*, corresponding to our porcelain, and *opus doliare* (from *dolium*, a large jar), a coarser type of work, including vessels and vases of any shape, roof-tiles, water-pipes, etc. The manufactories of these (*figlinæ*) were generally owned by capitalists.

25. Building, metal-work, etc.—The *stone* used for building in the Roman Empire was of necessity generally taken from the districts where the building was to be erected. Thus at Rome, the tufa, the green-grey peperino, and the travertine of the neighbourhood provided what was necessary for monumental buildings. Private houses there were at first built of unburnt bricks, but afterwards of the much more durable burnt bricks. From Greek lands Rome learned the practice of using marble casings for the walls, as well as solid marble pillars to support the upper parts of buildings. White marble was obtained from Hymettus, Pentelicus, Paros, Thasos, Lesbos, and Tyre, and others from the Propontis, Gaul, Egypt, Eubœa, Laconia, Thessaly, Numidia, Lydia, Caria, Phrygia (especially Synnada), etc. The transport of these was an important part of Roman trade, and stone-breakers, stone-cutters, and stone-polishers abounded. The mosaic workers, who constructed their pattern for pavements of houses out of small pieces of stone and glass, deserve mention, as also the constructors of tessellated pavements, including the *opus uermiculatum* and the λιθόστρωτον (Jn 19^{13}). The geometrical and pictorial elements were always distinguished. The pictorial part consisted sometimes of a landscape. The workers in mosaic were Romans or Romanized provincials. In building operations there were, of course, various classes of workmen concerned—stone-cutters, builders, pavement-makers (of various orders according to the kind of pavement), white-washers, wall-painters (often with real artistic power), lime-dealers, lime-burners, paint-sellers, brick-makers, etc.

In clay were constructed *bricks* of various kinds for walls (unburnt, called πλίνθος, *later*; burnt, κέραμος, *testa*), etc., and tiles for roofs, the *imbrices*, the rounded or upper tiles, and the *tegulæ*, or flat tiles (cf. Lk 5^{19}, Ro 9^{21}, etc.). For house-building the air-dried brick was used in Greece and Rome. In Greece the baked brick was known fairly early, but was not introduced in Rome till the end of the Republic, and there gained only gradual vogue. These bricks were of various sizes. The burnt bricks were used by preference for important buildings. Other house-works in clay were pipes for heating, water-pipes, cubic and other forms of tile for mosaic, decorations on pillars, windows, cornices, gutters, outer and inner friezes. The last were in blocks with holes for nails, and often painted. Sarcophagi, drinking cups, bath-tubs, statues, lamps, were also made of clay. But the numerous kinds of terra-cotta vessels were the most conspicuous works in clay, the large wine casks (*dolia*), big enough to hold a man, the smaller wine-jars (*amphoræ* or *cadi*), the water pitcher (*urna*, ὑδρία, Jn $2^{6.7}$ 4^{28}), the *lagœna*, *ampulla*, *gutus*, *crater*, *cyathus*, *phiala* (Rev 16, etc., where of gold), *patera*, *calix*, *scyphus*, *cantharus*, *carchesium*, *ciborium*, wine-cups of various sizes and shapes, the mention of which is familiar to the reader of Horace (cf. Rev 2^{27}). Plates and dishes for food, such as the παροψίδες (Mt 23^{25}), washing basins, and cooking vessels of various kinds were also constructed of this useful material. Clay vessels were made in various colours—yellow-brown for wine casks and jars; red, various in shade and quality, for plates; grey and black.

Some reference has been made above to localities in which the manufacture of these vessels was carried on, such as various places in Italy, Greece, Spain, France, Germany, and Britain.

The *metals* in use in antiquity were especially gold, silver, copper, iron, and lead, which were subjected to the same processes as in modern times. Statuettes were made particularly in gold and silver, and there is a well-known reference to the latter in combination with shrines in Ac $19^{23\text{ff.}}$. Metal knobs as ornaments of sceptres, girdles, cups, bridles, etc., were known from early times. In the construction of weapons of war—shields, helmets, breastplates, etc. (cf. Eph $6^{11\text{ff.}}$)—metal played, of course, a very important part. Wooden furniture of all kinds, such as couches, cupboards, chests, carriages, was tipped with metal or covered with metal plates, generally with relief work on them. In addition to the metals as above mentioned, bronze (1 Co 13^{1}) was much used for a great variety of purposes. A special department of metal work was that of wine-cups and other table furniture. The Roman tables were laden with silver plate, and the smaller houses took pride in their silver salt-cellars, which had descended as heirlooms, if they had nothing larger to pride themselves on. Of cast-metal the finest products were the Corinthian bronze statues, worth more than their weight in gold. Gold itself was used for collars, armlets, chaplets, charms, finger-rings (Ja 2^{2}), as well as for coins, hair-pins, hair-nets, bandeaux, ear-rings, necklets, chains, bracelets, anklets, brooches, etc., either set with precious stones or not. It is hardly necessary to mention the use of metal for needles, pens, surgical instruments, knives, skin-scrapers, etc.

Wood obtained from the wood-merchants was used especially in the building of houses and ships. The builders of these were divided into various classes according to the particular work which each undertook, and the workers, like all others, were members of trade-gilds. The most elaborate internal work was that of the wonderful ceilings (*lacunaria*, *laquearia*) which became such a feature of the richer Roman houses. Tables, of which the most expensive were those of citrus wood from North Africa, couches of all kinds, chairs of various kinds, and benches were made of wood. Vehicles of all sorts were constructed for the most part of wood. It is remarkable that nearly all their types were of Gaulish origin, though certain of them (*pilenta*, *carpenta*) were early Roman. Sedan chairs must not be forgotten; they were much used in the city of Rome, because heavier carriages were forbidden there.

Leather work has already been referred to above in connexion with clothing. It was employed also for harness, tilts, armour, tents, saddles, whips, lashes, etc. *Ivory* was used for the decoration of walls, doors, couches, chairs, carriages, tables, sceptres, boxes, hilts of swords, etc. Ivory work came from the East through the Phœnicians to Latium. *Glass* work was later in becoming known at Rome than any other already mentioned, though known in Egypt as early as the third millennium B.C. It was known later in Assyria and Phœnicia. In Italy it first became known as a material for the manufacture of bottles, cups, plates, dishes, glasses, and lamps. Imitations of certain precious stones were made in it, as the process of colouring was known. The finest work was in the production of cameos and intaglios. The industry was in fact widespread in our period. Glass was also quite well known in windows, as well as for mosaics, already mentioned.

For the eye-powder for which Phrygia was famous (cf. Rev 3^{18}) see W. M. Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, i. [Oxford, 1895] 52.

LITERATURE.—H. Blümner, *Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste bei Griechen und Römern*, i.^{2} [Leipzig, 1912]; J. Marquardt, *Das Privatleben der Römer*, pt. i., do., 1879; L. Friedländer, *Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire*, Eng. tr., i. [London, 1908] ch. vi.; the relevant chapters in J. E. Sandys, *A Companion to Latin Studies*^{2}, Cambridge, 1913; H. S. Jones, *Companion to Roman History*, Oxford, 1912; on the trade of the Italian towns, L. Friedländer, *Petronii Cena Trimalchionis*, Leipzig, 1891, p. 19 ff.

A. SOUTER.

TRADITION.—The body of religious literature contained in the OT is itself largely the deposit of oral tradition. As the result of its progressive canonization, this literature acquired the character of a fixed norm of faith and conduct. But the study devoted to the Scriptures (מִדְרָשׁ, 'seeking,' 'searching') led to a vast development in the religious traditions of Judaism. On the one hand, through the ceaseless activity of the scribes, the written Law was enriched by a wealth of oral statutes (תּוֹרָה שֶׁבְּעַל־פֶּה, 'the Torah that came by mouth'), partly natural expansions of the Law, arising from the force of custom and the new necessities of life, or as legal precedents from the courts of justice, partly definitions, interpretations, or detailed applications of the Law. From their direct bearing on matters of conduct, these new statutes were described as Hălākhôth (from הָלַךְ, 'go'), that is, rules governing the normal walk of life. But, while the scholastic mind thus busied itself with details of the Law, the imagination of more poetical spirits played around the narrative parts of Scripture, embellishing the history of Israel with a rich garland of legend, allegory, metaphysics, and morals, often grotesque enough, yet 'full of the strength and glow of faith' (H. Heine, *Jehuda ben Halevy*, pt. i. stanza 34). These more imaginative elements of tradition were termed Hăggādôth (from הִגִּיד, 'show,' 'tell'), that is, lessons of life taught by way of principles and examples, actual or fictitious (less probably, tales or legends as products of the story-telling gift).

The oral character of both these developments of OT literature was long preserved. As late as the Christian era, the traditional Law was known as מִצְוֹת זְקֵנִים, the 'command of the elders' (cf. the NT παράδοσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, 'tradition of the elders'), and a distinct prejudice operated against any part of its contents being reduced to writing. After the destruction of the Temple, however, the title Mishna (from שָׁנָה, 'repeat'), most probably in the sense of 'study' or 'teaching' (in spite of the *δευτέρωσις* of the Church Fathers), came to be applied to the oral Law; and various collections were now made by leading scholars like Hillel and Aḳiba, the standard edition being that of Judah ha-Nasi (*c.* A.D. 200). The Mishna itself is a compilation of Hălākhôth, or formal statutes; but the Gemara, or 'supplement' of the Mishna (from גְּמַר, 'complete'), contains many Hăggādôth as well. These were taken over by the Talmuds, especially the Babylonian Talmud, which contains by far the richest treasury of Jewish traditions.

Although originally mere expansions or embellishments of Scripture, the Halakhic traditions in particular acquired an authority and influence equal to those of the Law itself. This principle was explicitly taught in the schools of both Hillel and Shammai, and was accepted by the Pharisees generally, while the conservative Sadducees rejected the claims of tradition *in toto* (Jos. *Ant.* XIII. x. 6). Among the more rigid Pharisees, indeed, the oral Law was held to possess an even greater sanctity than the written; for the oral was the 'perfection' of the written, and he who knew and followed it was wiser and holier than he who observed merely the written. Thus the idea grew up that the traditional Law also was given to Moses on Sinai, and was delivered by him to Joshua, and by him to the elders, and by them to the prophets, and by them to the men of the Great Synagogue, and thence to the present generation (*Pirḳe Aboth*, i. 1 ff.). In later Talmudic tradition, the Law given to Moses was said to cover the whole body of Rabbinic doctrines. Thus the real heart of the Law was buried beneath the dead weight of tradition; and men too often used their zeal for tradition as a means of evading the moral demands of the Law (Mt $15^{2ff.}$, Mk $7^{1ff.}$, etc.).

The conflict with traditionalism, which figures so prominently in the Gospels, sinks into insignificance in the rest of the NT. The problem that confronted St. Paul was that of the Law itself, while the other writers were concerned with the weighty matters of Christian faith and life. Only a few faint traces of tradition appear in their writings—mere survivals from the dead past of Judaism. Thus the allusions of St. Stephen to the burial of Jacob and all his children in Sychem, to Moses' learning 'in all the wisdom of the Egyptians,' and to the presence of angels at the giving of the Law (Ac $7^{15f.\ 22.\ 38.\ 53}$) are doubtless drawn from Jewish Hăggādôth; examples of the same thing are found in St. Paul's references to the Rock that followed the Israelites (1 Co 10^{4}), to the seducing of Eve by the serpent (2 Co 11^{3}), and to the ministry of angels (Gal 3^{19}; cf. He 2^{2}), while the direct use of Haggadic literature is suggested in such texts as 2 Ti $3^{8f.}$, 1 P $3^{19ff.}$, 2 P $2^{4ff.}$, Jude $^{6ff.}$. The influence of Halakhic exegesis is equally evident in the Apostle's method of argument in Ro $9^{7ff.}$, Gal $4^{21ff.}$, 1 Co $9^{9f.}$ (cf. 1 Ti 5^{18}).

LITERATURE.—L. Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, Berlin, 1832; E. Deutsch, *The Talmud*, in his *Literary Remains*, London, 1874; H. L. Strack, *Einleitung in den Talmud*^{4}, Leipzig, 1908; M. Mielziner, *Introduction to the Talmud*^{2}, New York, 1903; S. Schechter, art. 'Talmud,' in *HDB* v. 57 ff.; W. Bacher, *Die Agada der Tannaiten*, 2 vols., Strassburg, 1884–90, *Die Agada der babylonischen Amoräer*, do., 1878, *Die Agada der palästinischen Amoräer*, 3 vols., do., 1892–99; F. Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*^{2}, Leipzig, 1897; E. Schürer, *GJV*^{4} i. [do., 1902] 111 ff., ii. [do., 1907] 381 ff. (*HJP* I. [Edinburgh, 1890] i. 117 ff., II. [do., 1890] i. 320 ff.); R. T. Herford, *Pharisaism*, 1912; J. Z. Lauterbach, art. 'Oral Law,' in *JE* ix. 423 ff.; A. C. Zenos, art. 'Tradition,' in *DCG* ii. 741 f.; H. St. J. Thackeray, *Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*, London, 1900.

A. R. GORDON.

TRAJAN.—Trajan's reign is of interest to the student of early Church history on account of its connexion with the treatment of Christians by the State. Spain, which had contributed during the 1st cent. a long line of celebrated names to Roman literature,—the Elder Seneca, Seneca the philosopher, Columella the agriculturist, Pomponius Mela the geographer, Lucan the epic poet, Martial the epigrammatist, and Quintilian the rhetorician,—gave in Trajan its first Emperor to the Roman Empire.

M. Ulpius Traianus was born at Italica, in the province of Hispania Baetica, which corresponded territorially to the modern Andalucia, on Sept. 18, A.D. 52 or 53. His father was the first of the family to attain to senatorial rank. Young Trajan served as military tribune under his father, who was governor of the important province Syria, in the year 76. This was only part of an extremely extensive military experience which fell to the lot of the future Emperor in his early manhood. It may be doubted, in fact, if any other aristocrat of the day had spent as much time in the field. Fortified by an assured military reputation, he returned to Rome in 78, and then passed through the regular succession of offices, attaining the prætorship, probably in 85. From 89 to 97 he was in command of a legion serving successively in Spain and Germany, and in the latter country he quelled a revolt of two legions at Vindonissa (modern Windisch). In recognition of these services, he was made one of the two chief consuls for 91. After a period of inaction he was, at the election of Nerva as Emperor in 96, appointed governor of the mountainous part of Germany (*provincia Germania Superior*), to secure a new frontier to the Empire, taking in the Agri Decumates (modern Schwarzwald, Black Forest). The aged Nerva on 27th October 97 adopted him as his son and successor, and he thus took the name Imperator Cæsar Nerva Traianus Augustus. In the same year he obtained the honorary title 'Germanicus' for his military exploits against the Germans. Later titles conferred upon him may be here enumerated: 'Pater Patriæ' in 98, 'Dacicus' at the end of 102, 'Optimus' in 114, and 'Parthicus' in 116. Nerva died on 25th January 98, and Trajan thus succeeded to the sole rule of the Empire, but he did not leave Germany till about a year after his accession. In 99 he reached Rome. He had already proved himself the ablest general of the time. He now showed affability to all classes, and conducted all his relations with the Senate and aristocracy in the most tactful manner. Details of his rule need not be given, but those best qualified to judge consider that of all the Roman Emperors, with the possible exception of Augustus, Trajan was the wisest, most competent, and greatest. Much of his reign was spent in necessary military operations, but the conduct of civil affairs was quite as excellent. The Emperor had to leave Rome in March 101 for the invasion of Dacia, which had proved a very troublesome foe in the time of Domitian. After two campaigns the Decebalus was defeated and his capital Sarmizegetusa captured (end of 102). A permanent bridge over the Danube, still in use, was built at Drobetæ. A rising of the Decebalus, however, took place late in 104, and early in 105 Dacia was again invaded by the Romans. Baffled and defeated, the Decebalus committed suicide. The Dacian population was almost completely exterminated, and a new province Dacia was created, to which colonists were introduced from various parts of the Empire. These were the ancestors of the present inhabitants of Transylvania and Rumania, and their origin explains the character of the Rumanian language and the sympathies of the

Rumanian people to-day. By the end of 106 Trajan was again in Rome. In the preceding year it had been necessary, in the interests of trade, to annex the territory of the turbulent Nabatæan tribes of Arabia Petræa, and thus the Roman province Arabia was formed. From 106 to about 112 Trajan was in Italy, and among much beneficial legislation the permanent establishment of the system of *alimentationes*, inaugurated by Nerva, deserves mention. This was a system for the support of poor boys and girls, including orphans and foundlings, throughout Italy. Trajan's Forum and its features have been referred to in the article ROME. His interest in provincial government comes out in the official correspondence with C. Plinius Cæcilius Secundus, governor of the province Bithynia-Pontus about 111–113. The reader is impressed by 'the careful attention paid to details . . . the consistent desire . . . to respect local customs and usages, the avoidance of general rules and principles, and the equitable spirit which insists on the execution of the laws, but observes vested interests, and avoids the appearance of anything arbitrary' (E. G. Hardy, *C. Plinii Cæcilii Secundi Epistulæ ad Traianum Imperatorem cum eiusdem Responsis*, p. 12). Pliny, having written that he had never taken part in trials of Christians, asked the Emperor what procedure he ought to follow. Trajan laid down that they must not be sought out, but that if duly prosecuted and convicted they must pay the penalty of execution. There is no real reason to suppose that Trajan inaugurated this policy. It was probably in the time of Vespasian or one of the other Flavian Emperors that the confession of Christianity in itself began to be regarded as an offence against the State, punishable with death. The affairs of Armenia caused the inevitable conflict with the Parthians on the eastern frontier, which occupied the last years of Trajan's life. The Emperor himself set out for the East at the end of 113, and in a succession of campaigns he was able to subdue the enemies of Rome and to add three provinces to the Empire—Armenia minor, Mesopotamia, and Assyria. But the conquest had been too rapid, and the last had to be relinquished. Trajan died at Selinus in Cilicia in August, 117.

LITERATURE.—The chief ancient authorities are Xiphilinus' Epitome of *Dio Cassius*, bk. lxviii.; Pliny, *Panegyricus* and *Correspondence with Trajan*. There are also many important inscriptions and coins. Besides the relevant parts of the histories of H. Schiller, *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*, i. [Gotha, 1883]; V. Duruy, *History of Rome*, Eng. tr., 6 vols., London, 1883–86; J. B. Bury, *Student's History of the Roman Empire*, do., 1893; A. von Domaszewski, *Geschichte der römischen Kaiser*, ii. [Leipzig, 1909] 171–185, there are the special monographs: J. Dierauer, *Beiträge zu einer kritischen Geschichte Trajans*, Leipzig, 1868; G. A. T. Davies, Lecturer in Roman History in the University of Aberdeen, is preparing a monograph on the Dacian campaigns (cf. his paper 'The Dacian Campaign of Trajan in A.D. 102,' read before the Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies on 3rd March 1914, and to be published in *JRS*); E. G. Hardy's *C. Plinii Cæcilii Secundi Epistulæ ad Traianum Imperatorem cum eiusdem Responsis*, London, 1889, is important. On Trajan's attitude to the Christians, consult W. M. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire before A.D. 170*, do., 1893, ch. x. pp. 196–225, and E. G. Hardy, *Studies in Roman History*, do., 1906, ch. vi. pp. 78–95; K. J. Neumann, *Der römische Staat und die allgemeine Kirche bis auf Diocletian*, i. [Leipzig, 1890] 17–26, may also be read.

A. SOUTER.

TRANCE.—The English word, derived through the French from Lat. *transitus*, is the translation of the Gr. ἔκστασις, which means 'standing out' of oneself, or outside of one's ordinary consciousness. It is used very loosely to describe the sleep-like state which is obviously different from that of ordinary sleep. Originally the soul was supposed to be temporarily withdrawn from the body; at the present time no such theory is generally held, but F. W. H. Myers would regard it as the abeyance of the supraliminal self, in order that the subliminal may be free to act. It is stated that Peter fell into a trance, by which is meant that whilst his body was probably in a cataleptic condition his spirit was engaged in beholding a vision (ὅραμα, Ac 10^{19} 11^{5}). St. Paul was in a trance whilst praying in the Temple, when he saw the Lord and heard His voice (22^{17}). The second stage of trance mentioned by Myers may be said to be reached when visions, or ecstasy proper, are experienced. The third stage which he mentions embraces those instanced in the NT as cases of demoniacal possession. Trance states are said by E. D. Starbuck to be 'the result of an over emphasis and irradiation of the relaxation and anæsthesia which begin in the higher centres, and work until consciousness is obliterated, and only the muscular centres are active, thus producing a cataleptic condition of the body' (*Psychology of Religion*, p. 168 f.). Ecstasy has in all ages been regarded as characteristic of periods of religious excitement, and the spectacle presented of a person in the condition of catalepsy has commonly inspired a sense of awe in the minds of beholders. It has been thought that 'the thorn in the flesh' of St. Paul was the physical accompaniment of his ecstasy. In the visions of Ezekiel (4^{4-8}) the bearing of the cords and the days of his boundness are considered by R. Kraetzschmar (*Das Buch Ezechiel*, 1900, pp. v, vi, 45, 46) to be the functional cataleptic paralysis that followed, first on one side and then on the other. St. Teresa (*Life*, Eng. tr., D. Lewis, 1904, p. 163) speaks of her body being perfectly powerless during her raptures and her limbs remaining fixed in one position. The ecstatic condition which frequently accompanies unusual religious excitement has often been deliberately cultivated by means of suggestion, fasting, music, and bodily contortions. The inner aspect of the phenomenon is treated more fully in the art. RAPTURE.

LITERATURE.—W. Morgan, art. 'Trance' in *HDB*; E. D. Starbuck, *The Psychology of Religion*^{2}, 1901; F. W. H. Myers, *Human Personality*, 1903, vol. ii. ch. ix.; F. von Hügel, *The Mystical Element of Religion*, 2 vols., 1908–09, ii. 45, 46.

J. G. JAMES.

TRANSFIGURATION.—Outside the Gospels the Transfiguration is only once directly referred to in the NT, in 2 P $1^{16ff.}$, where it is mentioned as showing the credibility of those who preached Christ's Parousia, seeing that they had been eyewitnesses (ἐπόπται) of His majesty (μεγαλειότης) and had heard the voice; cf. Jn 1^{14}, which also would seem to refer, *inter alia*, to the Transfiguration. Whatever view we take of the authorship of 2 Peter, the passage shows the importance of that event in the eyes of the early Christians. But why does not the writer appeal rather to the Ascension, of which the apostles were equally witnesses? The difficulty is the same, whether St. Peter or some later teacher wrote the Epistle. C. Bigg suggests, with much probability (*ICC*, 'St. Peter and St. Jude,' Edinburgh, 1901, pp. 231, 266), that those opponents who denied the Parousia perhaps denied the Resurrection as well, and that therefore it would have been useless for the writer to meet them by blankly affirming the fact of the Ascension; whereas they would acknowledge the truth of the events of our Lord's ministry. At any rate, the Epistle appeals to an event witnessed by St. Peter. This neither proves nor disproves the Petrine authorship. If the author was St. Peter (whether or not he gave a free hand to the scribe), the reference is natural enough; if he was a later writer wishing to pose as the Apostle, he might equally well introduce a Petrine reminiscence. It seems likely that the author, whoever he was, did not use the Gospel records, or at least not those which we now have. We notice (*a*) that he says that Jesus received from the Father honour and glory, which is not mentioned in the Gospels; (*b*) that he uses 'the excellent glory' for the 'bright cloud' of Mt 17^{5}; (*c*) that he speaks of the *holy* mountain (the adjective has been thought to betray a later date, when sacred sites might have been held in reverence—but why not in the Apostolic Age?); (*d*) that he quotes the words of the voice differently from the Synoptists, though he is nearest to St. Matthew; he has *εἰς ὃν ἐγὼ εὐδόκησα* (an unusual construction) for *ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα* of Mt 17^{5}; he omits 'hear ye him,' and in Codex B the order of the words is different. He also omits all reference to Moses and Elijah, but this does not affect the question of his source. The probable conclusion from these facts is that the writer, if he was not St. Peter, depended on oral tradition, and this would argue a comparatively early date. It has been noticed that in the context (2 P 1^{14}) we read of St. Peter's putting off his tabernacle (*σκήνωμα*) and of his departure (*ἔξοδος*), which may have been suggested by the *σκηναί* of Mk 9^{5} and ‖ Mt. Lk., and the *ἔξοδος* of our Lord in Lk 9^{31}, but this is very doubtful. It is possible that there is an indirect reference to the Transfiguration in 2 Co 3^{18} (note *μεταμορφούμεθα*; cf. Mk 9^{2}, Mt 17^{2}), but the reference is to the glory of the Ascended Lord.

A. J. Maclean.

TRANSLATION (*μετάθεσις*).—The word 'translation' is used of Enoch (*q.v.*) in He 11^{5}. The reference is to Gn 5^{24}, where we read: 'he was not; for God took (לָקַח) him,' the LXX translation being *οὐχ εὑρίσκετο, ὅτι μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεός*. The 'translation' of Enoch is mentioned in Sir 44^{16} (cf. also 49^{14}, 'he was taken up from the earth'), and is probably alluded to in Wis 4$^{7.\,10}$: 'a righteous man, though he die before his time, shall be at rest . . . and while living among sinners he was translated.' The NT passage adds an interpretation of the 'translation,' namely, 'that he should not see death,' whereas the passages in Gen. and Sir. need not necessarily mean anything but a holy death; but it was undoubtedly the common belief that Enoch did not die. The similar word *μεθίστημι* is used of king Saul's death in Ac 13^{22}, and metaphorically in Col 1^{13} of our translation into the Kingdom of the Son.

A. .J Maclean.

TRAVEL.—See Roads and Travel.

TREASURE, TREASURER, TREASURY.—Three times in the literature of the apostolic period (2 Co 4^{7}, Col 2^{3}, He 11^{26}) we find *θησαυρός* in the sense of 'treasure.' The word is from *τίθημι* with the paragogic termination *-αυρος* and means primarily 'the receptacle for valuables' (cf. Mt 2^{11}). But in the sense of 'treasury' we do not find it in the NT outside of Mt 12^{35} 13^{52} and Lk 6^{45}. Elsewhere it is used of the things in the receptacle, the valuables, the treasure. In He 11^{26} the word is applied to 'the treasures of Egypt' which Moses gave up for the reproach of Christ, which he considered greater riches. Here the term wavers between the literal and the metaphorical. But in the other two examples the metaphorical alone appears. In 2 Co 4^{7} it is the ministry of the gospel of Christ, and in Col 2^{3} it is the riches of wisdom in Christ, far in excess of human wisdom or the wisdom offered in the so-called 'mystery-religions' of the time. In Ac 8^{27} *γάζα* is a Persian word current in the *κοινή* (see 2 Es 5^{17} 7^{20}; Polyb., Diod., Plut., etc.). The Persians used it for both 'treasury' and 'treasure,' as the Greeks did *θησαυρός* (see above); cf. Curt. III. xiii. 5.

'Treasurer' occurs only in Ro 16^{23}: 'Erastus the treasurer of the city.' Here the word is *οἰκονόμος* (*οἶκος*, 'house,' and *νέμω*, 'manage'), 'manager of a house,' 'steward,' 'superintendent.' So *ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως* means 'superintendent of the city's business,' 'treasurer' (Vulg. *arcarius civitatis*); cf. Est 8^{9}, 1 Es 4^{49}, Jos. *Ant.* XII. iv. 7. The term is applied to apostles and ministers as God's stewards (1 Co 4^{1}, Tit 1^{7}). As a matter of fact the Eunuch of Ethiopia was queen Candace's treasurer 'over all her treasure' (Ac 8^{27}).

A. T. Robertson.

TREE (*ξύλον*).—'Tree' is used five times in the NT as a synonym for the Cross (Ac 5^{30} 10^{39} 13^{29}, Gal 3^{13}, 1 P 2^{24}). In classical Greek *ξύλον* means wood cut, timber (as in 1 Co 3^{12}, Rev 18^{12}); an instrument of punishment, resembling the pillory (Herod. vi. 75, ix. 37; so in Ac 16^{24}); rarely a living tree (as in Rev 22$^{2.\,14.\,19}$); and never a cross. But in the LXX, where *ξύλον* is used for עֵץ, 'tree,' the phrase 'hang on a tree' occurs several times (Gn 40^{19}, Dt 21^{22}, Jos 10^{26}); and the dread saying, *κατηραμένος ὑπὸ θεοῦ πᾶς κρεμάμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου* ('maledictus a Deo est qui pendet in ligno'), seems to have been applied very early in the Christian Church—apparently many years before the writing of the Epistle to the Galatians—with a deep theological meaning as well as a poignant pathos, to the death of Christ, whose Cross then came to be commonly known as 'the tree.'

Among the ancient Israelites the criminal was not executed by being hanged, but hanged after execution, his corpse being exposed before all eyes as a proof that he had met the reward of his deeds (2 S 4^{12} 21$^{9.\,10}$). But Gn 40^{19}, which refers to a case in Egypt, may denote a death by suspension (see J. Skinner, *ICC*, 'Genesis,' Edinburgh, 1910). Be that as it may, the tree used for this gruesome purpose was no doubt a literal living tree, not an artificial 'gallows-tree.'

The Cross is called 'a tree' in two addresses which are said to have been delivered by St. Peter (Ac 5^{30} 10^{39}), and 1 P 2^{24} refers to Christ bearing our sins in His body upon the tree. Cf. also St. Paul's words in Ac 13^{29} with Gal 3^{13}. The theme 'crux est arbor' is a favourite one in mediæval poetry, and 'the tree' is a common synonym for 'the Cross' in modern hymnology.

In Jude ^{12} apostates are compared to autumn trees without fruit. The writer of the Apocalypse refers to a conflagration among forest trees (8^{7}); also to trees spared by hurricanes (7$^{1.\,3}$) and by locusts (9^{4}). See also Tree of Life.

James Strahan.

TREE OF LIFE.—**1. Sources.**—There are three sources for our knowledge of the idea of the tree of life: the OT, Jewish apocalypses and Jewish theology, and ethnic legends.

(1) In the OT the tree of life appears neither in Psalms nor in the Prophets, but only in Genesis and Proverbs. The Genesis story (2^{9} 3^{22}) intimates that there are two objects which man would grasp at—knowledge and immortality. It has been maintained, however, that in Gn 2^{9} the tree of life is a later addition, and was inserted only when the idea of the under world had suffered such a change that immortality became an object of desire (K. Budde, *Die biblische Urgeschichte untersucht*, Giessen, 1883, p. 53 f.; but cf. A. Dillmann, *Genesis*, Eng. tr., Edinburgh, 1897, i. 121 f.). In any case, by reason of his sin man was not permitted to eat of the fruit of this tree, which signified fullness of life. Driven out from the Garden of Eden, he was effectually debarred from this Divine good. In Proverbs (3^{18} 11^{30} 13^{12} 15^{4}) wisdom, the fruit of the righteous, desire fulfilled, and a wholesome tongue are each a 'tree of life.' The reference is not to the recovery of a lost, or to the winning of a future, but to the enjoyment of a present, good (cf. Budde, *op. cit.*, p. 85 f.).

(2) In Jewish apocalyptic three constant factors are associated with the tree of life: it is in Paradise; the righteous have access to its fruit; it will be available only after the judgment. Its first appearance is in *Enoch*, xxiv. 1–6, xxv. 4–6, xxxi. 1–3 (cf. *Slavonic Enoch*, viii. 3–5, *4 Ezr.* vii. 123, viii. 52, *Pss.-Sol.* xiv. 3, *Test. of Levi*, xviii.—a Christian interpolation [?]). According to Jewish theology, its branches cover the whole of Paradise, and it has 500,000 kinds of taste and smell (F. Weber, *Jüd. Theologie*^{2}, Leipzig, 1897, p. 346; A. Wünsche, *Die Sagen vom Lebensbaum und Lebenswasser*, Leipzig, 1905).

(3) All Oriental religions which have risen above the nature stage have their legends of a tree of life. Sometimes it appears in a simple, at other times in a fantastic, form; but whoever, even a god, partakes of its fruit or its sap renews and preserves his life (cf. E. Schrader, *JPTh* i. [1875] 124 ff.; W. W. von Baudissin, *Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, ii. [Leipzig, 1878] 189 ff.; Friedrich Delitzsch, *Wo lag das Paradies?*, Leipzig, 1881, p. 148 f.). In the Babylonian-Assyrian circle this tree was date-palm, cedar, or vine (F. R. Tennant, *The Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin*, Cambridge, 1903, p. 49; T. G. Pinches, *The OT in the Light of the Historical Records and Legends of Assyria and Babylonia*^{2}, London, 1903, p. 71 ff.). In the Gilgamesh Epic the hero obtained a scion from the 'plant of life' which healed his mortal illness (cf. B. Meissner, *Ein altbabylon. Fragment des Gilgamosepos*, Berlin, 1902; A. Jeremias, *Die babylonisch-assyrischen Vorstellungen vom Leben nach dem Tode*, Leipzig, 1887, p. 93). In the Zend-Avesta the tree of life is the white Haoma—death-destroyer—similar to a grape vine, with plentiful buds and jasmine-like leaves; whoever eats of the fruit becomes immortal (*SBE* xxiii. [1883] 20; cf. *Rigveda*, x. xcvii. 17). The Hindu tree of life grows in the midst of water; whoever looks on it is made young.

Much that is fantastic and unreliable has been written by Assyriologists concerning the tree of life. Two facts, however, stand out as incontestable: there was throughout the ancient world a worship of trees, and man's dependence on particular trees for support of life offered the basis for a profound religious suggestion. 'The tree had always been the seat of Divine life and the intermediary between Divine and human nature. . . . In the holy tree the Divine life is bringing itself closer to man' (W. M. Ramsay, *The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia*, London, 1904, p. 248).

2. In Revelation.—The dependence of the idea of the tree of life in Revelation (2^7 22^{2,14}) upon earlier, especially Jewish, conceptions is evident. The legend has been traced to an Arabian or North African oasis, thence to Babylon, where the habitat of the tree became a garden; thence the Hebrews derived it (G. A. Barton, *A Sketch of Semitic Origins*, New York, 1902, p. 95 f.). With the shifting fortunes of Jerusalem, the garden was transformed into a city. The apocalyptists show this transformation under way. They picture the future as a garden (*Enoch*, xxiv., xxv.); then as a city—Jerusalem (*Pss.-Sol.* xvii. 33 f.; J. R. Harris, *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon*, Cambridge, 1909); finally, it is a city indeed, but with a garden enclosed (Rev 21 22^2; cf. also R. H. Charles, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*, Oxford, 1912, p. 53). Ezk 47^{12} has been influential here. In the prophet's vision, on each side of the river grow all trees bearing new fruits according to their months, which shall be for food, and their leaves for healing. The picture in the Revelation is of a city, in the midst of which is a garden; through this flows a river, on each bank of which is the tree of life (a word used collectively)—a row of trees bearing either twelve manner of fruits (AV, RV) or twelve crops (RVm). In the garden of God, then, grows the tree of life. For those who have been purified by faith, the doom man brought on himself in Eden, of prohibition from its food, is repealed. All that Judaism had lost, or mythology dreamed of, or Christianity awakened in the soul in the way of immortal longing was restored and fulfilled in the world to come. Not only is the fruit for food, but even the leaves have healing virtue. How this therapeutic property of the leaves is to be available for the 'nations' (cf. Rev 21$^{24-27}$, Is 60^3; *Enoch*, xxv. 4–6)—those not yet belonging to the New Jerusalem—is problematic. It may suggest the present functions of the Church in respect of social ills, or imply that after the Parousia the citizens of the city will have a ministry towards those outside, or, yet again, indicate that the writer had not fully assimilated the ideal proposed by Ezekiel (cf. C. A. Scott, *Revelation* [Century Bible], London, n.d., p. 297).

C. A. BECKWITH.

TRIAL.—See SUFFERING, TEMPTATION, TRIAL-AT-LAW.

TRIAL-AT-LAW.—**1. Primitive justice.**—The earliest form of justice was personal redress. An injury sustained by any primitive tribe, or individual member of the tribe, must be requited by those to whom the honour of the tribe was sacred. No account was taken of the motive; nor was it necessary to bring home crimes like murder to the actual perpetrator of the deed, still less to mete out vengeance by the exact measure of the wrong. The whole family or tribe of the criminal was held as guilty as himself, and had often to pay ten-fold the price of blood. Among the heathen Arabs the most honoured tribes were such as could boast, 'Never is blood of us poured forth without vengeance' (*Hamâsa*, ed. F. Rückert, Berlin, 1846, p. 15), and 'Never shall the avengers cease without their fifty' (*ib.*, p. 328). But murder was not the only crime that called for vengeance in blood. Everything that prejudiced the honour of the tribe—adultery, insult, wounds, and even robbery—was an offence worthy of death. The sensitive tribesman would not hesitate to shed blood 'but for the shoe's latchet' of his friend (C. J. Lyall, *Translations of Ancient Arabic Poetry*, London, 1885, p. 6 f.).

In this system of reprisals there were at least the germs of social justice; for the very ferocity of the vengeance deterred men from wrong-doing. But, once set in motion, tribal feuds were the source of interminable bloodshed. Thus society was driven in self-defence to seek a way out of them. It was hardly possible, indeed, to restrain the avenger of blood from exacting the due penalty of deliberate wrong. But compensation might be made for unpremeditated crimes by their price in cattle or money. Thus arose the widespread custom of submitting such cases to an arbiter or umpire chosen by the parties, with the full approval of the people. A suggestive example is found in the well-known picture on the shield of Achilles (Homer, *Il.* xviii. 497 ff.), where two men are represented 'striving about the blood-price of a man slain,' the one maintaining that he has paid the price in full, the other refusing to take aught (for to him there is no case for compensation), but both desirous of placing the issue in the hand of a daysman, and to this end demanding judgment of the elders, having first deposited in the midst the two talents of gold 'to give to him among them that spake the justest doom' (cf. Leaf's note *sub loco*).

We are still at the stage where the reference of a cause to an arbiter is purely voluntary, and neither party is legally bound by the decision given. But the force of public opinion was exerted increasingly on the side of law and order. The actual execution of justice was left to the injured party, and in the case of 'manifest' crimes like open murder and house-breaking ancient codes interposed no check on summary vengeance; but where the least doubt existed, and the accused claimed the privilege of trial, society demanded clear evidence of his guilt, at the same time seeking to control the fierce impulses of the avenger by limiting punishment to the responsible wrong-doer, and making the penalty correspond as nearly as possible to the gravity of the offence; in other words, replacing the principle of unrestricted vengeance by the *ius talionis*—'an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth.' This higher platform of justice is represented by the simple courts that survive to the present day among the Arabs of the desert, and in the primitive village communities of Southern Russia. The suspected offender is haled before the council of elders, presided over by the local sheikh or village headman. As the result of a sharp canvassing of the facts and testing of evidence, often supported by oath, and in earlier times by the ordeal of battle, fire, or water, a decision is arrived at, inspired by that swift instinct for justice so characteristic of the primitive mind, which the condemned party can evade only at the cost of expulsion from his kindred and tribe.

2. Hebrew procedure.—The roots of Hebrew justice are embedded in the primeval principle of reprisals. Thus the patriarchal legends of Israel claim among that people's ancestors the Bedouin chieftain Lamech, whose standard of vengeance was a life for a bruise, and seventy-and-seven lives for one (Gn $4^{23f.}$). But from the very dawn of national history the principle was restricted by the *ius talionis*, while summary execution was forbidden, except in the case of the red-handed criminal (Ex $21^{12ff.}$, Dt $19^{11ff.}$), or the son who defied his parents' authority ($21^{18ff.}$). Disputed cases were brought before the headman or leader of the people, who, in his combined capacity of priest and judge, submitted them to God (for decision by oracle, oath, or ordeal), and in His name gave authoritative sentence (cf. Ex $18^{13ff.}$). Such resort to the 'ordeal' of Divine judgment continued to be made in difficult questions (cf. $22^{8ff.}$, Nu $5^{11ff.}$, Jos $7^{16ff.}$, 1 S $14^{37ff.}$); but ordinary cases were decided by the 'elders' (*i.e.* the heads of families) seated as a formal court of justice. The institution of judgment by wise and able 'elders' is by the Elohistic writer ascribed to Moses, acting on the advice of his father-in-law Jethro (Ex $18^{17ff.}$), and appears in full force with the settlement of the people in Palestine. The procedure before these 'courts' was much the same as among other primitive nations. A formal charge or complaint must first be lodged by the injured party in the case, who forthwith summoned, or forcibly dragged, the offender before the elders. In grave matters of blasphemy or notorious crime, the person accused might be openly denounced by 'witnesses' in presence of the people (cf. 1 K 21^{13}). At a later date accusations were, occasionally at least, presented in writing (cf. Job 31^{35}). The case was debated before the elders seated in judgment, usually in the market-place in front of the city gate, and therefore in full audience of the citizens. In times of social disorder, as the prophets lament so frequently, justice could be bought and sold for money (cf. Am 6^{12}, Is 5^{23}, etc.); but as a rule judicial procedure in Israel was marked by a stern regard for right. Each party was allowed the fullest freedom to present his case (רִיב) before the judges. The strongest emphasis was placed on the character of the evidence given by each. If tangible proofs were not forthcoming, the presence of competent witnesses was encouraged by every means. A solemn adjuration was laid upon the eye-witness; and he that refused to tell what he had seen or heard was accounted a criminal (Lv 5^{1}, Pr 29^{24}). The defendant's rights were carefully safeguarded. In the *précis* of rules laid down in Deuteronomy, no doubt as the formulation of ancient practice, the testimony of two witnesses at least is required for condemnation. 'One witness shall not rise up against a man for any iniquity, or for any sin, in any sin that he sinneth: at the mouth of two witnesses, or at the mouth of three witnesses, shall a matter be established' (Dt 19^{15}). Even the evidence of two or three witnesses must not be accepted without proof. The judge is to examine their testimony as they stand 'before the Lord' (*i.e.*, doubtless, on oath administered by the priest), and to carry out on the person of the false witness 'as he had thought to do unto his brother,' thus putting away such evils from the midst of the people (vv.$^{16ff.}$). Later laws excluded the evidence of women and slaves, that of the former, according to Josephus, 'on account of the levity and boldness of their sex,' and of the latter 'on account of the ignobility of their soul' (*Ant.* IV. viii. 15).

Judgment was pronounced orally in the presence of both parties, and immediate effect was given to the sentence. Civil injuries were compensated, as a rule, by the exact equivalent of the loss sustained, though in the case of theft by two-, four-, or five-fold the amount (cf. the scale of damages in the Book of the Covenant, Ex $22^{1ff.}$). More serious crimes were punished by scourging, mutilation, or death by stoning. In the last case the witnesses cast the first stones, the rest of the people carrying through the execution, and thus sharing responsibility for the act of justice (Dt 17^{7}).

Though the old district courts survived till at least the age of Ezra, the establishment of the monarchy imposed limits on their authority. As supreme judge, the king not merely acted as a final court of appeal, but exercised independent powers as well. Thus David sat by the gate, in person or through his deputy, to hear the suits that came to him for judgment (2 S 14^{4} $15^{1ff.}$), while Solomon had a judgment-hall attached to his palace, where he tried such cases as baffled the ordinary judge (*e.g.* 1 K $3^{16ff.}$), and matters generally affecting the welfare of the people. The judgment of kings like David and Solomon was naturally influenced by regard for the best interests of the people; but in the hands of more reckless monarchs this judicial absolutism was the source of grave perversions of justice, such as the suborning of false witnesses to compass the death of the innocent (1 K $21^{8ff.}$), or the removal by banishment or imprisonment of good citizens whose presence was obnoxious to the king (*e.g.* Jer $32^{2ff.}$).

A certain safeguard against injustice was found in the growing influence of the priesthood. As administrators of the oath, and keepers of the sacred lot (the Urim and Thummim), they had long enjoyed special authority in the courts. To them was further entrusted the codifying of legal decisions (מִשְׁפָּטִים). They thus acquired a definite position as judicial advisers (cf. Dt 17^{9} 19^{17}). On the fall of the monarchy they assumed the full responsibilities of justice. The high priest was the virtual king of the new spiritual community, with the lower priests as a council of assessors to confer with him in judgment. Thence was evolved the court of the Sanhedrin, the institution of which dates probably from the beginning of the Greek era. The name is sometimes used of the local courts of seven that now finally superseded the original councils of elders. It was technically applied, however, to the Great Sanhedrin of Jerusalem, the 71 members of which decided all cases of appeal from the lower courts, as well as the graver questions of law and conduct. The rules of procedure are codified in the Mishna *Sanhedrin* (*c.* A.D. 200), and show how strongly the passion for justice still possessed the Jewish mind—although gross miscarriages of justice may sometimes have occurred in practice—and how closely mercy is linked with judgment. Even in civil suits the principle is laid down that 'the court shall not listen to the claims of one party in the absence of the other' (i. 1); proof is required of every claim, however slight a bearing it may have on the main issue; the evidence of relatives and other interested persons, also of gamblers, usurers, and those 'vicious in money matters' (though not necessarily 'in heavenly matters'), is disallowed; and judgment must be given for the defendant if the case fails of proof (iv. 1 ff.). Far more stringent rules are prescribed for the conduct of criminal charges where life is at stake. Each witness must be carefully examined, after the most solemn adjuration to tell the truth, in the name of 'the Holy and the Blessed.' In the event of discrepancies, the accused was allowed the benefit of the doubt. Expert students of the law were likewise permitted to speak on his behalf, but not against him. In civil cases the judges might pronounce their opinions in any order; in criminal trials those in favour of acquittal must speak first. For acquittal a bare majority was sufficient, while for condemnation a majority of two at least was required; and, whereas a judge who had voted for guilt might change his mind, a vote for acquittal was irrevocable. If the accused was found innocent, the case was dismissed before nightfall; otherwise, judgment was deferred till the following day, the court meanwhile conferring together, 'eating little meat, and drinking no wine during that whole day.' On the morrow they voted afresh on the case, with the same precautions as before. Even after sentence of death was finally passed, the court remained sitting, to receive any evidence that might yet be brought in the criminal's favour; and he would be recalled, at a given signal, from the very place of execution (v. 5, vi. 1).

3. Procedure in Roman courts.—The judicial procedure of the Romans shows a decided advance in legal precision. There are still, indeed, survivals of primitive justice. Thus the technical term for joinder of issue—*manus consertio*—recalls the physical struggle for possession which originally took the place of judgment, while 'the magistrate carefully simulated the demeanour of a private arbitrator casually called in' (H. S. Maine, *Ancient Law*, p. 383 f.). The earlier method of decision, too, was by the *sacramentum* or oath taken before the pontiffs. But the religious administration of oaths soon yielded to a purely secular process. Clear distinctions were drawn between cases civil and criminal, separate courts being assigned to each. By the strict division between procedure *in iure* (before the magistrate) and that *in iudicio* (before the judge), the first bold steps also were taken towards the modern system of trial by jury.

In civil cases, the principal form of action was the *Legis actio sacramento*, a survival of the trial by oath before the pontiffs. Proceedings were invariably begun by the plaintiff, who found his man, summoned him by word of mouth to accompany him before the magistrate, haling him by force (*manus iniectio*) if he refused, or poinding his goods (*pignoris capio*) if he shut himself up in his house. The plaintiff stated his ground of complaint before the magistrate (king, consul, or prætor), and a date was fixed for further procedure, both parties engaging to present themselves, and the defendant offering securities (*vades*). On the day appointed, each appeared in court with a staff (*festuca*), the symbol of ownership, by which he laid claim (*vindicatio*) to the person or property in question. Issue being thus joined, both took the *sacramentum* (now secularized into a mere staking of money against defeat), and the case was referred to a special *iudex* or arbiter, before whom proceedings passed *in iudicium*. The formal question to be here decided was, 'Is the *sacramentum* of N. N. just or unjust?' This, however, raised the whole question afresh. According to ancient custom, the *persona* or *res* in dispute must be present in court. If the *res* were immoveable, the court adjourned to the place, and *vindicatio* was made there, though at a later date some turf or stone taken from the spot was accepted in lieu of the property. The claim being made and disputed, probation was led before the *iudex*, and judgment given always in view of the specific charge, any failure to make good the full claim being regarded as a ground for acquittal.

The cumbrous methods and insecurity of the sacramental process led to the gradual adoption of the 'formular' system so widely in vogue during the Ciceronian age. Under this system the prætor (who from 367 B.C. presided over Roman justice as a whole), on hearing the claims of both parties *in iure*, drew up a judicial *formula*, embodying a brief statement of the case in dispute (*demonstratio*), the plaintiff's claim (*intentio*), a request to the judge to adjudicate the person or property as he thought most fitting (*adjudicatio*), and instructions to condemn the accused or dismiss the case as the evidence warranted (*condemnatio*). The *formula* being accepted by both parties and their respective witnesses (*litis contestatio*), it was forwarded to a *iudex*, to be tried on a day fixed by the court. The hearing before the judge was always in public, the judge being usually accompanied by a board of assessors (*concilium*), and the parties by skilled lawyers and orators (*advocati* and *patroni*), who helped them in their pleadings. The charge was presented by plaintiff or his counsel, the defence following with the counter-plea, a sharp *altercatio* or cross-examination usually terminating this part of the proceedings. Evidence was produced and commented on during the pleadings. In civil cases witnesses appeared voluntarily, their evidence being taken on oath (that of slaves under torture, but only in default of other witness). Written documents and declarations (*tabulæ*, *codices*, or *instrumenta*) might also be produced; and the opinions of juris-consults were often laid before the judge. The burden of proof rested, as a rule, on the pursuer; but the judge was allowed a wide discretion, subject only to the instructions given in the *formula*. On the full hearing of the case, the judge retired *in consilium*, to discuss the evidence with his assessors and arrive at an equitable decision. Judgment was delivered orally, without reasons given, in presence of both parties. Execution of judgment was left to the winner; but strong judicial pressure was brought to bear on a recalcitrant debtor. Appeal was allowed, either by a simple *Appello* in court, or by application for a dimissory letter to the judge of appeal, the letter stating the fact of the appeal and the names of parties and judge. The appeal involved a rehearing of the whole case, new facts and witnesses being freely allowed. Final judgment was arrived at through the evidence submitted to the higher court; and an unsuccessful appellant was made liable for four-fold his rival's costs in appeal.

Criminal cases were originally tried before the king in person; but at an early date special *duumviri perduellionis* and *quæstores parricidii* were appointed for charges of treason and murder. Appeal to the people against the death sentence (*provocatio ad populum*) was allowed as a right from the first year of the Republic; thus criminal cases came more and more to be tried directly before the *comitia populi*. Proceedings here began with an *inquisitio* or preliminary investigation, conducted by the magistrate in presence of a *contio*, or informal gathering of the people, which sat for three days, and heard evidence on both sides. The result of each day's investigation was embodied in a tentative *accusatio*, which could be modified or expanded by subsequent evidence. On the third day the charge was definitely formulated; and after an interval of three market-days (24 days), as a *quarta accusatio*, backed by a fresh *contio* of the people, it was brought before the *comitia* in the shape of a Bill (*inrogatio*) to be passed or rejected by vote of the assembly. The case against the accused was formally presented by the magistrate; defence was made in person, or by friends of the accused (the assistance of advocates being permitted in the later period of the Republic); witnesses were heard and examined as in civil suits; the *comitia* then voted as in the regular legislative proceedings of the assembly, and sentence was pronounced by the magistrate in terms of the vote. Execution was forthwith carried out by officials of the court, unless the accused had previously made good his escape and become an exile.

The multiplicity of criminal cases under the Republic suggested the institution of special courts (*quæstiones*), which Maine has aptly compared with the Committees of the House of Commons (*Ancient Law*, p. 391). The 1st cent. B.C. saw a vast development of this system in the shape of the *quæstiones perpetuæ*, or Standing Committees, which dealt with all the more serious crimes. The institution of these courts was 'in some sort a fusion of the processes of civil jurisdiction with those of the old criminal courts' (A. H. J. Greenidge, *The Legal Procedure of Cicero's Time*, p. 415). Here, however, the old distinction between *ius* and *iudicium* was abolished, the prætor presiding during the whole progress of the case. A criminal charge was likewise opened by a personal *postulatio* or request to the prætor for permission to institute proceedings. This might be made by any citizen (except an official), but must be supported by an oath of good faith. After some interval the *nominis* (or *criminis*) *delatio*—a more precise specification of the charge—was presented to the magistrate, usually in presence of the accused. A brief *interrogatio* or oral examination of the accused satisfied the prætor whether a *prima facie* case existed for further proceedings or the charge was the result of mere malice, and exposed the accuser to action for *calumnia*. If the case was allowed, the prætor drew up a written statement of the charge (*inscriptio*), which was signed by the prosecutor and his supporters (*subscriptores*), and formally accepted by the prætor (*nominis receptio*). The court was summoned to meet on a certain date, not earlier than ten days from the *delatio*. Parties were cited by herald, and witnesses for the prosecution by a *denuntiatio* or mandate from the magistrate. Jurors were empanelled—originally from the senatorial order, but afterwards in equal numbers from the Senate, *equites*, and *tribuni ærarii*—and sworn. The prætor acted as president of the jury, sitting with them on the *tribunal*, he on his *sella curulis* and they on benches (*subsellia*) around him, while the parties with their advocates and witnesses occupied places in front of the tribunal. As under the older system of public hearings, the case was opened by plaintiff's counsel and followed up by defendant's, in set speeches (*perpetuæ orationes*), calculated to appeal not merely to the reason, but even more strongly to the feelings of the court. The effect of this appeal was heightened by the appearance of the accused (now a *reus*), who sat in court often in mourning, and with the deepest marks of grief on his face. At the close of the speeches evidence was taken, that of personal witnesses under oath, and written statements and testimonials to character (*laudationes*) when duly signed and attested. Evidence for the prosecution was obligatory, that for the defence voluntary. On both sides it was carefully sifted, and a written *précis* made in court. The case was finally closed by the reply of the prosecution and the rejoinder of defence, no longer in set speeches, but in the form of brief questions and answers by the respective advocates (*altercatio*). In the consideration of the verdict the prætor still sat with the jury, discussing the case with them, and thus helping them to reach a just decision. This was arrived at mainly on the evidence. Conviction was never allowed on the unsupported testimony of one witness. The character and standing of the witnesses were likewise taken into account. Judgment was given by ballot, and the verdict pronounced by the prætor in accordance with the vote of the majority. A verdict of 'not proven' (*non liquet*) resulted in a re-hearing of the case; but no appeal was allowed against a clear verdict (except on technical points), though sentence might be reversed through a subsequent decision of *quæstio* or people (*in integrum restitutio*).

In the free cities of Italy judicial procedure was modelled upon that of Rome, while the Roman *coloniæ* and *municipia* were governed by prefects under jurisdiction of the prætor. The over-seas provinces, on the other hand, were subject to the unfettered *imperium* of the governor. The provincial magistrate was really a king in his own domain. He and his delegates (*legati*) were responsible for the whole judicial administration of his province. As holder of the *imperium*, he had full powers of coercion by imprisonment, scourging, or death; and no appeal could be made, except by a Roman citizen, against his decisions. In practice, however, his judicial freedom was carefully restricted. A wise governor respected the customary laws of his province, allowing minor offences to be tried before the local courts, and even in graver crimes directing the proceedings of the national councils with a view to securing full Roman justice, rather than suppressing their former prerogatives. As a rule, too, he sought the assistance of a *consilium* of advisers, composed partly of Roman citizens and partly of his personal attendants (the *cohors prætoria*). Cases of grave moment or difficulty might even be sent to Rome. Though the provincials had no direct appeal against the arbitrary acts of an unjust governor like Verres, they could successfully impeach him before the Roman courts, and secure his condemnation and recall.

Imperial government introduced a change in the spirit rather than in the form of justice. The popular *comitia*, indeed, passed out of existence; but the *quæstiones* remained as the regular courts for criminal procedure till almost the close of the 2nd cent. A.D. The prætors, too, maintained their position as presidents of the law-courts, their number being actually increased to sixteen. But the real threads of justice were increasingly gathered into the Emperor's own hand. He had not merely the absolute power of repeal or reversal of the judgments of the regular courts, but in cases involving grave matters of State, or the life and honour of persons in high rank, he held extraordinary jurisdiction, while the right of private complaint in criminal cases passed over to the infamous *delator*, who was too often a mere creature in the Emperor's power. Thus the old Roman principles of freedom and equality before the law yielded to the most unblushing absolutism.

4. Trials in the NT.—The trial of Jesus conformed to the letter, at least, of Roman law by its final appeal to Pilate. In the trials of the earlier Christians no such sanction was sought. The case against Peter and John was too vague to warrant criminal proceedings, and the Sanhedrists contented themselves with the scourging usual in minor breaches of the peace (Ac 5^{40}). The bolder outlook and speech of Stephen rendered him liable to the same charge of blasphemy as his Master had faced; but so infuriated were his judges by the aggressive tone of his defence that they hurried him out to execution without even the semblance of a formal condemnation (7$^{57f.}$). The proceedings of king Herod were still more summary, the ignominious death of James and imprisonment of Peter being carried through apparently without either accusation or trial (12$^{1ff.}$). Even the apostle Paul had to endure persecution and stoning apart from the regular forms of trial (9$^{23ff.}$ 14$^{5f. 19}$, etc.). But in his case Roman justice came definitely athwart the hot passions of Jewish prejudice; for the main sphere of his activity lay within the direct administration of Rome, and he himself enjoyed the privileges of a free-born Roman citizen.

His first appearance before a Roman magistrate was in the *colonia* of Philippi, soon after his landing in Macedonia. The charge levelled against him and Silas was the serious one of 'impiety'—introducing customs which Roman citizens could neither acknowledge nor observe. In the exercise of their official *coercitio*, the magistrates (στρατηγοί, *prætores*) stripped and beat the accused, leaving them in prison till the case might be formally tried, or the riot otherwise quelled. But the public scourging of Roman citizens, without trial, was a scandal that might involve the magistrates themselves in a criminal prosecution, and Paul and Silas were released with honour (16$^{19ff.}$). At Thessalonica a similar charge of impiety, combined with the suggestion of treason against the Emperor, was brought by jealous Jews; but here the case was disposed of by the simple course of taking securities from the leading Christians of the city, while Paul and Silas went free (17$^{5ff.}$). A renewed charge of illegal worship brought against Paul by the Jews of Corinth recoiled on their own heads; for the philosophic proconsul, Gallio, not merely resolved the accusation into a mere matter of 'words and names' and questions affecting their own law, but calmly permitted the mob to seize and beat Sosthenes, the ruler of the synagogue, before the very tribunal (18$^{12ff.}$). At Ephesus, again, the Apostle was saved from the fanatical violence of the mob by the sanity of the town-clerk (ὁ γραμματεύς, the city scribe or secretary), who reminded them that the courts were open and the proconsuls (ἀνθύπατοι, plur. of category) ready to hear all matters of public order and justice (19$^{35ff.}$).

The final long-drawn trial of Paul affords the most interesting example of the interplay of national and Imperial justice around the person of a Roman citizen. The case was opened by the lawless attack of certain Jews from Asia, who laid hold of the Apostle, accusing him of treason against the Jewish law and people (21$^{27f.}$). His life was saved only through the forcible intervention of the Roman military tribune, who hurried him to the fortress of Antonia, where the garrison was stationed, and would have examined him by scourging, had not Paul once more asserted his privileges as a Roman citizen (22$^{24ff.}$). The case being apparently one for the Jewish courts, the tribune summoned the Sanhedrin, and set the Apostle on his defence before them (22^{30} 23$^{1ff.}$). No result being thus arrived at, the tribune, in strict harmony with Roman procedure, remanded him to the governor Felix, then residing in Cæsarea, with a formal dispatch explaining the main grounds of the charge, and his own tentative judgment on their validity (23$^{12ff.}$). The prosecution being judicially cited to appear before the governor, the high priest himself accepted summons, with a number of the Sanhedrists, and a trained orator, Tertullus, who formally accused the prisoner on the three counts of heresy, sacrilege, and treason (24^{5}). The case broke down, and Paul was detained for two more years simply through the governor's weakness and greed (v.^{26}). The rehearing of the case before Felix' successor, the brave and honourable Porcius Festus, would no doubt have resulted in the Apostle's acquittal, had he not chosen, in the exercise of his rights as a citizen, to entrust his life and liberty to Roman justice rather than expose them to the malice of his enemies in Jerusalem (25$^{10f.}$). The appeal was allowed by Festus, after a brief deliberation with his *consilium* (v.^{12}), and Paul was sent to Rome, with a dimissory letter strongly in his favour (v.$^{26f.}$). Unhappily, the destinies of Roman citizens were then in the hands of a Nero; and as the result of a tedious process, the details of which are wrapped in obscurity, 'the prisoner of Jesus Christ' found no more justice at his court than he had experienced in Jerusalem, the powers of Rome and Jerusalem uniting to stamp out the Christian 'heresy' in blood (see art. PAUL).

LITERATURE.—On primitive justice cf. **H. S. Maine**, *Ancient Law*, ed. F. Pollock, London, 1907, ch. x., *Lectures on the Early History of Institutions*, do., 1875, chs. ix., x.; **R. Dareste**, *Études d'histoire du droit*, Paris, 1889, and *Nouvelles études d'histoire du droit*, do., 1902; **M. Kovalewsky**, *Coutume contemporaine et loi ancienne*, do., 1893; **A. H. Post**, *Grundriss der ethnologischen Jurisprudenz*, ii. [Oldenburg, 1895] 210 ff. On ancient Arabic justice see **G. Jacob**, *Altarab. Beduinenleben*^{2} [=*Studien in arab. Dichtern, III.*], Berlin, 1897, p. 209 ff.; and on justice among the modern Bedouins cf. **J. L. Burckhardt**, *Notes on the Bedouins and Wahábys*, London, 1830; **C. M. Doughty**, *Travels in Arabia Deserta*, 2 vols., Cambridge, 1888, etc. On Hebrew legal procedure cf. **W. Nowack**, *Lehrbuch der hebr. Archäologie*, Freiburg i. B., 1894, and **I. Benzinger**, *Hebräische Archäologie*^{2}, Tübingen, 1907, with the Mishna *Sanhedrin*; and for Roman procedure see **T. Mommsen**, *Römisches Strafrecht*, Leipzig, 1899, to be compared with **F. P. Walton**, *Historical Introduction to the Roman Law*^{2}, London, 1912; **A. H. J. Greenidge**, *Legal Procedure of Cicero's Time*, do., 1901; **H. J. Roby**, *Roman Private Law in Times of Cicero and of the Antonines*, Cambridge, 1903, ii. 312 ff. The student should also consult **Cicero**, *pro Quintio*, *pro Roscio Comœdo*, *pro Tullio*, and *pro Cæcina*, and *The Institutes of Gaius and Rules of Ulpian*, tr. J. Muirhead, Edinburgh, 1880, bk. iv. On the trial of Jesus cf. **J. Moffatt's** art. in *DCG* ii. 749 ff., with literature there referred to, especially **A. Taylor Innes**, *The Trial of Jesus Christ: A Legal Monograph*, Edinburgh, 1899. On the trial of St. Paul see the standard *Lives*, and **W. M. Ramsay**, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, London, 1895.

A. R. GORDON.

TRIBES (φυλή).—From the earliest times the nation of Israel was divided into various tribes, the number invariably being given as twelve. Conflicting opinions have been held as to how these tribal divisions arose, the traditional theory being that the different families descended from the sons of Jacob multiplied till they formed tribes. Others take the view that the history of the sons of Jacob is really a history of the various tribal communities which were combined to form the nation, and that the divisions were to a large extent geographical. In the lists of the tribes, as we find them in the OT, considerable variations are to be found, and frequently the tribes descended from Joseph (Ephraim and Manasseh) have to be regarded as one in order to make the number twelve. Some of the tribes seem to have disappeared at an early date or were absorbed into larger communities, and the divisions tended more and more to become geographical. After the return from the Exile many members of other tribes probably came to Jerusalem along with Jews strictly so called, *i.e.* those belonging to the ancient tribe of Judah. Most of these returned exiles came to be regarded as members of the tribes of Judah or Benjamin, although some may have been able to trace their descent from a distinguished member of another tribe, and others determined their tribe from the locality which they left at the Exile. No doubt many members of the priestly caste were in a position to claim their descent from the tribe of Levi.

In the NT we have few allusions to any of the tribes, with the exception of Judah and Benjamin, which were always more or less closely associated. Anna the prophetess, however, is stated to have belonged to the tribe of Asher (Lk 2^{36}), and Barnabas is described as a Levite (Ac 4^{36}). The apostle Paul, a Jew brought up in the Roman province of Cilicia, claims to belong to the tribe of Benjamin (Ro 11^{1}, Ph 3^{5}). The fact that Jesus was connected with the royal tribe of Judah is frequently mentioned, and the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews calls attention to the fact in order to bring out the uniqueness of Christ's Priesthood (He $7^{13.\,14}$). In the same way the writer of the Apocalypse calls Him the 'lion of the tribe of Judah' (Rev 5^{5}).

In NT times the conception seems to have been general that Israel even at that date still consisted of twelve tribes. Thus in Ac 26^{7} Paul, in addressing king Agrippa, uses the phrase 'our twelve tribes' as synonymous with 'Israel.' But just as the term 'Israel' came to be employed in a spiritual and Christian sense as the true people of God, so the expression 'twelve tribes' is used to signify Christian believers generally. Thus James (1^{1}) addresses his Epistle to 'the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad.' In Rev $7^{4\text{ff.}}$ the writer speaks of the sealing of the servants of God. We are told that one hundred and forty and four thousand of 'all the tribes of the children of Israel' are sealed, and then follows a list of twelve tribes each furnishing twelve thousand. The tribes enumerated are Judah, Reuben, Gad, Asher, Naphtali, Manasseh, Simeon, Levi, Issachar, Zebulun, Joseph, and Benjamin. The remarkable features about this list are the substitution of Joseph for Ephraim, and the omission of Dan, which seems to have fallen into disrepute at a comparatively early date. The fact that the writer has taken over a Jewish apocalypse and worked it into a Christian setting makes it difficult to settle who exactly are meant here by the servants of God who are sealed in their foreheads. Are the 'servants of God' of v.^{3} identical with the 'multitude' of v.^{9} 'whom no man can number'? Can this be the case when the sealed are numbered so definitely? If not, who then are the sealed? Are they faithful Jews of the OT dispensation, or are they Jewish Christians, and are the Gentile Christians not to be sealed? The first suggestion is impossible, as the sealed are evidently still on the earth. The view that Jewish Christians are the sealed, while possible, is unlikely, as the whole trend of the Apocalypse is to identify Christians as the true Jews, the Israel of God. Probably, in spite of all difficulties, the same persons are indicated in both passages, and neither the numbering of the sealed nor the reference to the various tribes of Israel is to be taken literally. The servants of vv.$^{1\text{-}8}$, who are safeguarded on earth, are the innumerable multitude of vv.$^{9\text{-}17}$, viewed after their martyr death under a definitely Christian light. The OT imagery of the sealing is used to express the thought that God's faithful people are numbered and protected on earth to the last individual, while the subsequent vision (vv.$^{9\text{-}17}$) points to their glory in heaven. For our writer as for James (Ja 1^{1}) and Paul (Gal 6^{16}) the true Israel consists of Christian believers (cf. J. Moffatt, *EGT*, 'Revelation,' London, 1910, p. 395).

W. F. BOYD.

TRIBULATION.—'Tribulation' is used to translate θλῖψις, but not quite so frequently as 'affliction,' in both AV and RV. We have 'tribulation' in Ac 11^{19} and 1 Co 7^{28} (RV; AV 'persecution,' 'trouble'). In 2 Co 1^{4} 7^{4}, where AV has 'tribulation' RV has 'affliction.' In 2 Co $1^{4.\,8}$, where AV has 'trouble' RV has 'affliction.' θλίβω is tr. 'afflict' in RV in every passage in which it occurs except 2 Co 4^{8} ('press') and 1 Th 3^{4} (pass. 'suffer affliction'). The latter passage in AV is tr. 'suffer tribulation.' In half of the passages, however, this Gr. verb is rendered 'trouble' in AV. The Vulg. has *tribulatio* for θλῖψις very frequently. In *4 Ezr.* 'tribulation' is the rendering of *tribulatio* in xv. 19, xvi. 19 (AV and RV) and in xvi. 67, 74 (RV; AV 'trouble'), and of *pressura* in ii. 27 (RV). In *Ass. Mos.* iii. 7 we find the transliteration *thlibsis* (cod. *clibsis*).

Tribulation may affect either body or mind or both. Those who marry heedless of 'the present distress' 'shall have tribulation in the flesh' (1 Co 7^{28} RV). St. Paul writes to the Corinthians 'out of much tribulation and anguish of heart' (2 Co 2^{4}). Part of his tribulation in Macedonia consists of fears within, while his flesh had no relief (2 Co $7^{4\text{f.}}$). To him anxiety about the faithfulness of his converts and the progress of the gospel is a source of tribulation (1 Th 3^{7}, Ph 1^{17}).

Tribulation may be produced by various causes. The famine caused the inhabitants of Egypt and Canaan great tribulation (Ac 7^{11}). The captured Joseph suffered tribulation in Egypt (7^{10}). Part at least of the tribulation of the Corinthians was poverty (2 Co 8^{13}). By ministering to St. Paul's need the Philippians had fellowship with his tribulation (4^{14}). The lot of the fatherless and widows is tribulation (Ja 1^{27}). Such tribulation may be relieved (1 Ti 5^{10}). Sometimes tribulation is the punishment of sin. To those who trouble the Thessalonian Christians God will recompense tribulation (2 Th 1^{6}). There shall be 'tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil' (Ro 2^{9}). God will cast the woman Jezebel out of the Church of Thyatira and those who commit adultery with her into great tribulation (Rev 2^{22}). But it is the Christians who are specially subject to tribulation, and their tribulation consists largely of persecution and of the opposition which their religion meets in an unfriendly world. 'The tribulation which arose about Stephen' (Ac 11^{19} RV) was of course 'persecution' (AV). St. Paul speaks of all the 'persecutions and tribulations' which the Thessalonians endure (2 Th 1^{4}). He says they received the word 'with much tribulation,' and entreats them not to 'be moved by these tribulations' (1 Th 1^{6} 3^{3}). In 2 Co 8^{2} we are told that the churches of Macedonia experienced much tribulation. St. Paul exhorts other converts to be 'patient in tribulation,' and to bless them that persecute them (Ro $12^{12.\,14}$). In his work of evangelization the Apostle met with much tribulation. He told the elders of Ephesus that 'bonds and tribulations' awaited him (Ac 20^{23}). He gloried in tribulations (Ro 5^{3}), feeling that neither tribulation nor anguish nor persecution could separate him from the love of Christ (8^{35}). There is little doubt that he is referring to the difficulties and the dangers which he met with in his proclamation of the gospel. Tribulations are mentioned in the list he gives of his trials in 2 Co $6^{4\text{ff.}}$. Bad news about certain Corinthians gives him tribulation (2 Co 1^{8} 2^{4} 4^{8}). Tribulation, then, to the early Christians meant not so much ill-health, or poverty, or loss of friends, as the sacrifices they had to make and the perils they had to meet on account of their proclamation or profession of Christianity. In Hebrews the writer says that after his readers were converted, they 'endured a great conflict of sufferings; partly, being made a gazingstock both by reproaches and afflictions; and partly, becoming partakers with them that were so used' (10^{33}; cf. 11^{37}). Tribulation is the appointed destiny of Christians. St. Paul reminds the Thessalonians that both he and they were appointed unto tribulations, and that he had told them before that they were to suffer tribulation (1 Th 3$^{3f.}$). John is partaker 'in the tribulation and kingdom and patience which are in Jesus' (Rev 1^{9}); and he tells the church of Smyrna that they shall suffer tribulation ten days (2^{10}). 'Through many tribulations we must enter into the kingdom of God' (Ac 14^{22}).

Tribulation thus leading to the Kingdom, joy in tribulation is a phenomenon that can be understood. In much proof of affliction the churches of Macedonia had abundance of joy (2 Co 8^{2}). The Thessalonians received the word with much tribulation, with joy of the Holy Ghost (1 Th 1^{6}). In the case of the Christian, tribulation results in increased energy and blessedness of the spiritual life. 'Our light tribulation, which is for the moment, worketh for us more and more exceedingly an eternal weight of glory' (2 Co 4^{17}). 'Tribulation worketh patience' (Ro 5^{3}; cf. Rev 1^{9}). God comforts the faithful in tribulation (2 Co 1^{4} 7^{6}), and the comfort thus given enables them to comfort others (1^{4}). His judgment will put an end to their tribulation, and they will be rewarded with rest (2 Th 1$^{5ff.}$; cf. Rev 2^{10}).

It was a common eschatological idea that before the Judgment could come evils of all kinds would greatly increase. This idea is found, *e.g.*, in the Apocalyptic Discourse, and the coming of great tribulation is predicted (Mk 13^{19}; cf. Zeph 1^{15}, Dn 12^{1}). 'The inhabitants of the earth . . . shall fall into many tribulations. . . . And it will come to pass when they will say in their thoughts by reason of their much tribulation: "The Mighty One doth no longer remember the earth"—yea, it will come to pass when they abandon hope, that the time will then awake' (*Apoc. Bar.* xxv. 3, 4). The faithful martyrs who have come out of the great tribulation will receive the highest place of honour in heaven (Rev 7^{14}). To the wicked the Judgment is 'the day of tribulation' (*4 Ezr.* ii. 27 RV; cf. *1 En.* i. 1, xcvi. 2), when they shall be recompensed for the tribulation which they have inflicted on the righteous (2 Th 1$^{6f.}$).

LITERATURE.—J. Weiss, *Die Schriften des NT*, Göttingen, 1907, *s.v.* 'Trübsal' in Index; P. Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie*, Tübingen, 1903, § 31; *DCG*, *s.v.*; John Foster, *Lectures*, London, 1853, lect. xli.

WILLIAM WATSON.

TRIBUTE.—The Roman system of taxation prevailed generally in those countries where Christians were living in the Apostolic Age. The taxes were of two kinds, viz. (1) *indirect*, such as customs-duty levied on merchandise in transit; and (2) *direct*, consisting of (*a*) taxes imposed upon products of the land (*tributum soli* or *agri*) and (*b*) poll-tax (*tributum capitis*). The indirect taxes were commonly controlled by local authorities who farmed them out to the so-called 'publicans.' The publican paid the Government a fixed sum for the privilege of collecting the customs from a given territory, reimbursing himself and paying his subordinates out of the surplus. Although the amount to be collected on different articles was probably in most cases fixed by law (see especially the Palmyrene inscription edited by Schroeder in *SBAW*, 1884, pp. 417–438), the collector frequently grew rich on the profits; and it is not improbable that he often made excessive assessments (cf. Lk 3^{13} 19^{8}). On the other hand, the direct taxes—the 'tribute' proper—were not farmed out, but were collected by Roman officials. Levies on the products of the soil were paid partly in kind and partly in money, and the poll-tax was paid in Imperial coinage (Lk 20^{24}). From time to time in the provinces a census was taken (cf. Lk 2$^{1ff.}$) as a basis for regulating taxation.

Christians in apostolic times must have been quite familiar with all these forms of taxation, although the Christian writings of the period contain only a few references to these matters. It is true that the publicans (τελῶναι) appear somewhat frequently in the Gospels (8 times in Mt., 3 times in Mk., 10 times in Lk.; also τέλος in Mt 17^{25}, Ro 13^{7}; and τελώνιον in Mt 9^{9} ‖ Mk 2^{14} ‖ Lk 5^{27}), but reference to direct taxation—the payment of 'tribute'—is less frequent. In Ro 13$^{6f.}$ St. Paul admonishes his readers to pay tribute (φόρους) as a matter of conscience, since rulers are God's instruments in the preservation of civic order. All three Synoptic Gospels report an incident in which Jesus had advised submission to the existing order, even to the extent of paying the Imperial tribute (κῆνσος, Lat. *census*, Mt 22$^{17.19}$, Mk 12$^{14f.}$; but φόρος in Lk 20^{22} 23^{2} and δηνάριον in Lk 20^{24}). The dues payable to the Temple in Jerusalem are also spoken of as 'tribute' (κῆνσος) in Mt 17^{25}, where Jesus again advised submission for practical reasons, although affirming that ideally Christians were free from this obligation.

LITERATURE.—J. J. Wetstein, *Novum Testamentum Græcum*, Amsterdam, 1751–52, i. 314–316; J. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, ii.^{2} [Leipzig, 1884] 180 ff., 261 ff., 289 ff.; B. P. Grenfell and J. P. Mahaffy, *Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus*, Oxford, 1896; U. Wilcken, *Griechische Ostraka aus Aegypten und Nubien*, Leipzig, 1899, i. 194 ff.; E. Schürer, *GJV* i.^{4} [Leipzig, 1901] 474 ff., 510 ff.

S. J. CASE.

TRINITY.—See GOD.

TRIUMPH.—This verb (θριαμβεύειν) is used in later Greek as the equivalent of the Latin *triumphare*, to which it seems to be etymologically akin. It occurs twice in the NT—2 Co 2^{14}, Col 2^{15}. In Col 2^{15} the Crucifixion is represented as the triumph which crowns the Holy War of redemption. As the Roman conqueror led the vanquished captives in triumphal procession up to the Capitol and offered them to the supreme God, so in exalting to His right hand the Crucified Christ, by whom He has reconciled us unto Himself in the body of His flesh through death, God led in triumph the 'principalities and powers,' the world-governing spirits who are unfriendly to man, and to whose dominion man in the state of nature is subjected. The thought of the passage is similar to that of 1 Co 2^{8}, where the spirit-rulers of this world are represented as ignorantly bringing about that crucifixion through which their own power is brought to naught (1 Co 15^{24}). In 2 Co 2^{14} the general meaning is clear. 'In a magnificent figure Paul represents himself as by God's ordinance sharing, in his travels through the world, the triumph Christ is celebrating over all that has withstood His cause' (A. Menzies, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 1912, p. 17). But in what capacity—as conqueror or as captive? The only meaning which the known usage of the word justifies is that St. Paul himself is the most auspicious trophy of the conquering power of Christ (Heinrici, Bousset). Many modern commentators, however (Schmiedel, Menzies, etc.), give the verb an active sense, 'maketh us to triumph' (AV), on the ground that, though no lexical parallel is found, the sense of the passage requires it. Others (Theodoret, Lietzmann) take the word in the more general sense of 'to lead about in a conspicuous manner,' for which Lietzmann quotes corroborative instances from Suidas. The RV 'leadeth us in triumph' is felicitously ambiguous. ROBERT LAW.

TROAS (Τρῳάς).—Troas was a seaport on the N.W. coast of Asia Minor, opposite the island of Tenedos, midway between the Hellespont and Cape Lectum, and about ten miles south of the much more ancient Troja (Ilium). The name was an abbreviation of 'Trojan Alexandria' (Ἀλεξάνδρεια ἡ Τρῳάς, Strabo, XIII. i. 2, Ptol. V. ii. 4; or Ἀλεξάνδρεια τῆς Τρῳάδος, Strabo, II. v. 36; or Ἀλεξάνδρεια ἡ ἐν τῇ Τρῳάδι, Paus. X. xii. 2). The qualifying adj., Τρῳάς, which was needed to differentiate this Alexandria from the many other cities of the same name, came to be used sometimes alone (as in Pliny, *HN* v. 33, *ipsaque Troas*), though this led to ambiguity, Troas (ἡ Τρῳάς, the Troad) being properly the whole territory once ruled by the kings of Troy.

The city, which was founded by Antigonus and named Antigonia Troas, was enlarged and improved by Lysimachus and renamed Alexandria. The names are found together on some coins. 'It appeared to be an act of pious duty in the successors of Alexander first to found cities which should bear his name, and afterwards those which should be called after their own. Alexandria continued to exist, and became a large place; at present' [*i.e.* under Augustus] 'it has received a Roman colony, and is reckoned among celebrated cities' (Strabo, XIII. i. 26). Troas was under the power of the Seleucids till the defeat of Antiochus the Great at Magnesia in 190 B.C., after which it was a free city of the kings of Pergamos, the last of whom bequeathed his realm to the Roman Republic in 133 B.C. The Troad had a romantic interest for the Romans as the traditional motherland of their race, and the honours which they lavished upon the city were the expression of a kind of filial devotion. As a colony with the *ius Italicum*, and as the seaport of a fruitful country, Troas rose to the front rank among the cities of Asia Minor. According to Suetonius (*Jul.* 79), Julius Cæsar had thoughts of making it the capital of the Empire instead of Rome, and Augustus may have played with the same idea (Hor. *Od.* III. iii. 61 f.), which finally presented itself as a possibility to Constantine three centuries later, before he decided to make Byzantium the future seat of the Empire (Zosim. ii. 30).

St. Paul's connexion with Troas illustrates the high pressure at which he habitually worked. He was at least three times in the city, and could not but earnestly desire to stay and plant a church in a place of such importance, but each time he was torn away from it to some other sphere of labour. To Troas he came down from the borders of Bithynia, and received the vision which made him 'immediately' embark for Europe (Ac 16^{7-10}). To Troas he came again, after his flight from Ephesus (Ac 20^{1-6}), 'for the gospel of Christ,' eager to preach to willing hearers, yet restlessly preoccupied by thoughts of Corinth, and soon compelled to turn his back upon 'an open door' (2 Co $2^{12.13}$). On a third visit he 'tarried seven days,' on the last of which—a Sunday—he took no sleep, but preached till midnight, breaking bread, and talking 'till break of day,' knowing that his ship was waiting him in the harbour (Ac 20^{6-12}). On the Monday morning his companions went on board to rest, but the wakeful Apostle discovered that he could give a few more hours to Troas, take the short overland route—doubtless not on foot, if Christian courtesy and gratitude meant anything—to Assos, 20 miles distant, and there catch his ship after she had rounded Cape Lectum. And meanwhile how much could be done in the last flying hours of intimate and unforgettable fellowship!

On the theory that St. Paul never again visited Troas, it must be assumed that this was the occasion on which he left behind him the cloak and the parchments which Timothy was afterwards requested to bring to Rome (2 Ti 4^{13}). But those who believe in the Apostle's release from prison hold that Troas was one of the places to which he returned. The point is fully discussed in A. C. McGiffert, *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, Edinburgh, 1897, p. 407 f.

Troas is now almost deserted. It bears the Turkish name of Eski Stambul or Old Constantinople, and its former greatness is attested by the extent of its ruins, including the old walls, which are six miles in circumference, and the supports of an aqueduct which conveyed water down from Mount Ida.

LITERATURE.—R. Chandler, *Travels in Asia Minor and Greece*^{3}, London, 1817; Murray's *Handbook to Asia Minor*, do., 1895. JAMES STRAHAN.

TROGYLLIUM (Τρωγύλλιον, WH Τρωγύλιον).—Trogyllium was a promontory formed by the western termination of Mt. Mycale, on the coast of Asia Minor, about equidistant from Ephesus and Miletus. It runs out into the sea just opposite the island of Samos, from which it is separated by a channel less than a mile wide (Strabo, XIV. i. 12, 13). Its present name is Santa Maria. According to the TR of Ac 20^{15}, St. Paul's ship, after leaving its anchorage at Chios, struck across to Samos, and, having tarried at Trogyllium, came the following day to Miletus. This in itself is likely to have happened, and, though the words καὶ μείναντες ἐν Τρωγυλλίῳ are omitted by the great MSS (ℵ ABCE), they are retained by Meyer, Alford, Blass, and Ramsay on the strength of DHLP and many ancient versions. The reason for their omission may have been either the mistaken idea in the mind of the copyists that the text located Trogyllium in Samos, or the difficulty of imagining two night-stoppages, one in the harbour of Samos and another at Trogyllium, which is only 4 or 5 miles from Samos. But a night spent at Samos is quite imaginary, for the nautical term παρεβάλομεν does not mean 'arrived at' (AV) or 'touched at' (RV). All that it implies is a *crossing* from one point to another; and, while Samos was merely sighted and passed, Trogyllium was the resting-place. An anchorage just to the east of the extreme point of Trogyllium now bears the name of 'St. Paul's Port' (W. J. Conybeare and J. S. Howson, *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, London, 1877, ii. 264 n.). JAMES STRAHAN.

TROPHIMUS (Τρόφιμος).—Trophimus was a Christian convert belonging to Ephesus (Ac 21^{29}) and a companion of the apostle Paul on his third missionary journey (20^{4}). He is called along with Tychicus an Asian (Ἀσιανοί), and the two appear together as deputies of the Ephesian church, by which they were appointed to carry their contribution to the poorer brethren of Jerusalem. Both were with St. Paul in Macedonia and accompanied him to Asia, and thence preceded him to Troas, where they were joined by the delegates from the other churches—Sopater of Berœa, Aristarchus and Secundus from Thessalonica, Gaius of Derbe, and Timothy. After the Apostle's arrival at Troas the whole company seem to have journeyed together to Jerusalem. We find from 21^{29} that Trophimus had been seen in the Apostle's company in Jerusalem, and the riot raised against the Apostle was made ostensibly on the ground that St. Paul had introduced Trophimus, a Gentile, into the Temple.

We have no means of knowing whether Trophimus accompanied St. Paul to Rome after his appeal to Cæsar, but we find him again in the Apostle's company after the first imprisonment. He is mentioned in 2 Ti 4^{20} as having been left at Miletus sick. In 2 Co 8$^{18-24}$ reference is made to two companions of the Apostle who accompanied Titus from Ephesus to Corinth with the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. It has been suggested that these two were the Ephesian friends of the Apostle, Tychicus and Trophimus, who had previously been appointed to travel with him, carrying the offerings of the Churches (2 Co 8^{19}). We have, however, far too scanty evidence to make any certain identification (cf. J. H. Bernard, in *EGT*, '2 Corinthians,' 1903, p. 89). W. F. BOYD.

TRUMP, TRUMPET (*σάλπιγξ*, from *σαλπίζειν*, 'to sound a trumpet').—The word appears once in the Gospels, in the eschatological discourse of Jesus (Mt 24^{31}), where we learn that the elect are gathered by trumpet-call for the final judgment. There are three references to trumpet in the Pauline Epistles, one in Hebrews, and six in Revelation. *σαλπιστής* (classical Greek, *σαλπιγκτής*) appears only in Rev 18^{22}.

'The sound of a trumpet' (He 12^{19}) occurs in the description of the scene at Sinai, and is illustrative of the awe-inspiring character of the Jewish dispensation. The passage from which it is taken (vv.$^{18-29}$) closes the main argument of the Epistle, and 'offers a striking picture of the characteristics of the two Covenants summed up in the words "terror" and "grace"' (cf. B. F. Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*^{3}, London, 1903, p. 411 f.). In 1 Co 14^{8} St. Paul continues his illustration from music to criticize an unedifying speaking with tongues. 1 Co 15^{52} develops his eschatological doctrine. The verse is part of the climax of the Pauline argument which bases the future resurrection on the resurrection of Christ. The trumpet blast seemed to his Jewish mind a fitting accompaniment of an unparalleled scene of Christian triumph. The reference in 1 Th 4^{16} is also eschatological. Once again the trumpet betokens majesty and command, and it may be that St. Paul had in his thought the Jewish tradition of archangelic music (cf. Jude $^{9. 14}$; and B. Jowett, *Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians, and Romans*, 2 vols., London, 1855, i. 73–75).

The other references to trumpet appear in Revelation. In two of these it is used as a figure of speech to define the voice of the angel (1^{10}), just as 'the sound of many waters' describes the speech of 'one like unto the Son of man' (v.^{15}). In Rev 8$^{2. 6. 13}$ 9^{14} we read of the seven angels who sounded their seven trumpets to the discomfiture of the earth. The imagery of the Apocalypse is in keeping with Jewish tradition, which saw in the trumpet-call the music appropriate to angels. H. B. Swete holds that the picture in Rev 8 has as its basis the scene of law-giving described in Ex 19$^{16ff.}$, and he sees possible allusions to Jos 6^{13} and to Jl 2^{1} (cf. *The Apocalypse of St. John*^{2}, London, 1907, p. 107).

Thus the trumpet, which was so closely connected with Jewish ceremony in war and religion, acquired definitely Christian associations in the Apostolic Age. In the AV, 'trump,' 'trumpet,' and 'cornet' (cf. S. R. Driver, *Joel and Amos*, Cambridge, 1897, p. 144) are the translations of the two Hebrew wind instruments, שׁוֹפָר and חֲצֹצְרָה. In early Hebrew history they were used for secular purposes, such as signalling the approach of an enemy (Hos 5^{8}, Am 3^{6}), but in later days their use became increasingly religious. This is especially true of the latter. But, however they may have been confused in earlier times (cf. *HDB* iv. 816), they were different instruments in use, shape, and material. The שׁוֹפָר was made of horn, usually that of a ram (Driver, *op. cit.*, p. 144), and was blown at certain Jewish festivals. The חֲצֹצְרָה, unlike the Roman *tuba*, was recognized as a priestly instrument. We read of it, for example, in Josephus (*BJ* IV. ix. 12). From Nu 10$^{1-10}$ we learn that Moses made two trumpets of silver, which the priests sounded on occasions of assembly, pilgrimage, and festival. The mention of seven trumpets in 1 Ch 15^{24} and Neh 12^{41} is interesting in view of Rev 8^{2}. Josephus (*Ant.* III. xii. 6) gives a description of a trumpet, in which he mentions that it was about one yard long and a little wider than the flute, that at its mouthpiece it was somewhat expanded, and that, like the war-trumpet, its extremity was bell-shaped. This description is borne out by a coin struck in the days of the Emperor Hadrian. On the relief of the Arch of Titus there is a representation of two trumpets which appear similar to those of Egyptian origin, but are longer than those described by Josephus (*ib.*). For these representations compare J. Wellhausen, 'Psalms' in R. Haupt's *PB*, p. 220. ARCHIBALD MAIN.

TRUTH.—In the apostolic documents the simplest meaning given to 'truth' is that of sincerity. St. Paul, writing of the different motives that had impelled people to make known the gospel of Christ, declared that he rejoiced that Christ was proclaimed 'whether in pretence or in truth' (Ph 1^{18}). The same Apostle called upon the Corinthian Christians to banish all insincerity from their holiest religious ceremonies. 'Let us keep the feast not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth' (1 Co 5^{8}). Even in passages like these it is evident that 'truth' tended to acquire a deeper and wider meaning, passing from mere sincerity to conformity with the highest ethical claims. The standard of ethical truth was embodied in Jesus, who was set forth as the example to which Christians should conform. Thus St. Paul warned his readers against a life of lasciviousness by recalling the way in which they had learned Christ, 'if so be that ye heard him, and were taught in him, even as truth is in Jesus' (Eph 4^{21}). (This passage is sometimes taken as asserting the identity of Jesus and the Christ, but the old reading and interpretation seem preferable.) For the most part, however, the apostles speak of truth as equivalent to truth *κατ᾿ ἐξοχήν*, the revelation of God that reaches its fullness in the gospel of Christ. St. Paul made it synonymous with 'the gospel of your salvation' (Eph 1^{13}), and, writing to the Thessalonians, he described the Divine and human sides of conversion as 'sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth' (2 Th 2^{13}). The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews declared that for those who sinned wilfully after they had gained a full knowledge of the truth there could be no further sacrifice for sin (He 10^{26}). In the Pastoral Epistles this use is specially prevalent—*e.g.* 1 Ti 2^{4}, 'God willeth that all men should be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth'; 1 Ti 3^{15}, where the Church of the living God is described as 'the pillar and ground of the truth'; 2 Ti 2^{15}, 'a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, handling aright the word of truth.' While these various aspects of truth are suggested in the apostolic writings, it would be a mistake to suppose that the apostles regarded truth as consisting of separate entities; rather they regarded it as a unity embodied in Jesus Christ, so that intellectual sincerity, ethical purity, doctrinal enlightenment, and spiritual experience were all manifestations of the one living and true God. This unity of truth seems to be the thought underlying the general principle set forth by St. Paul that 'we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth' (2 Co 13^{8}). No one has power against truth, for all truth and all kinds of truth are one in God: the only power is given to those who seek to act in the service of truth. Wherefore it is the denial of God to endeavour to advance truth by any means that fails to yield to truth in every department of human thought and life.

Truth was fully embodied and expressed in Jesus Christ, but before His coming there had been partial revelations of truth 'by divers portions and in divers manners' (He 1^{1}), and St. Paul felt free to acknowledge that the Jew might claim that he had in the law 'the form (*μόρφωσιν*) of knowledge and of the truth' (Ro 2^{20}). This outward form was determined by the inner truth of which it was the outline or expression, but it was at the best only partial and imperfect. The apostles further taught that the truth of God outlined in the Law and embodied in Christ was brought home to the heart and mind of men by many various methods, but that all these methods received their virtue through the vitalizing influence of the Holy Spirit. The Day of Pentecost left its mark not only on the life but also on the teaching of the Apostolic Church, and St. Paul in his special experience learned on the way to Damascus and in the solitude of the desert that the gospel came to him through no human means but through revelation of Jesus Christ (Gal 1^{12}). Hence there was constant insistence on the agency of the Holy Spirit as the real source of enlightenment in the truth of God. At the same time it was recognized that there was great diversity in the Spirit's working, for there was no dead uniformity in His operations. St. John offers the chief example of the revelation of truth being given by direct vision, and in his Apocalypse he shows how he received in this way the knowledge of things present and future when he was in the spirit on the Lord's Day. St. Paul claimed that he also was indebted to visions for knowledge that he had received, and for the hearing of 'unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter' (2 Co 12^{4}). But such experiences were acknowledged by him to be unusual, so that he indulged in some modest boasting on account of the exceptional privilege granted to him. The more usual method of illumination was by the Spirit's interpreting the life of Jesus Christ to the needs of human experience, and making the Scriptures of the OT radiate a new meaning in the light of the sacrifice and work of the Saviour. Thus the Suffering Servant of Jahweh of Deutero-Isaiah led to a better understanding of the Crucified Lord (Ac 8^{35}), and prophets as well as private Christians learned the truth better through examination of the Scriptures (17^{11}).

One source of progressive knowledge was found by the apostles in the facts of their experience, an experience that covered not only their fellowship with Christ in the days of His flesh, but also the mighty working that followed His ascension to the right hand of God. This may be illustrated by the advance in truth that followed the outpouring of the Spirit of God upon Gentiles who believed in Jesus as the Redeemer. To St. Paul especially this fact of experience brought the assurance of God's readiness to save and bless all men through faith in Jesus Christ without the necessity of their submitting to any rite of Jewish origin. Thus there was heralded forth by him the free grace of God in Christ to all sinners. But in order that the truth of God might be received it was necessary, according to the apostles, that it should be not only understood but also obeyed (Gal 5^{7}). The heart and will were as powerful as the mind in influencing the attitude to the truth in Christ. This not only was asserted positively, but may be inferred also from the reasons assigned by the apostles for some people not receiving the truth. Stephen in his defence charged those who denied Jesus Christ and His gospel with the crime of resisting the Holy Ghost as their fathers had been guilty likewise in persecuting the prophets (Ac $7^{51.\,52}$), while St. Paul impressed upon his unbelieving hearers the fact that they might see and hear the truth, and yet be so hardened in their hearts that they would not believe (Ac 28^{26}). Indeed in his contrast of *ψυχικός* and *πνευματικός* St. Paul asserted that the spiritual truths could not be discerned by the natural man even with his highest intellectual capacity but only by the spiritual man in whom the Divine Spirit is living and working (1 Co 2^{14}; cf. Ro 8^{5}, 1 Jn 4^{5}). But the apostles never exalted mere 'spirituality' at the expense of the moral side of life, for they insisted that nothing hindered the reception of truth more than a low ethical life. St. Paul foretold a time when men would be guilty of all excesses, loving pleasure more than God, and, led away by divers lusts, would be 'ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth' (2 Ti 3^{1-7}), and the same Apostle ascribed the lack of the free expansion of truth in some people to the fact that they kept it down by their unrighteous lives (Ro 1^{18}). St. James, as might be expected, associated knowledge of truth with moral qualities such as the grace of meekness, and the absence of bitter envy and rivalry (Ja $3^{13.\,14}$). St. Peter was marked with the same spirit, for he traced the golden cycle of Christian experience as leading from purity of soul by obedience to the truth onwards inevitably to the love of the brethren (1 P 1^{22}). Thus the beginning and the ending of the Christian reception of truth were indissolubly linked to purity and love.

LITERATURE.—F. J. A. Hort, *The Way, the Truth, the Life*, Cambridge, 1893, p. 41 ff.; W. P. DuBose, *Soteriology of the NT*, London, 1892, p. 299; H. J. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der NT Theologie*, Freiburg i. B., 1896–97, ii. 375 f.; R. H. Hutton, *Theological Essays*^{4}, London, 1895, p. 19 ff.

D. MACRAE TOD.

TRYPHÆNA (*Τρύφαινα*, a Greek name).—Tryphæna is a woman saluted by St. Paul in Ro 16^{12} and coupled with **Tryphosa.** The two are generally supposed to have been sisters, 'or at least near relatives, for it was usual to designate members of the same family by derivatives of the same root' (J. B. Lightfoot, *Philippians*^{4}, London, 1878, p. 175). It is possible, however, that we have here twin-names denoting twin-sisters, either form being a feminine of *Τρύφων* according as the accent falls on the first or the second syllable. Similar twin-names, in which a slight modification of the consonants or vowels is sufficient to distinguish one from the other, are Huz and Buz (Gn 22^{21}), Muppim and Huppim (46^{21}), Yama and Yami (Rigveda), Romulus and Remus, Baltram and Sintram (see J. R. Harris, *The Dioscuri in the Christian Legends*, London, 1903, p. 1 f.). Tryphæna and Tryphosa are described as women 'who labour in the Lord' (*τὰς κοπιώσας ἐν κυρίῳ*). The verb, which suggests painstaking effort, is used in Ro 16 of women only —of Mary (v.^{6}), of Persis (v.^{12})—but elsewhere describes apostolic and other ministerial labours. It is unlikely, therefore, that the work of these women was limited to practical benevolence, such as showing hospitality (see art. PERSIS). We shall picture their activity at Rome or Ephesus according to our view of the destination of the salutations in Ro 16. Both names are found in inscriptions of the Imperial household (Lightfoot, *op. cit.*).

T. B. ALLWORTHY.

TRYPHOSA (*Τρυφῶσα*, a Greek name).—A woman saluted by St. Paul in Ro 16^{12} and coupled with Tryphæna (*q.v.*). T. B. ALLWORTHY.

TUNIC.—See COAT.

TUTOR.—The word 'tutor,' which has taken the place of 'schoolmaster' (*q.v.*) in the RV of Gal 3^{24}, and of 'instructer' in 1 Co 4^{15}, has itself given place to '**guardian**' in the only passage of Scripture where it formerly appeared—Gal 4^{2}. It has in this passage, however, not an educational but a strictly legal connotation, rendering the word *ἐπιτρόπους*, in close connexion with *οἰκονόμους*—'guardians and stewards.' The *ἐπίτροπος* is here employed to describe the guardian of the child under the will of the father, potentially if the father is still alive, actually if he is dead. Bengel calls the *ἐπίτροπος tutor heredis*, the *οἰκονόμος curator bonorum.* Under Roman law a minor came of age at twenty-five, and was under a *tutor* till fourteen and a *curator* till his minority ceased. This was 'the day appointed of the father,' and St. Paul here compares the state of the world, both Jewish and Gentile, before Christ came to an heir in his minority. Then 'when the fulness of the time came, God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the law, that he might redeem them which were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons' (Gal 4^{4}).

LITERATURE.—W. M. Ramsay, *Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, London, 1899, pp. 381 ff., 392 f.

THOMAS NICOL.

TWELVE.—See NUMBERS.

TWIN BROTHERS.—See DIOSCURI.

TYCHICUS (*Τυχικός*, 'fortunate').—Tychicus was an Ephesian Christian who journeyed with St. Paul from Macedonia to Asia and preceded him to Troas (Ac 20^{4}). Thence he accompanied him to Jerusalem on the Apostle's last visit there, acting along with Trophimus as a delegate of the church of Ephesus and conveying the offerings of the church to the poor brethren at Jerusalem. He was a companion of the Apostle during his first captivity, and was sent to Ephesus from Rome probably with the Epistle to the Ephesians. He is described by St. Paul as a 'beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord,' and he is entrusted with the duty of telling the Ephesians of the writer's welfare and of comforting their hearts (Eph 6^{21}). In the same way in the Epistle to the Colossians (Col 4^{7}) he is described as 'a beloved brother and faithful minister and fellow-servant,' and the same duty is committed to him of telling the Colossians of the Apostle's condition and comforting their hearts. In 2 Ti 4^{12} the writer tells Timothy that he has sent Tychicus to Ephesus, from which we may conclude that he was with the Apostle in his second captivity in Rome. The same conclusion is borne out by the reference in Tit 3^{12}, where the writer purposes to send either Artemas or Tychicus to Titus in Crete with the injunction that Titus should meet the Apostle at Nicopolis. It is possible that the reference in 2 Co 8^{18} to 'the brother whose praise in the gospel is spread through all the churches,' and who was deputed along with Titus and another unnamed Christian to carry the Second Epistle to the Corinthians from Ephesus to Corinth, may be Tychicus, and the other unnamed deputy may be Trophimus. This, however, is little more than conjecture, although from Ac 20^{4} we may gather that these two Ephesians were known to the church in Corinth, and that the two deputies referred to in 2 Co 8^{18} were also well known to those addressed.

A late tradition makes Tychicus bishop of Chalcedon in Bithynia. The Greek *Menologion* (9 Dec.) reports that he was bishop of Colophon after Sosthenes, and suffered martyrdom for the faith.

W. F. BOYD.

TYPE.—**1. Word and idea.**—Though *τύπος* and *ἀντίτυπος* both occur in the original, 'type' and its correlative 'antitype' are theological rather than Scriptural terms. In theological usage a type is a person or thing in the OT dispensation that represents and prefigures a person or thing in the NT, hence called the antitype. In the text of EV, however, neither 'type' nor 'antitype' is found, though RV gives 'in the antitype' as an alternative rendering in 1 P 3^{21m}. Even in the Greek NT, where *ἀντίτυπος* occurs twice, the word appears to be employed not substantively but adjectively in the forms *ἀντίτυπα* (He 9^{24}) and *ἀντίτυπον* (1 P 3^{21}), which RV renders respectively 'like in pattern' and 'after a true likeness'; while *τύπος*, again, which is of frequent occurrence, is used with a variety of meanings and only once (Ro 5^{14}) in a sense corresponding to that of a doctrinal type. In Jn 20^{25} it denotes the impression left by a stroke ('the print of the nails'); in Ac 7^{43} the figure or image of a god; in 23^{25} a form of writing; in Ro 6^{17} a form of teaching; in Ac 7^{44}, He 8^{5} a pattern or model for the making of the tabernacle. From this last meaning the transition is easy to the ethical sense of an example of conduct. In 1 Co 10^{6} it designates an example that is to be avoided; in other cases (Ph 3^{17}, 1 Th 1^{7}, 2 Th 3^{9}, 1 Ti 4^{12}, Tit 2^{7}, 1 P 5^{3}) an example that is to be copied. In Ro 5^{14}, where Adam is said to be *τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος* (*i.e.* of Jesus Christ), and where EV renders 'figure,' the word is used at last in a doctrinal sense and the idea of type and antitype comes clearly into view.

When once this idea is accepted, however, it becomes evident that the NT uses of the word are far from exhausting the cases in which the idea is present. The contrasts in Col 2^{17} between the *σκιά* and the *σῶμα*, in He 8^{5} between the *σκιά* and the *ἐπουράνια*, in 10^{1} between the *σκιά* and the *εἰκών* are all of them contrasts between types and their antitypes—between a prefiguring ordinance of the old dispensation and a corresponding spiritual reality of the new. The case is similar in Gal $4^{24ff.}$, where St. Paul contrasts the two covenants, in He 9^{9}, where the author represents the first tabernacle as a *παραβολή* 'for the time now present,' and very notably in 5^{7}, where he works out at length the relation between Melchizedek, 'made like unto the Son of God' (7^{3}), and Jesus Himself, 'a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek' (5^{6} etc.). In these and many other familiar passages which will have to be considered more particularly, the NT authors bring before us the idea of type and antitype—the idea that persons, events, and institutions of the OT represent, and were designed by God to represent, persons, events, and institutions of the Christian dispensation.

2. Origin of the idea.—The typological idea, as it meets us in the NT, is not a peculiar or isolated phenomenon, but a natural outgrowth from the more general conception of the OT revelation as prophetic, and of Jesus and the gospel as fulfilling the hope and promise made to the fathers. The forward look of their own Scriptures was apparent to the Jews themselves; to the apostles it had become evident that what prophets and psalmists looked for was now in their very midst. Jesus had announced the arrival of the Kingdom of God and had declared Himself to be the expected Christ. On His first public appearance He had read a passage from Isaiah ($61^{1f.}$) which throbs with the good tidings of the Lord's acceptable year, and had said to the listeners, 'To-day hath this scripture been fulfilled in your ears' (Lk 4^{21}). From that time onward He had pointed out repeatedly that what was written in the OT Scriptures was now being accomplished, that what prophets and righteous men of old had desired to see and hear was now being seen and heard by those around Him (Mk 7^{6}, Mt 13^{17}). That the Scriptures bore witness of Christ the disciples understood even during His earthly life, but their understanding of this fact was wonderfully enlarged by His death and resurrection, which cast a flood of light upon aspects of prophecy that had previously been obscured (cf. Ac 8^{28-35}). St. Peter's speeches in Acts (cf. 2^{14-39}) and his First Epistle show how strong a sense he had that the Spirit of Christ was in the Prophets (1 P 1^{11}). To St. Paul with his larger outlook upon history and revelation the whole of Scripture was prophetic—the Law as well as the Prophets (Ro 3^{21}); and so the Law became 'our tutor to bring us unto Christ' (Gal 3^{24}). With their view of the OT writings as prophetic of Christ and Christianity at point after point, it was natural that the NT authors should apply to the revelation in the history of Israel the principles they had already applied to its record, and should find Christ and the Christian salvation prefigured in the persons, events, and institutions of OT history, as they had already found them foretold in the OT Scriptures. Such an extension of the principle of prophecy from utterances to types was the natural outcome of a belief in a progressive revelation passing from a lower to a higher stage. If the older dispensation as a whole contained within it the promise of the Christ who was to come, it was only to be expected that there should be correspondences in detail between the two economies. Prophecy and type, indeed, run into each other, the difference being one of form rather than of nature, so that at times they are hardly distinguishable (cf. Is 28^{16}, 1 P 2^{6}). And, if the authority of Jesus Himself had been required for the adoption of a definitely typological interpretation of OT history, the apostles and other NT writers might recall His use of Jonah's experience to typify His own (Mt 12^{40}), of the wisdom of Solomon to suggest the wisdom of One greater than Solomon (v.^{42}), of the flood that came in the days of Noah to prefigure the coming of the Son of Man ($24^{37ff.}$), and of the serpent uplifted by Moses in the wilderness to stand as a prophetic symbol of the truth that the Son of Man must be lifted up (Jn 3^{14}).

3. Applications of the idea by apostolic Christianity.—(1) *The primitive circle.*—Springing naturally out of the conception of the OT as prophetic of the Christian dispensation, and being justified by the language of Christ Himself, the idea of type and antitype appears in the teaching of those who belonged to the original apostolic circle. Sometimes it is hardly distinguishable from the use of historical examples for purposes of illustration (1 P 3^{6}, Ja $2^{21.\,25}$ $5^{11.\,17}$), but at other times it stands out with unmistakable clearness. In St. Peter's speeches in Acts Moses as a prophet becomes a type of Jesus Christ (3^{22}), the covenant with Abraham of the blessings of the Christian salvation (v.$^{25f.}$), the rejected stone which was made the head of the corner (Ps 118^{22}) of Jesus in His humiliation and exalted power (Ac 4^{11}). In 1 Peter the Apostle takes the unblemished lamb of the Passover (Ex 12^{5}) to typify Christ as a lamb without blemish and without spot (1 P 1^{19}), and sees in Noah's ark a prefiguration of baptism as a means of salvation (3^{21}). In 1^{2}, again, the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ upon the elect is evidently an antitype of the action of Moses in sprinkling blood first on the altar and then on the people for the inauguration of the covenant (Ex 24^{6-8}).

(2) *The Pauline Epistles.*—This typical conception of the history and institutions of Israel was taken up by St. Paul, and received from him much wider and more frequent application. Sometimes it is the *persons or characters* of the OT that he treats as types. In Ro 5^{14}, 1 Co 15^{22} Adam, the natural head of the race, is taken as a type of Christ, the spiritual head. In Gal 3^{9} faithful Abraham is a type of all who believe the gospel. In 2 Co $3^{7ff.}$ Moses with the glory on his face represents the more glorious ministration of the Spirit. In Gal $4^{22ff.}$, where allegory is blended with type through a deeper meaning being read into the OT narrative than it naturally bears, Sarah and Hagar, Isaac and Ishmael are used as types of Judaism in bondage to the Law and Christianity set free from its yoke. At other times types are found in the *transactions or events* of the OT narratives, as when the union of Christ with the Church is held to be prefigured by the union of Adam with Eve (Eph 5^{32}; cf. Gn 2^{24}), Christian baptism by the passage of the Red Sea (1 Co $10^{1.\,2}$), the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper by the manna and water of the wilderness (vv.$^{3.\,4}$), and Christ Himself by the rock from which the water flowed (v.^{4}). Most frequently, however, it is in the *religious institutions* of the OT that St. Paul discovers types of the new economy. The paschal lamb and Christ (1 Co 5^{7}; cf. Ro 3^{25}, Eph 5^{2}), the Temple and the Christian Church (1 Co 3^{16}, 2 Co 6^{16}), the ministry of the altar and the ministry of the gospel (1 Co 9^{13}), circumcision and baptism (Col $2^{11.\,12}$), the sacrificial communion of Judaism and communion at the Lord's Table in the body and blood of Christ (1 Co $10^{16.\,18}$)—these are particular instances he gives of the fact that the institutions of the old dispensation were anticipative and symbolic of the new. In the later Epistles he states the case more broadly. In Col 2^{17} the general principle is laid down that the legal institutions of Judaism are only 'a shadow of the things to come,' viz. the institutions of the Messianic Age, while the body, *i.e.* the substantial reality, is of Christ. The antinomy between Law and Gospel which meets us in the earlier Epistles is now resolved, for he sees that the Law as a Divine ordinance was temporary, indeed, in its obligatory character, but possessed of an abiding significance as typical of the future blessings of the Kingdom of grace. Circumcision finds its meaning in 'a circumcision not made with hands' (v.^{11}; cf. Eph 2^{11}, Ph 3^{3}), the expiatory sacrifices of tabernacle and temple in the self-surrender of Christ to God on our behalf (Eph 5^{2}), the free-will offerings in those gifts of Christian liberality which are a sacrifice acceptable to God (Ph 4^{18}), the whole Levitical service (λατρεία; cf. Ex 12^{25} LXX) in a service wrought by the Spirit of God (Ph 3^{3}) of which the self-sacrificing ministry (λειτουργία; cf. Nu 8^{22}) of St. Paul to his converts (2^{17}) or theirs to him (v.^{30}) may be taken as an example.

(3) *The Epistle to the Hebrews.*—In this Epistle we find the typological interpretation of the OT carried to its fullest results. Conceiving of religion as a covenant between God and man, the author's purpose is to prove to his Jewish readers that Christianity, the religion of the New Covenant, is better than Judaism, the religion of the Old; and the method which he employs is to draw a series of contrasts between the Old and the New regarded as type and antitype. If the doctrinal keynote of the Epistle may be found in the twice-quoted prophecy of Jeremiah, 'Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah' (Jer $31^{31ff.}$; cf. He $8^{8ff.}$ $10^{16f.}$), the method of its apologetic argument is given when the legal service of tabernacle and temple is described as 'a copy and shadow of the heavenly things' (8^{5} RV), and the Levitical Law generally as 'having a shadow of the good things to come, not the very image of the things' (10^{1}). All through the Epistle there runs a series of contrasts between Judaism as preparatory and typical and Christianity as

antitypical and perfect. (*a*) In the opening verses the fragmentary and varying revelation 'of old time' by the prophets is set over against God's speech unto us in His Son ($1^{1.\,2}$), and this is immediately followed by the contrast of angels as ministering spirits sent forth to do service for the heirs of salvation (v.^{14}) with Him who was made a little lower than the angels that He might bring many sons unto glory ($2^{9.\,10}$). (*b*) Next comes (3–4^{13}) a contrast between Moses, a faithful servant in God's house, and Christ, a Son set over it ($3^{5\text{f.}}$), in the course of which a further contrast is drawn between the good tidings preached to the Israelites in the wilderness and the word of the Christian gospel (4^{2})—the promised rest of Canaan being used as symbolic of the rest that remains for the people of God (v.^{9}). The relation of type and antitype clearly underlies these two contrasts, but (*c*) in the next section of his work (4^{14}–10^{18}), where a contrast is drawn out between the Levitical or Aaronic high priest of the OT and Christ, the Son, conceived as a High Priest after the order of Melchizedek, the author typologizes more boldly and directly, following here a suggestion derived from the OT itself (Ps 110^{4}). Melchizedek, he says, the mysterious king-priest, was 'made like unto the Son of God' (He 7^{3}); and he describes Christ not only as 'a high priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek' (6^{20}; cf. $5^{6.\,10}$ $7^{11.\,17.\,21}$), but as a priest 'after the likeness of Melchizedek' (7^{15}). Side by side, however, with this typology of likeness there is introduced a typology of contrast—the contrast between the order of Aaron and the order of Melchizedek (v.^{11}). If Melchizedek typifies Christ as another priest of the same order, Aaron typifies Him as a priest of a higher order than his own, who becomes the surety of a better covenant than that given under the Levitical Law (v.^{22}; cf. v.^{11}). The anticipatory and typical relation of the Levitical priesthood, as serving that which is a copy and shadow of the heavenly things (8^{5}), to the high priesthood of Christ, as ministering the heavenly things themselves (9^{23}) in the heavenly sanctuary ($8^{1.\,2}$), is carried by the author into great detail. The tabernacle that Moses pitched pointed to the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched and not man (vv.$^{2.\,5}$), and so became 'a parable for the time now present' (9^{9}), *i.e.* for the age of the OT. The first covenant, inasmuch as it was not faultless, gives the promise of the second and better covenant ($8^{6.\,7}$). In the passage of the high priest once a year into the holy place with his sacrifice of blood, the Holy Ghost signifies that the way into the holy place has not yet been made manifest (9^{8}), and that Christ Himself must come as the Mediator of the New Covenant, offering Himself through the eternal Spirit without spot unto God (v.$^{14\text{f.}}$). In all these cases of contrast between the tabernacle made with hands and the greater and more perfect tabernacle, between the earthly ministry of the Levitical priesthood and the ministry of Christ Himself, the relation of type and antitype is made perfectly apparent. It is a relation between copies (*ὑποδείγματα*) of the things in the heavens and the heavenly things themselves (v.^{23}), between what is like in pattern (*ἀντίτυπα*) to the true (v.^{24}) and the enduring realities foreshadowed thereby.

(4) *The Apocalypse.*—The typology of the NT, so far as we have hitherto considered it, bears upon the relation between past and present; it consists in the use of persons or things in the OT to represent and prefigure the present realities of the Kingdom of God. But God's Kingdom has a future as well as a present, and when we reach the Apocalypse—a book that claims to be a revelation of 'things which must come to pass hereafter' (4^{1}; cf. 1^{1})—we find that the writer goes to the OT for his types of the Christian future, just as St. Paul and the author of Hebrews have done for their types of the Christian present. In the messages to the Seven Churches, it is true, he deals with existing situations, and the use which he makes in this connexion of OT types does not differ in character from what we find in other books of the NT. The seven lamps of the golden lampstand in the tabernacle become types of the Seven Churches themselves ($1^{12.\,20}$); Israel's kings and priests, of a kingdom and priesthood to God already enjoyed by all whom Jesus has loosed from their sins by His blood (v.$^{5\text{f.}}$). And the history of Israel furnishes types not only of the living Christianity within the churches, but of a false doctrine and debased morality that were making the lamps of the churches burn dim—Balaam has his antitype in the contemporary Balaamites (2^{14}) and Jezebel in the false and wicked prophetess by whom God's servants are seduced (v.^{20}).

But, apart from his rapid glance at existing circumstances in the churches with which he was familiar, the gaze of this writer is forward and upward; he is looking through a door opened in heaven, he is thinking of the things that must come to pass hereafter (4^{1}). From the actual churches in Asia he leads his readers to the great vision of the Church that is to be, saying to them in the words of the angel, 'Come hither, I will show thee the bride, the wife of the Lamb' (21^{9}). And in his descriptions of the coming glory that is to crown the long struggles of the Church on earth he finds in the OT foreshadowing types of the final consummation. Some of his types are taken from the story of human beginnings in the early chapters of Genesis, as if to show the unity of the Divine plan from first to last. The Garden of Eden prefigures and anticipates 'the Paradise of God' (2^{7}); the tree of life in the midst of the garden (Gn 2^{9}), from which fallen man had to be debarred (3^{22}), another tree of life, whose fruit is given to be eaten (Rev 2^{7}) and whose leaves are for the healing of the nations (22^{2}). Other types are offered by the history of the chosen people and the chosen land. Sodom and Egypt have their spiritual counterparts (11^{8}), the fall of Babylon becomes a parable of the fall of that great city which made all nations drink of the wine of her fornication (14^{8}). The triumph song of Moses and the children of Israel (Ex 15^{1}, Dt 31^{30} 32^{4}) becomes 'the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb' (Rev 15^{3}); the manna by which Israel was fed in the wilderness tells of a hidden manna given to him that overcometh (2^{17}); the twelve tribes reappear in the twelve companies of the sealed servants of God ($7^{4\text{-}8}$); Jerusalem itself is transfigured into the new Jerusalem, the city of God (3^{12} $21^{2.\,10}$); Mount Zion, to which the tribes went up, becomes the gathering place of the hosts of the redeemed ($14^{1\text{-}3}$). But, as was natural to one who conceived of the heavenly blessedness as consisting essentially in acts of adoring worship ($7^{9\text{-}15}$ 22^{3}; note that 'to serve [*λατρεύω*] God' = to worship Him), the writer of this book finds his most frequent types in the sanctuary and sanctuary service of ancient Israel. The tabernacle in the wilderness anticipated that 'tabernacle of God' in which He shall dwell for ever with His people and they with Him ($21^{3\text{f.}}$); the Temple in Jerusalem, 'the temple of God' which is in heaven (11^{19}; cf. 3^{12} 7^{15} and *passim*); the very pillars of the Temple are types of the strong overcoming soul who shall go out of the temple no more (3^{12}). Aaron and his sons in their holy garments of glory and beauty (Ex $28^{1\text{ff.}}$) reappear in the angels of the celestial temple 'arrayed with precious stone, pure and bright, and girt about their breasts with golden girdles' (Rev 15^{6}). In antitypal reality the golden altar with its four horns (Ex 30^{3}) still stands before God

(Rev 9^{18}; cf. 6^{9} 8^{3}); the ark of the covenant is still seen in His temple (11^{19}; cf. 'the tabernacle of the testimony,' 15^{5}). There is a golden censer in the heavenly courts, and golden bowls full of incense; but the incense of heaven is the prayers of the saints (5^{8} 8^{3}; cf. Lv $16^{12f.}$). And, as an atoning sacrifice was the central and culminating act of all the sanctuary worship of Israel (Ex 30^{10}; cf. He $9^{7ff.}$), Jesus, the antitype of all ancient sacrifice, appears predominantly (27 times) under the figure of 'the Lamb'—the sacrificial and victoriously redemptive significance of the name being made evident on its very first appearance in the book, when the Lamb is described as having been slain, and yet standing in the midst of the throne (Rev $5^{6.\,9.\,12}$; cf. 'I was dead, and behold, I am alive for evermore, and I have the keys of death and of Hades,' 1^{18}), endowed with all might and all knowledge ('having seven horns, and seven eyes,' 5^{6}), and yet having bought us with His blood (v.^{9}; cf. 7^{14} 12^{11}).

LITERATURE.—P. Fairbairn, *The Typology of Scripture*^{4}, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1864; *CE*, *s.v.*; B. Weiss, *Biblical Theology of NT*, Eng. tr., 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1882–83; W. Beyschlag, *NT Theology*, Eng. tr.^{2}, do., 1908.

J. C. LAMBERT.

TYRANNUS (Τύραννος).—In the narrative of St. Paul's sojourn at Ephesus we are told that after he had spent three months in arguing with the Jews in the synagogue he succeeded in rousing the hostility of their rulers to such an extent that he was compelled to withdraw from the synagogue altogether, and that he remained in the city for a period of two years, 'reasoning daily in the school of Tyrannus' (Ac 19^{9}). The reference here is extremely vague, and it is not impossible that the first readers were more familiar with the situation alluded to than we can be.

There is a remarkable variation in the Greek text, and the original reading is doubtful. Some of the best MSS (*e.g.* ℵAB), several cursives (13, 27, 29, 81), and a number of the ancient versions (Sah. Boh. Syr. Pesh. Vulg. followed by Tisch. WH RV Weiss and Wendt) omit τινος ('a certain' Tyrannus), which we find in TR. Probably τινος is an addition by some early copyist, to whom Tyrannus was merely a name. Another variation is found in the addition by D and T and several versions of ἀπὸ ὥρας πέμπτης ἕως δεκάτης, which is accepted as original by several critics, including Blass, Belser, Nestle, Zöckler, while Wendt sees in it a passage in which D has retained some elements of the original text, otherwise lost. B. Weiss (*Der Codex D, in der Apostelgeschichte* (*TU* xvii. 1 [Leipzig, 1897]), 110) thinks it may have been added according to an old oral tradition. Ramsay (*The Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 152, *St. Paul*, p. 270 f.) expresses the view that the phrase is probably part of the original text or at least that the tradition gives an actual account of the real state of affairs. He quotes Martial, ix. 68, xii. 57, Juvenal, vii. 222–226, to prove that schools opened at daybreak, and that by the fifth hour, 11 a.m., the pupils would be dismissed and the place free for the use of the Apostle.

The word σχολή, tr. 'school,' means originally 'leisure,' then 'the products of learned leisure,' 'treatises,' and lastly 'the place where literary instruction is given,' a 'school.' The 'school of Tyrannus' was in all probability some such place, where instruction was given, and more definitely where philosophic lectures were delivered. The question here arises, Is Tyrannus to be conceived of as a lecturer in philosophy in Ephesus at the date of the Apostle's visit, who gave his lecture-room for the use of the Christians? Two explanations are possible.

(1) If the reading τινος of TR, etc., be correct, the most probable theory is that Tyrannus was a private teacher in Ephesus who granted the use of his building to St. Paul either free or for hire. This view is strengthened if we accept the other addition to the text which we find in *Codex Bezæ*, 'from the fifth to the tenth hour.' Tyrannus would thus be a teacher or lecturer who used his *schola* for the early hours of the day and left it free for the Apostle from one hour before noon to two hours before sunset. From Greek and Latin sources we find that the hours for teaching, and, in fact, for the general business of the day, were the early hours of the forenoon (cf. Ramsay's allusions to Juvenal and Martial referred to above). Ramsay (*HDB* iv. 822) expresses the opinion that the full Western text establishes the meaning of an otherwise obscure passage, giving a natural and satisfactory sense. He sees no reason to account for the additions to the text, but thinks that there was considerable temptation to allow the words to drop out, as they seemed quite unimportant to 3rd cent. students. But may not the words have been inserted by one who did not understand the reference to the school of Tyrannus and who desired to make it more intelligible?

It is impossible to settle the question whether this Tyrannus supposed to be teaching at Ephesus at the date of the Apostle's visit was a Jew or a Gentile. It is unlikely that an unconverted Jew would give his building for the Apostle's use and thus incur the hatred of his co-religionists, and the reference seems to imply that St. Paul had left the unbelieving Jews behind him in the synagogue and taken his adherents with him to the new meeting-place.

(2) The only other possible explanation is that the 'school of Tyrannus' was the name of some public building in Ephesus which had either belonged to or been used by a person named Tyrannus some time before, and been gifted to the city as a place of public instruction. Teachers of philosophy frequently gave lectures in public buildings or open spaces available to the whole population. Thus the apostle Paul himself addressed the Athenians in the Areopagus, while in an ancient Pompeiian painting a schoolmaster is represented as teaching in the open forum. On the other hand, it is doubtful if the Apostle could have continued to teach for the period of two years in a public building unless he had received the sanction of the civic authorities to do so, and it is far from probable that he either sought or obtained such permission. At the same time, we have evidence that he was on friendly terms with the Asiarchs (cf. Ac $19^{31.\,37}$), and it is not impossible that he may have been allowed to teach without any formal permission or recognition being granted. If the text of the best MSS, which has been adopted in the RV, be correct, then it does seem more than likely that the 'school of Tyrannus' was a public or semi-public place of resort and that the phrase would have as its modern equivalent some such expression as 'the McEwan Hall,' or 'the Trades Hall,' or the like. But the whole matter remains in uncertainty, and there is perhaps more to be said for the view implied in the Western text, that Tyrannus was a teacher lecturing in Ephesus at the date of the Apostle's visit.

LITERATURE.—R. J. Knowling, *EGT*, 'Acts,' 1900, p. 404; W. M. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, 1893, p. 152, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, 1895, p. 270 f., art. 'Tyrannus' in *HDB*; A. C. McGiffert, *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, 1897, p. 285; F. J. A. Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, 1894, p. 93.

W. F. BOYD.

TYRE (Τύρος).—Tyre, the ancient mother of colonies and mistress of the seas, 'the merchant of the peoples unto many isles' (Ezk 27^{3}), ceased to be politically important under the Greeks and

Romans. But, along with the sister-city of Sidon, it still retained its commercial prosperity, though they had now a very formidable rival in Alexandria. 'Both,' says Strabo (XVI. ii. 22), 'were formerly, and are at present, illustrious and splendid cities, but which of the two should be called the capital of Phœnicia is a matter of dispute among the inhabitants.' Confined to an island-rock with a surface area of only 140 acres, in which room had to be found not only for dwelling-houses but for factories, dockyards, a canal, and a great temple, Tyre solved the problem of space in an un-Oriental manner by running up buildings of many stories, 'of more even than at Rome' (*ib.*). Since the time of a memorable siege by Alexander the Great (332 B.C.), the island had been connected with the mainland by a mole half a mile long, which was gradually widened by the accretion of sand—it is now ½ of a mile broad. In the Roman period, when 'the great number of dyeing works' rendered the city 'unpleasant as a place of residence' (*ib.*), suburbs began to rise along the coast, on or near the site of Old Tyre, Palæ-Tyrus.

The Tyrians were devoted to the worship of Melkart ('king of the city'), whom the Greeks identified with Hercules (as in *CIG* 122, *c.* 180 B.C.). The coming of Christianity to Tyre was foreshadowed when many of its inhabitants journeyed to Galilee to see the Prophet of Nazareth, and when He returned their visit (Mk 3^{8}, Lk 6^{17}, Mk 7^{24}, Mt 15^{21}). Luke relates that the dispersion of Christians from Jerusalem, consequent upon Stephen's death, sent preachers to Phœnicia, who confined their message to the Jews (Ac 11^{19}); and, further, that the story of Paul's first missionary journey and of 'the conversion of the Gentiles' was told to 'all the brethren' of Phœnicia before it was heard by the Council of Jerusalem (Ac 15^{3}). Ac 21$^{3-6}$, which is a 'we-section,' gives an indication of the measure of progress made by the new faith in Tyre by A.D. 56 (C. H. Turner in *HDB* i. 423^{a}), when Paul and Luke landed there at the end of the third missionary journey. They 'found the disciples,' but the verb (ἀνευρόντες) implies that they had to 'look them up'—*quærendo reperire* (F. Blass, *Acta Apostolorum*, Göttingen, 1895, p. 225)—evidently because the Christians were still numerically a feeble folk in the great heathen city. They are not called a church, yet among them were some who spoke 'through the Spirit,' with the rapt utterance of NT prophets. At the end of a week of fellowship, 'they all, with wives and children,'—the language still suits a small company of converts—escorted Paul and his comrades outside the city. On the beach there was enacted a sacred and pathetic scene very similar to the one at Miletus (20$^{36-38}$), and with this the story of nascent Christianity in Tyre suddenly ends.

The Elder Pliny refers to the prosperity of Tyre, in the middle of the 1st cent., and indicates its staple trade in the words: 'Nunc omnis ejus nobilitas conchylio atque purpura constat' (*HN* v. 17). Jerome, at the end of the 4th cent., calls it still the first commercial city of the East, 'an emporium for the commerce of the whole world' (*Com. ad Ezk* on 26^{7} 27^{2}). Septimius Severus made it a Roman colony, and among its illustrious citizens were Origen and Porphyry. From 1124 to 1291 it was an impregnable stronghold of the Crusaders. Deserted by the Christians after the fall of Acre, it was destroyed by the Muslims. It is now an unimportant town among scattered fragments of ruins (see PHŒNICIA).

LITERATURE.—A. P. Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, new ed., London, 1877, p. 270; W. M. Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, do., 1910, pp. 155–172; C. Baedeker, *Palestine and Syria*^{4}, do., 1906, pp. 267–269.

JAMES STRAHAN.

U

UNBELIEF.—One of the great problems of the Apostolic Age was to account for the unbelief of the Jews. Unhappily, it was only too clear that the Jews not only had brought Jesus Christ to the Cross through their representative leaders, but also after Pentecost had refused to listen to the gospel preached by the apostles, and had become the main opponents of the Christian faith. To those whose eyes had been opened to see the glory of God in Christ Jesus, it seemed the strangest of all experiences that those whom God had taken to be His peculiar people, and to whom He had granted so many privileges, should have turned away in unbelieving scorn from the Lord who had come to be their Redeemer. Hence the poignancy of the confession: 'He came unto his own, and they that were his own received him not' (Jn 1^{11}). In the apostolic history that experience was sadly repeated (Ac 13^{45}).

Three chief questions were raised by this unbelief of the Jews. (1) Did this unbelief not cancel the early promises made by God? (2) Did this unbelief not defeat God's plan? (3) Could God's salvation be complete apart from the Jewish people? These questions are dealt with by St. Paul in the Epistle to the Romans in the sympathetic method that might be expected from one whose pride in his ancient lineage was never concealed, and whose faith was clear and enlightened as well as intense. To the three-fold problem St. Paul made reply. (1) The promises of God did not depend upon man, for God would keep His word whatever man might do. God would be true and faithful however His people might be convicted of falsehood and unbelief (Ro 3^{4}). (2) God's purpose was both narrower and wider than was commonly supposed. In all the Jewish history the purpose of God was to redeem some within the Hebrew race to be the means of blessing, and even in the Christian era, as of old, there was a 'remnant' that believed and shared in the purposes of God. So too God's purpose was wider than was supposed. From the earliest times His plan looked forward to embracing the Gentiles within its scope, and through the very unbelief and defection of the Jews there had come a marvellous fulfilment of this wider purpose. 'By their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles' (11^{11}). (3) St. Paul believed with all his heart that the Kingdom of God would not be complete apart from the Jews. This was so far true even in the Apostolic Age. 'Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace' (11^{5}). But in the future there would be a glorious return of the chosen people. St. Paul represented the Jews as being subjects of unbelief and disobedience, so that in the gracious purpose of God they might be objects of the Divine mercy. The Most High would unfold all the width of His salvation when after their period of darkness the Jewish people would come forth into the light.

Then would come the final consummation, and the receiving of them would be truly 'life from the dead' (11^{15}).

The same problem of the unbelief of the Jews was treated in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The discussion in this Epistle centred round the rest of God into which God Himself entered after the work of creation, and to which He called His people. This rest was offered to Israel in the time of Moses and was not realized by them through unbelief. The mere entrance into Canaan under Joshua was no true fulfilment of the promise, for 'if Israel had believed they would have entered in, the Rest would have been appropriated, and God's gracious design satisfied, and a Rest would have been no more "left" for others' (A. B. Davidson, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Edinburgh, n.d., p. 98). When their unbelief left this rest still open, it was offered again by God in the new revelation that He made. His voice was heard through His Son in the end of those days in which He had spoken to the early believers on to the time when He should come again. Thus the promise that was unrealized in the Old Covenant was renewed in the New Covenant. These conclusions are largely the same as those reached by St. Paul—that unbelief marked the Jews in all their history, and that their unbelief opened the way to the receiving of the Gentiles. But there is not in this Epistle the forecast of the glorious future yet in store when Israel would turn again, only an insistence upon the need of giving diligence to enter into that rest, 'that no man fall after the same example of disobedience' (He 4^{11}).

It is worthy of note that in all these apostolic discussions unbelief and disobedience are almost interchangeable terms. Both words, ἀπιστία and ἀπείθεια, are derived from the same root and express the intimate connexion that is found between faith and life. What is thus suggested by the use of these words is corroborated by the general apostolic teaching, where unbelief is ascribed to the hardening of the heart (Ac 19^{9}), to blindness caused by the god of this world (2 Co $4^{3.\,4}$), to the evil working of the prince of the power of the air (Eph $2^{1.\,2}$), to the corrupt heart that believes a lie (2 Th $2^{11.\,12}$). Hence we read of the evil heart of unbelief, and of the deceitfulness of this sin (He $3^{12.\,13}$). As unbelief sprang from moral causes it could be removed best by the declaration of the gospel wherein Jesus Christ was made known as meeting the moral and spiritual needs of life. It is for this reason especially that St. Paul magnified 'prophesying' in contrast to 'speaking with tongues.' He suggested that an assembly where all were speaking with this strange utterance would seem to an outsider like a gathering of madmen, and would confirm any unbeliever in his unbelief, whereas the general practice of prophesying would reach the reason and the heart of any unbelievers who happened to be present, and would lead such to confess that God was truly present in this Christian assembly (1 Co 14^{22-24}). From such a passage as this it may be inferred that the apostles distinguished between those who were unbelievers because Christ had not been presented to them fully and those who had resisted the truth when it was made known to them and who had openly denied the Lord. The latter class, who 'denied that Jesus was the Christ,' seemed so base in the eyes of the apostles that St. John characterized it as Antichrist (1 Jn 2^{22}), and it seemed so hopeless of change that the same Apostle placed the unbelieving among the vilest, whose 'part shall be in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone' (Rev 21^{8}). One phase of unbelief caused no little perplexity to the apostles, viz. unbelief among those who had professed their faith in Jesus as Christ and Lord. To the apostles this faith had so wondrously purified their hearts and enlightened their minds that they could hardly conceive of a faith that omitted some of the great essential truths. An example of this phase may be found in the Corinthian church, where many failed to believe in the resurrection of the dead and were not slow to express openly their unbelief. They accepted the common faith in the personal resurrection of Jesus Christ, but they seemed to have assumed that this was a unique occurrence, and to have rejected the general truth of the recovery and resurrection of the body as sharing in the Christian salvation. St. Paul in his reply asserted that such unbelief was destructive of the faith of the Church, and affirmed in some of the most brilliant passages of all his writings that the resurrection of Christians was part of the Christian redemption, gave inspiration to the Christian life, and crowned with glory the Christian experience (1 Co 15).

Two practical questions affecting the relation of Christians to unbelievers in the Apostolic Age are worthy of notice. The higher and nobler conceptions of marriage that arose through Christian teaching suggested to many the question whether relations contracted under pre-Christian conditions should be continued, especially where one spouse refused to accept the Christian faith and became an unbeliever. St. Paul dealt with this question in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, where he affirmed that the unbelieving spouse was sanctified by the believing member, that the Christian spouse was not to seek divorce from the non-Christian; but, if the latter insisted on separation, then it was to be acquiesced in. But such separation was undesirable, for peace was better for a Christian than disunion, and there was always the possibility that the unbelieving spouse might be won to the faith by the believer (1 Co 7^{10-16}; cf. 1 P 3^{1}). On the other hand, marriage of a believer after conversion with an unbeliever was deemed an un-Christian act (2 Co 6^{14}). The other practical question was with regard to the practice of Christians carrying their quarrels before unbelievers. The Corinthians were litigious as well as licentious, and even after they adhered to the Christian faith they were beset by their old weaknesses. They were guilty of quarrelling, and insisted so much on their presumed rights that they did not hesitate to go to law with a Christian brother before pagan judges. St. Paul denounced this practice as showing the lack of Christian love, as bringing disgrace upon the whole Christian community, and as implying that there were none within the Christian fellowship able to settle the petty differences that had arisen. Even the Jews exercised jurisdiction over internal affairs, and reckoned as guilty of impiety any of their number who brought a matter of law before idolatrous judges; much more should Christians shun heathen courts, and seek rather the judgment of their fellow-Christians, especially when they remembered that to believers was given by God the judgment of the world, and even of the angels in heaven (1 Co 6^{1-6}).

D. Macrae Tod.

UNCIRCUMCISION.—See Circumcision.

UNCLEAN.—See Clean.

UNCORRUPTNESS (ἀφθαρσία).—The Eng. word is used in the AV only in 1 Co $15^{42.\,50.\,53.\,54}$, but the Gr. word occurs also in Ro 2^{7}, Eph 6^{24}, 2 Ti 1^{10}. The RV renders 'incorruption' not only in each of the four verses in 1 Co 15, but in Ro 2^{7} and 2 Ti 1^{10}, where the AV has 'immortality.' In Eph 6^{24} the AV gives 'sincerity' and the RV 'uncorruptness.' In Tit 2^{7} 'uncorruptness.' (AV and RV) represents *ἀφθορία* (or *ἀδιαφθορία*). The noun *ἀφθαρσία* is derived from the adj. *ἄφθαρτος* (*α* priv. and *φθείρω*, ‘to corrupt’), which is found in Ro 1[23], 1 Co 9[25] 15[52], 1 Ti 1[17], 1 P 1[4. 23] 3[4], and in the RV is always rendered ‘incorruptible.’ The RV is correct in this consistent use of ‘incorruptible’ for *ἄφθαρτος*, and more correct than the AV in using ‘incorruption’ for *ἀφθαρσία* in those cases where the latter has ‘immortality,’ which properly represents *ἀθανασία* (1 Co 15[53. 54], 1 Ti 6[16]). But corresponding to ‘incorruptible’ for *ἄφθαρτος*, ‘incorruptibility’ would have been still better than ‘incorruption’ for *ἀφθαρσία* (Tertullian [*de Cultu feminarum*, ii. 6] and subsequent writers render *incorruptibilitas*; Vulg. in most cases *incorruptio*, which probably suggested ‘incorruption’ of the EV), since the word really denotes the quality of imperishableness. The fact that ‘incorruption’ is the AV rendering in 1 Co 15, so familiar to English ears from its place in the order for the burial of the dead in the Book of Common Prayer, may have determined the Revisers to use it in that chapter, and the principle of adopting as far as possible a uniform rendering of particular words (see Revisers’ Preface) would lead them to adhere to it elsewhere. In Eph 6[24] they have departed from their usage in other places by substituting ‘uncorruptness’ (AV ‘sincerity’), but it is questionable whether by doing so they have brought out the writer’s real meaning. It seems quite likely that he was employing the word in its usual sense, and was thinking not of the purity of the Christian’s love for Christ, its freedom from corrupt elements, but of its incorruptibility, *i.e.* its imperishableness. In Ti 2[7], where *ἀφθορία* is applied to the doctrine which Titus was to teach, that word is properly translated ‘uncorruptness.’

It may be noted that when the two terms ‘incorruptibility’ (*ἀφθαρσία*) and ‘immortality’ (*ἀθανασία*) are set side by side in 1 Co 15[53. 54], we are not to understand the former as applying to the body and the latter to the soul. In classical Gr. such a distinction might be valid, but not in the NT. If we read of God in 1 Ti 6[16] ‘who only hath *immortality*,’ we also read in 1[17] that He is ‘the King eternal, *incorruptible*, invisible.’ Unlike Plato, St. Paul has no doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul; and in 1 Co 15 he is dealing specifically with the resurrection of the body, so that ‘incorruptibility’ and ‘immortality’ are practically synonymous. J. C. LAMBERT.

UNCTION.—See ANOINTING.

UNDERGIRDING.—See SHIP.

UNGODLINESS (*ἀσέβεια*; the verb is *ἀσεβέω* and the adj. *ἀσεβής*).—*ἀσέβεια* is the religious designation and estimate of impious and immoral conduct (Cremer, *Bibl.-Theol. Lexicon of NT Greek*, p. 523); cf. Ro 1[18], where it stands side by side with *ἀδικία*. It appears also in Ro 9[26], where it is in the plural in an OT quotation translating פְּשָׁעִים. Elsewhere it occurs only in the Pastoral Epistles (2 Ti 2[16], Tit 2[12]) and Jude (v.[15]). The verb *ἀσεβέω* occurs only in 2 P 2[6], Jude [15]; *ἀσεβής* is more frequent: Ro 4[5. 6] (opp. *δίκαιος*) 5[6. 8] (synonymous with *ἁμαρτωλός*), 1 Ti 1[9], 1 P 4[18], Jude [15] (joined with *ἁμαρτωλός*); also in 2 P 2[5] 3[7], Jude [4].

Cremer remarks interestingly on the rare use of *ἀσεβέω* and the comparatively rare use of the whole group in the NT: ‘Generally the negative and strong terms *ἀδικεῖν*, *ἀσεβεῖν*, *ἀνόσια ποιεῖν*, which occur often in profane Greek, are met with in Scripture far more rarely than the positive *ἁμαρτάνειν*, . . . which in profane Greek was far less morally, and still less religiously, estimated. Herein is manifest, on the one hand, the far deeper religious view of Scripture, which estimates “failings,” or sins of omission, so seriously, and, on the other, its deeper humanity, which does not resort to the strongest terms to designate whatever is actually sinful’ (*op. cit.*, p. 524).

It is an interesting point in NT criticism that the *ἀσεβής* group is not confined, like the opposed *εὐσεβής* group, practically to the Pastoral Epistles and 2 Peter. As we have seen, St. Paul uses *ἀσεβής* and *ἀσέβεια* not infrequently in Romans. This furnishes an argument to those who maintain the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles. In opposition to the argument that the use of the word *εὐσέβεια*, etc., in the Pastorals to express practical religion, both as faith and morals within the sphere of the Church, is un-Pauline and represents a stage of development entirely subsequent to the Apostle, it is argued that, even if there be a fresh emphasis on piety within the sphere of the Church in the Pastorals, the idea is one that might naturally have come to St. Paul in view of changing conditions, and that the linguistic argument from the absence of *εὐσεβής*, etc., in the earlier Pauline Epistles proves nothing, since his use of the opposed group shows that it was mere accident (see GODLINESS). For *ἀσέβεια* in the sub-apostolic writings see 2 Clem. xvi. 1, ‘flee impiety’; and for *ἀσεβής* see 2 Clem. xviii. 1.

LITERATURE.—H. Cremer, *Biblico-Theological Lexicon of NT Greek*, Edinburgh, 1880, p. 523 f.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

UNION WITH GOD.—The idea of union with God, as conceived of by the apostolic writers, always implies an element of plurality and difference or distinctness as characterizing the being of which such union is affirmed (*e.g.* Jn 1[1]). It is thus incompatible with the pantheistic conception of God as embracing all reality within an undifferentiated unity of being. Further, according to the apostolic conception, union with God, while it is not equivalent to simple identity with God, admits also of varying degrees of intimacy or perfection.

1. Union of Christ with God.—The apostolic idea of union with God, in the highest degree of intimacy and perfection, is most clearly illustrated and exemplified in the case of the historic personality of Jesus Christ, whose union with God is so intimate and complete that He can say with truth, ‘I and the Father are one’ (Jn 10[30]).

Yet this oneness is not that of simple identity, so that Jesus could say, ‘I am the Father,’ but rather a oneness which is compatible with plurality and distinctness such as makes it possible for Him to say, ‘My Father is greater than I’ (Jn 14[28]). This oneness of the historic Christ with God is explained by the apostolic writers in two ways, or as due to two sources or conditioning causes, one of which may be described as metaphysical and the other as moral or spiritual.

(*a*) From the metaphysical point of view, the oneness is explained as being due to the fact that the historic personality of Jesus Christ is the incarnation of a pre-existent Divine principle, or power of Deity, termed in the Fourth Gospel the Word or Logos, which belongs to the Divine essence, or eternally co-exists with God, and in the fullness of time becomes man (Jn 1[1. 2], ‘In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God’; Jn 1[14], ‘And the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us’).

By St. Paul this pre-existent Divine principle or power of Deity, termed in the Fourth Gospel ‘the Word,’ is represented as already personal, and as becoming man by an act of voluntary condescension or ‘self-emptying’ motived by love (2 Co 8[9], ‘Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might become rich'; cf. Ph 2[5. 6. 7], 'Christ Jesus who, being in the form of God, counted it not a thing to be grasped to be on an equality with God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men'). This conception of the nature and origin of the human personality of Jesus Christ, supplemented by the definite personification of a third principle or power of Deity, viz. the Holy Spirit, which, while one in essence, is yet also regarded as in some way distinct in function and activity alike from the Father and from the Son (Jn 14[16. 17] 16[7], etc.), gave rise to the Catholic Christian doctrine of the Trinity or Triunity of God which was explicitly set forth by the Council of Nicæa in A.D. 325. Union with God, metaphysically conceived of as predicated of Jesus Christ and of the Holy Spirit, was thus regarded not as equivalent to simple identity, but as admitting of plurality and distinctness within the fullness of the one God.

(*b*) From the moral and spiritual point of view, again, the oneness of Christ with God is explained by the apostolic writers as due to the perfect harmony of thought and feeling, desire and volition, subsisting between the historic Christ and God the Father Almighty. This point of view is seen in such sayings as Lk 2[49], 'Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?'; Mt 11[27], 'All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him'; Jn 4[34], 'My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work'; Jn 5[17], 'My Father worketh hitherto, and I work'; 8[28], 'I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak'; Jn 14[10], 'The words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself: but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works.'

From this point of view, while the metaphysical background of the historic personality of Christ in the pre-existing Logos is not denied, it is not emphasized or made prominent as that which constitutes the oneness; the emphasis is on the rational, emotional, and volitional activities of the historic human personality, which are so intimately in harmony with the mind and will of God the Father that Christ is described as 'the effulgence of his glory, and the very image of his person' (He 1[3]). Christ Jesus, by the free exercise of those faculties of knowledge, feeling, desire, and will which are the characteristic elements of human personality, so lifted human nature into union with the Divine that in His historic personality the invisible God is expressed or manifested in human form (Jn 1[18], 'No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him'; Jn 14[9], 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father'). From this ethical and spiritual point of view, the oneness of Jesus Christ with God is not conceived of as a oneness completed from the first, apart from historical and ethical process, but as a oneness progressively realized or exhibited in a truly human life lived under human conditions. And, inasmuch as this oneness with God does not de-personalize or de-humanize Christ Jesus, but is compatible with His being truly man—the Son of man *par excellence* (Mt 12[8])—it becomes the incentive and inspiring motive-power whereby Christian believers, through faith-union with Christ and participation in His Spirit, may hope to reach an ethical and spiritual union with God similar to, if less complete and perfect than, that of Christ (Jn 17[21], 1 Co 6[17]). Neither in Christ's case nor in the case of Christian believers does union with God involve the de-personalizing, in any pantheistic way, of those persons who attain to such union. Whether metaphysically or spiritually regarded, union with God, according to the apostolic teaching, admits of plurality and distinctness of personality, which are yet not a barrier to a true oneness with God.

2. Union of the material world with God.—The apostolic writers are far from thinking of a union of the material world with God in any pantheistic sense, such as would tend to eliminate the personal existence of God, or do away with the distinction between the world and God. According to them, the material world owes its existence to a creative act of the will of the personal God (He 11[3], Ro 1[20]). It has a real existence for God, distinct from His own personal existence, though intimately related thereto. It is the expression of His thought, the product of His creative word, the instrument of His supreme all-controlling will.

Equally removed is their conception from a philosophic dualism like that of Plato, which would erect matter into a principle of being co-eternal with God the supreme Spirit, and serving, as the source of evil, to oppose an insurmountable limit to His omnipotence and infinitude.

Yet in the apostolic doctrine of the eternal Word, or the pre-existent Christ, and the way in which this is thought of in relation to God on the one hand, and to the material created world on the other, there are elements of affinity both with the dualistic and with the pantheistic view. Thus, in relation to God, the eternal Word is one with Him, yet there is plurality or distinctness (Jn 1[1]). There is therefore an element of plurality or 'dualism' which is eternal, though not such as to be incompatible with the Divine oneness, or to thwart eternally the Divine sovereignty, for Son and Father are one.

Again, the eternal Word or pre-existent Christ is at once the active agent in creation, the underlying ground and teleological goal of the created universe, and the principle of coherence which gives meaning and system to the whole (Jn 1[3], 'All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men'; Col 1[16. 17], 'All things have been created through him, and unto him; and he is before all things, and in him all things consist' [*i.e.* 'hold together']).

Thus the created world is not something entirely external to or apart from God, but is in intimate union with God, through the Logos, in whom it has its source, and ground, and principle of subsistence or coherence.

Yet this union of the material world with God, through the Logos, is not incompatible with its having a distinct existence for God as the product of His creative will and the instrument of His all-controlling power (He 11[3]). The union of the material world with God through the Logos, as thus presented, is metaphysical rather than moral or spiritual, and cannot be realized except through ethical and spiritual process. Yet the further thought seems to be expressed in the Pauline writings that, through the influx of sin, the created world as a whole has in some way become alienated from God, and 'made subject to vanity' (Ro 8[20]), and that the issue of Christ's redemptive mission to the world is to be the reconciliation, not of humanity only, but of the whole created world, to God, in a moral and spiritual union which is at present lacking. The completed redemption of mankind will be accompanied by a renewed world fitted to be the home of the redeemed sons of God (Ro 8[22. 23], 'We know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body'; Col $1^{19.\ 20}$, 'It pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; and, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven'; Rev 21^{1}, 'And I saw a new heaven and a new earth').

3. Union of man with God.—The apostolic conception of the Logos as an essential principle in the nature of God, and also the underlying principle and teleological goal of creation, which conditions the apostolic conception of the material world and its relation to God, conditions also in a special way the apostolic conception of man and his relation to God.

As the highest of the creatures, the crown of creation, man stands in a relation of special nearness to the Divine Logos, who, while immanent in all created existence, is immanent with special fullness in man. Thus man is described as 'the image and glory of God' (1 Co 11^{7}) and as 'living and moving and having his being' in God (Ac 17^{28}). This furnishes the basis for affirming a certain metaphysical union between man and God, in virtue of creation, which is yet not incompatible with plurality and personal distinctness. Further, the union between man and God which is due to creation, or to the fact that man's being is rooted and grounded in the Divine Logos, is not yet a complete ethical and spiritual union, but only furnishes the potential basis for such union, which awaits realization through ethical and spiritual process. Man as man is 'made in the image of God' (Gn 1^{26}) and predestined 'to be conformed to the image of his Son' (Ro 8^{29}) and to participate in the Divine eternal life. But this can be realized only through ethical process, involving the exercise of freedom of will by man as a moral personality distinct from, though intimately related to and grounded in, God. The influx of sin, through man's perverse misuse of his free will, is represented as hindering and preventing this intended spiritual union between man and God, which is the true goal of creation.

Sin is represented, in apostolic thought, as causing alienation and separation of man from God, with all the bitter consequences flowing therefrom (Ro 5^{12}, 1 Jn 3^{8}, Ja 1^{15}). Though man's being, as man, is rooted and grounded in the Divine Logos (Ac 17^{28}), yet sinful men are not in spiritual union with the holy God as sons in whom He is well pleased, but are alienated from Him and under His wrath and curse (Ro 1^{18} 2^{8} $8^{7.\ 8}$, Eph 2^{3}, Gal 3^{10}, etc.). That perfect spiritual union of man with God which the natural head of our human race, the first Adam, failed to attain to, through sin, has, however, been attained to and realized in the Person of Jesus Christ the second Adam, who is the perfect 'Son of man' and also 'Son of God' (1 Co $15^{22.\ 45\text{-}49}$). As made in the image of God, the form of man furnished a form of being capable of expressing the Divine Logos in fullness of measure. And, in the fullness of time, there appeared on earth a man in whom the Divine Logos was incarnate and dwelt in perfect fullness—the man Christ Jesus (Jn 1^{14}, Ph $2^{6\text{-}8}$). In Him the incarnation of the Divine Logos receives supreme and perfect individual expression, and union of man with God is perfectly realized. And the aim and purpose of this incarnation of the Logos in the individual historic personality of the man Christ Jesus is said to be 'the bringing of many sons unto glory' (He 2^{10})—the bringing into being of a kingdom of redeemed humanity under Christ as King, in which love, the principle of the Divine nature, reigns supreme (Col 1^{13}).

The fall of mankind under the power of sin, with all its bitter consequences, conditioned the task which the perfect Son of man and Son of God, when He appeared on earth, had to undertake and accomplish, in order to bring about reconciliation and effect the redemption and restoration of sinful men, and establish the Kingdom of God.

As the representative and head of our sinful race vicariously bearing our sins in His body (1 P 2^{24}) and on His Spirit (Mt 8^{17}), He had to suffer and die, 'the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God' (1 P 3^{18}). And it is through union with Him by faith that sinful men, alienated from God through sin, become reconciled to God and enter progressively upon that ethical and spiritual union with God which is man's true goal (1 Co 6^{17}, 2 Co $5^{17\text{-}21}$, etc.). Thus, according to the apostolic conception, union of man with God, in the ethical and spiritual sense, implied in the relation of sonship to God, is not something already belonging to man in virtue of creation, and persisting in spite of sin, but something to be attained to and realized through ethical and spiritual process. And for sinful men the only way of attainment is through union by faith with Jesus Christ the 'one mediator between God and men' (1 Ti 2^{5}). This union with Christ, and thereby with God, realized in the life of Christian faith, is brought about by the gracious influence of the Holy Spirit in the minds and hearts of individuals, working through the means of grace, viz. the Word, the sacraments, and prayer.

But, while the agency of the Holy Spirit in bringing about this union is emphasized and made prominent by the apostolic writers, the individual human personality is regarded, not as purely passive in the process, but as co-operating through free will, at least to the extent of yielding freely to the Spirit's gracious influences and allowing the life to be moulded thereby (Ro 8^{14}, Ph $2^{12.\ 13}$, 2 Co 3^{18}). Union with God, mediated through the gracious influences of the Spirit, is thus set forth by the apostolic writers as essentially of an ethical or spiritual rather than of a mystical kind. It is not an ecstatic rapture of a Neo-Platonic kind, tending to dissolve the individual personality in a wider whole, though traces of such a conception are not altogether wanting in the apostolic records (*e.g.* 2 Co $12^{2\text{-}4}$). Rather is it an experience of an ethical and spiritual order, the goal of which is not the absorption of the individual in God, in a kind of Nirvana, but the completion and perfecting of all that is of worth and value in individual personality in loving communion with God through Christ (Jn 17^{23}, Rev 21^{2}). The literature of the 1st cent., outside the canon of Scripture, including the epistles of Clement and Barnabas and perhaps the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, fragments of Papias, and the *Shepherd of Hermas*, so popular in the Church during the 2nd and 3rd centuries, contains nothing new or distinctive bearing on the subject of union with God as compared with the apostolic writings.

Clement has some fine passages about creation (*Ep. ad Cor.* xx., lix., lx.) in which a clear distinction is drawn between Creator and creature. God's name, he says, is 'the primal cause of every creature' (ch. lix.); and God's immanence in man is recognized ('His breath is in us' [ch. xxi.]). He recognizes also, in a clear way, the mediatorship of Christ, through faith in whom we rise into union with God, 'looking up to the heights of heaven' and 'tasting of immortal knowledge' (ch. xxxvi.). He is eloquent, too, in praise of love as that which 'unites men to God' (ch. xlix.).

Barnabas dwells on the idea of believers being the spiritual temple of God through the indwelling presence of His Spirit in them (*Ep. of Barn.* xvi.).

In the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* the union of the world with God through His creative activity and sovereign controlling power is recognized ('The workings that befall thee receive as good, knowing that apart from God nothing cometh to pass' [ch. iii.]; 'Thou Master Almighty didst create all things for thy name's sake' [ch. x.]). The words 'Let grace come and let this world pass away' (ch. x.) seem to point, like Ro $8^{22.23}$ and Rev 21^{1}, to the coming of 'a new heaven and a new earth' as the result of the final triumph of Divine grace. Christ is recognized as the Mediator of spiritual union between man and God, through whom life and knowledge have been made known to men, and the Church of the redeemed is to be 'gathered from the ends of the earth' and 'sanctified for the kingdom prepared for it' (chs. ix., x.).

Papias says of believers that 'they ascend through the Spirit to the Son and through the Son to the Father,' and that in due time 'the Son will yield up his work to the Father' (frag. v.; cf. 1 Co 15^{25-28}).

Hermas says of God, 'who created and finished all things and made all things out of nothing,' 'He alone is able to contain the whole, but himself cannot be contained' (*Mand.* 1). Again, 'They only who fear the Lord and keep his commandments have life with God; but as to those who keep not his commandments, there is no life in them' (*Mand.* 7), and 'The Lord dwells in men that love peace, because he loved peace; but from the contentious and the wicked he is far distant' (*Sim.* IX. xxxii. 2).

LITERATURE.—J. Rendel Harris, *Union with God*, London, 1895; articles on 'Union,' 'Oneness,' 'Unity,' in *DCG*; *The Apostolic Fathers*, tr. A. Roberts and J. Donaldson (*Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, i.), Edinburgh, 1867; J. R. Illingworth, *Divine Immanence*, London, 1898.

D. S. ADAM.

UNITY.—The idea of unity is one of those that are most pervasive in the apostolic writings; and naturally so. Christianity is the religion of reconciliation; and, fully recognizing the radical character of the antagonisms that reveal themselves in experience, it everywhere discloses a profounder unity in which these opposites are harmonized. While it does not assume the function of a philosophy, it does claim to give, from the moral and teleological standpoint, a synthetic view, and, indeed, the only synthetic view, of reality; in Christ it finds the way, the truth, and the life by which the unity of God and man and the whole universe of being must be finally achieved.

On the cardinal issue, existence is seen both as a unity and as a duality. The duality is wholly and tragically real. Physical evil is no illusion, but is the correlate of moral evil; and moral evil is not an inevitable stage in the evolution of moral good, but is *sin*, that which absolutely ought not to be. Yet this duality exists within the circumference, so to say, of an eternal unity before and after; an original self-existent principle of evil is excluded by NT thought. On the other hand, it attempts no solution of the problem how duality has arisen out of pre-existent unity; it is content to trace sin back to the beginning of human history, or, if further, to the agency of a Tempter who had himself fallen from his first estate. Its interest in the problem is not at all speculative, but solely practical—to emphasize, on the one hand, the fact of man's innate sinfulness, and, on the other, the fact that sin is precisely that which has no point of origination in the Divine causality, but is in essential antagonism to the nature and will of God.

1. The Being of God as the primal source of all unity.—(*a*) As against all polytheistic or dualistic systems, apostolic thought posits this as its first truth (1 Co $8^{4.6}$, Eph 4^{6}, Ja 2^{19}). And this ensures a unity in nature and history. Although the marks of imperfection and disorganization are everywhere seen upon the face of Creation, although it is in bondage to the law of decay and corruption, and is the scene of apparently fruitless tragedy (Ro 8^{20-22}), yet it is pervaded by a unity of rational purpose and control (v.^{28}, Ac 27^{22-24}); and this is true not only of natural processes and events, but of those that are brought about by the volition of men or other free agents (Ac 2^{23} 21^{10-14}, 2 Co 12^{7}).

(*b*) The Divine nature is ethically a unity—light in which there is no darkness at all. God is 'faithful' (1 Jn 1^{9}, 2 Ti 2^{13}), unchangeably self-consistent (Ja 1^{17}). His different modes of action upon different objects only prove the immutability of His moral nature (Ro 2^{6-10}, 2 Th $1^{6.7}$, 2 P 2^{4-9}). And the centre of this unity, from which all His ethical attributes derive, is Love; the ultimate explanation of all that God does, and purposes, and permits is—God is Love (1 Jn 4^{8}). Hence, also, the Righteousness of God, His Will as imperative for all beings capable of ethical life, is a unity. His Law is an ethical organism, expressing in every part the same principle (Ro 13^{8-10}), to violate which in one point is virtually to violate the whole (Ja 2^{10}). Hence, again, sin is a unity. Within all individual sins (ἁμαρτήματα) there lives that (ἡ ἁμαρτία) which makes them to be sinful. St. Paul almost personifies this principle of sin (Ro $7^{11.14}$). St. John defines it as ἀνομία, lawlessness, the assertion of an evil egoistic will against the perfectly good will of God (1 Jn 3^{4}). Sin is not seen in its true character until it is seen in its unity.

2. Unity of mediation.—The explanation of the dualism we are conscious of in experience is not found, as in Gnosticism, in the transition from the transcendent God to the created universe. The unity of the Divine self-existence is not lost when related to other being; its fullness is not portioned out in successive separate emanations. There is one God, and one Mediator (1 Co 8^{6}, 1 Ti 2^{5})—He who became in human history the 'man Christ Jesus.' In Him, as the Image and Only-begotten of the Father, the undivided fullness of the Godhead dwells (Jn 1^{14}, Col 2^{9}); and He is not only, by His Incarnation, the one Mediator to mankind of all Divine life, truth, and saving grace, but the Divine agent in all creation (Jn 1^{3}, Col 1^{16}), and the principle of its unity (Col 1^{17}). See FULNESS; MEDIATION.

3. The unity of man.—(*a*) The generic unity, physical and moral, of mankind (already seen in the OT and in Stoicism) is a presupposition of Christian soteriology; human nature has everywhere the same spiritual capacities, needs the same salvation, and is capable of appropriating it by the same means (Ro 1^{16}, etc.). This unity is categorically affirmed (Ac 17^{26}); historically it has its source in descent from one common primal ancestor (Ro 5^{14-19}, 1 Co $15^{22.47}$), but ultimately in the fact that man as man is the image and offspring of God (Ac $17^{28.29}$).

(*b*) Hence there is unity as regards responsibility. Apart from special revelation, man possesses a rational and moral nature, made for the knowledge and love of God, with capacities for discerning the self-manifestations of God in His creative and providential activities (Ac 14^{17}, Ro 1^{19-21}); and especially does conscience bear witness to the sovereign imperative of His righteousness ($2^{14.15}$).

(*c*) But, actually, unity in responsibility has become unity in sin. Human character has become corrupt at its hereditary source (Ro $5^{12.17-19}$, *4 Ezr.* iii. 216, *Apoc. Bar.* liv. 15, 19); human life universally characterized by wilful sin (Ro 3^{9-20}), involving guilt (v.^{19}) and that separation from God (Eph 4^{18}, Col 1^{21}) which is death (Ro 6^{23}, Eph $2^{1.5}$, Col 2^{13}).

4. Unity of redemption.—(*a*) For the common human need one common redemption is provided (Ac 4^{12}, Ro $10^{4.12}$, 1 Jn 2^{2}), to be received by the same means (Ro 4^{11-16}, Gal 2^{16}, 1 Jn 1^{7-9}), working to the same issues of forgiveness (Ro 8^{1}, Rev 1^{5}), reconciliation to God (Ro $5^{1.10}$, 2 Co 5^{18-21}), enduement with the Spirit (Ro 8^{1-16}), eternal life ($5^{17.21}$, 1 Jn $5^{11.13.20}$). Possessing such fellowship with God in Christ, as the source of their common life and object of their common faith, Christians also possess a unique spiritual affinity and fellowship with each other. And, in the Apostolic Age, the consciousness of unity reaches its intensest point in the conception of this fellowship, alike Divine and human, as embodied in the Church. In this, racial and social distinctions—Jew and Gentile, bond and free—serve only to emphasize and enhance the fact that those who are united in Christ, however different in all else, have immeasurably more in common than those who are separated by Christ, however alike in every other respect (1 Co 7^{22}, Gal 3^{28}, Eph 2^{11-22}). So, also, distinctions of custom and even of conviction do not disappear (Ro 14^{5}); yet even such diverse interpretations of truth and duty ought only to evoke a fuller realization of supreme truth and duty, the faith and love in which all are one. Unity is emphasized as against mere uniformity (1 Co 12). In the spiritual body, as in the physical, a rich diversity of gift and function is necessary to the complete expression of the organic life-principle (vv.$^{4-6}$). It is only in its complex collective unity that renewed humanity can reach its Divine ideal (Eph 4^{11-13}).

(*b*) But in the Pauline Epistles it is seen that, Christ being what He is, universal Mediator and Lord, He is destined to become by His reconciling work the centre of a unity that embraces all existence, and that is essential even for the full redemption of man. Christ must be Head over all things to His Body, which is the Church (Eph 1^{22}); hostile elemental forces must be subdued (1 Co 15^{24}, Eph 1^{21}); all things, whether on earth or in heaven, must come under His reconciling sway (Col 1^{20}), and the whole creation be emancipated into the liberty that belongs to the glorified state of God's children (Ro 8^{21}), that God may be all in all (1 Co 15^{28}).

5. The final unity.—As has been said, the NT attempts no solution of the problem how duality has arisen out of an original unity, and the same is largely true of the converse problem, how the existent duality is to be finally overcome, resolved into the eternal unity of Divine truth and love. One thing only is seen as a certainty for Christian faith: of such unity Christ is the sole cause and ever-living centre. He must reign: it is unto Him that all things must be subdued; it is as the fruit of His sacrifice that God will reconcile all things unto Himself; it is in His name that every knee shall bow, Him that every tongue must confess as Lord, to the glory of God the Father. But in apostolic thought (which here virtually means Pauline) the age to come seems to be viewed in different perspectives. In the one the curtain falls upon an unresolved or, at any rate, imperfectly resolved dualism. Christ's enemies are made His footstool; yet their subjection, if not merely physical, is not completely moral. Evil is still evil, though in chains and, to this extent, subject to the righteousness of God. This is the vision which arises when the final issue is viewed from the side of human freedom and responsibility. If absolute finality is not ascribed to the spiritual choices of the present, the future of those who in this present world reject the life-giving Spirit is left in unrelieved gloom. From another point of view, the necessary consummation of Christ's victory is seen to be nothing less than the moral unification of all existence. The ruin wrought by Adam and the redemption wrought by Christ seem to be co-extensive in human history (Ro 5^{16}, 1 Co 15^{22}); and in the dispensation of the fullness of the times it is God's purpose to bring all things again into unity (*ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι*) in Christ (Eph 1^{10}; cf. Col $1^{19.20}$, Ph 2^{9-11}). When Christ's work is done, God will be all in all (1 Co 15^{28}). And this is the vision that arises when the final issue is regarded from the side of Divine sovereignty and purpose. As to the means by which such a consummation may be hereafter achieved the NT is silent. Again it has to be said that its interest in the problem is wholly practical, not speculative—to emphasize the fact that there is complete, eternal deliverance and blessedness for all who are Christ's; that in some sense, at some time, by some means beyond our ken, Christ will be universally victorious, because God is God, and God is Love.

ROBERT LAW.

UNIVERSALISM.—See ESCHATOLOGY.

UNKNOWN GOD (Ac 17^{23}; AV and RVm 'TO THE UNKNOWN GOD,' RV 'TO AN UNKNOWN GOD' [the absence of the article in Greek was common in inscriptions, so that either rendering is permissible]).—It is often stated that light is thrown on this subject by an incident in the life of Epimenides as related by Diogenes Laertius (*Epimen.* i. 110). We are told that the hero, in a time of plague at Athens, took white and black sheep to the hill Areopagus and let them loose. Wherever one of the animals rested, an altar was erected, in the supposition that the sheep was pointing to the god whose shrine was situated nearest to that particular spot. The reason for this procedure was that the people were ignorant as to which deity was offended, and they hoped in this way to ascertain which god they ought to propitiate in order that the plague might be stayed. Among the ancients such a dilemma seems to have been frequent (cf. at Rome, Aul. Gell. ii. 28; Horace, *Epod.* v. 1, *Sat.* II. vi. 20; see also Theophrastus, *Char.* 17). But the chief objection to this theory is that the altars are distinctly said to be 'anonymous,' which can only mean that they bore no inscription.

It is just possible that some such inscription as that in the text was afterwards added, but not likely. Nor are we helped by Jerome, who states (on Tit 1^{12}) that the inscription actually read, 'To the gods of Asia and Europe and Africa, to unknown and strange gods,' for such an altar could not possibly be that referred to by the Apostle. The main difficulty lies in the fact that no extant inscription exactly bears out the Apostle's words; and yet there is sufficient evidence to lead us to suppose that he is correctly reported. For instance, Pausanias (I. i. 4) says that on the road from the Phaleric port to the city he had noticed 'altars of gods called unknown, and of heroes' (*βωμοὶ δὲ θεῶν τε ὀνομαζομένων ἀγνώστων καὶ ἡρώων*), which may quite well mean that he saw several altars bearing inscriptions similar to that mentioned by St. Paul, yet in V. xiv. 6 he speaks again of 'an altar of unknown gods' (*πρὸς αὐτῷ δ' ἐστὶν ἀγνώστων θεῶν βωμός*). Similarly Philostratus (*Vit. Apollon.* vi. 3) says that at Athens are found 'altars of unknown deities.' It is, therefore, impossible to say with certainty whether such altars were erected 'to an (or 'the') unknown god' or 'to unknown gods.' The only passage where direct support is found for the words of Acts is in the dialogue of *Philopatris*—attributed to Lucian—where one of the characters swears 'by the unknown god of Athens.' But, as this work belongs to the 3rd cent. A.D., it may only be a quotation from this passage. The same objection is in part valid with regard to the Mithraic inscription of Ostia, now in the Vatican Museum; a sacrificial group is represented bearing the legend 'the symbol of the undiscoverable god.' The date of this is probably the 2nd or 3rd cent.; but, on the other hand, the Mithraic cult is a good deal older than that. The Greek word (ἄγνωστος) translated 'unknown' possibly bears also the meaning 'unknowable,' though it is less probable. In this connexion we may compare a passage from Plutarch (*de Is. et Osir.* 9) which tells of an inscription on the veil of Isis at Sais. It runs as follows: 'I am, and I was, and I shall be; no mortal has lifted my veil.' Such suggestions as that there is a reference in 'unknowable' to Jahweh, who was spoken of by Gentile writers as 'wholly hidden' (Justin Martyr, *Apol.* ii. 10), or that such an altar might date from the period when writing was unknown, are quite fanciful and cannot be entertained.

Some writers, as F. C. Baur and E. Zeller, regard the whole incident as unhistorical, from the fact that the inscription is in the singular, whereas none such has been found, while the plural is more in keeping with the prevalent polytheism. At any rate there is an element of doubt in some of the references, and, had the writer so wished, he could easily have fallen into line in this matter. Even F. Overbeck admits that the above references allow the possibility of such an inscription. It is difficult to suppose that a mere romancer would have invented such a point; and, if St. Paul made any such reference, it is unthinkable that he would have been inaccurate.

LITERATURE.—See the Commentaries on Acts; also E. H. Plumptre, *Movements in Religious Thought*, London, 1879, p. 78 ff.

F. W. WORSLEY.

UNLEAVENED BREAD.—See PASSOVER.

UNRIGHTEOUSNESS (ἀδικία, subs. corresponding to ἀδικεῖν=to be ἄδικος, *i.e.* out of harmony with δίκη, 'established usage,' 'what is right and fit').—In the NT, where men are described as ἄδικοι (*e.g.* 1 Co 6^{9}, 1 P 3^{18}), the interchangeable EVV equivalents are 'unrighteous,' 'unjust.' Where the verb ἀδικέω occurs, the versions vary between 'do wrong,' 'be an offender (wrong-doer),' 'be unjust (unrighteous)'; see Ac 7^{26} 25^{10} (trans.) and Ac 25^{11}, Rev 22^{11} (intrans.). As for ἀδικία itself, the usual equivalent in the EVV is 'unrighteousness' (see Romans, *passim*). 'Iniquity' occurs as an alternative: but only once the RV prefers the variant 'wrong-doing' (2 P 2^{13}). 'Iniquity' as= 'unrighteousness' springs from a kindred primitive conception—the uneven surface as compared with the crooked line. The ἄδικος may be represented indifferently as being 'out of the level' or 'out of the straight' (see both ideas in parallel use in Is 40^{3-5}). There is a simple adequacy in these primitive modes of describing human character and action that no development of ethical doctrine can outgrow.

1. In the vocabulary of the Apostolic Church 'righteousness' and 'unrighteousness' form an antithetic pair in correspondence with others, such as 'light' and 'darkness.' An ethical dichotomy this, which has its rise in far-off early days, gains new force in the teaching of Jesus (the broad and narrow ways), and lives on with undiminished vigour. Interesting parallels are furnished in the *Shepherd* of Hermas (*Mand.* vi. 2): 'There are two angels with a man—one of righteousness, and the other of iniquity. . . . It is good to follow the angel of righteousness, but to bid farewell to the angel of iniquity' (*Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, vol. i., 'Apostolic Fathers,' Edinburgh, 1867, p. 359 f.); in the *Epistle of Barnabas* (chs. 18–20), where both the two ways and the two angels occur in association: 'There are two ways of doctrine and authority, the one of light, and the other of darkness . . . over one are stationed the light-bringing angels of God, but over the other the angels of Satan.' Cf. also the Two Ways (of Life and of Death) in the *Didache*. One unfaltering demand is made of the Christian in the primitive Church—he must 'depart from iniquity' (2 Ti 2^{19}).

2. In St. Paul's doctrine of justification 'unrighteousness' appears as the salient, universal characteristic of man as such, and figures as a necessary pre-supposition. He cannot, however, be legitimately claimed as supporting the view that this unrighteousness is the sequel of a lapse from an 'original righteousness' in which the 'first parents' of mankind were created (cf. A. Ritschl, *The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation*, Eng. tr., Edinburgh, 1900, p. 330). The righteousness, moreover, which the ἄδικος may attain through faith ('righteousness-of-God,' 'righteousness-by-faith') is not a mere matter of imputation (*iustitia imputata* of a past theology): for St. Paul's emphasis on 'Christ *in* us' must not be overlooked. His robust ethical quality also appears in his vigorous rejection of the plea that might be suggested in excuse for man's unrighteousness, viz. that it serves as a foil against which the righteousness of God shows more splendidly (Ro 3^{5}). Note further a conspicuous use of 'truth' as the antithesis of 'unrighteousness' (Ro 2^{8}, 1 Co 13^{6}, 2 Th 2^{12}). 'Injustice is falsehood in deed' (B. F. Westcott, *Gospel according to St. John*, 2 vols., London, 1908, i. 268).

3. A brief *dictum* in the Johannine teaching deserves notice: 'All unrighteousness is sin' (1 Jn 5^{17}), with which may be compared the valid converse of the proposition in 3^{4}: 'Lawlessness is sin.' Thus sententiously all distinction between various forms of deliberate transgression is abolished. Wrong as from man to man is also wrong as from man to God. Due thought of God's perfect righteousness, together with man's relation to Him, demands this heightening of the conception of unrighteousness. Similarly, the claim that there is 'no unrighteousness' in God's perfect Messenger (Jn 7^{18}) rests on the fact that He is sent by God in whom no unrighteousness dwells (cf. Plato, *Theæt.* 176 C: 'In God is no unrighteousness at all; He is altogether righteous').

J. S. CLEMENS.

UPPER ROOM.—See HOUSE.

URBANUS (Οὐρβανός, a Latin name, common among slaves and found in inscriptions of the Imperial household).—Urbanus is saluted by St. Paul in Ro 16^{9} and described as 'our fellow-worker in Christ' (τὸν συνεργὸν ἡμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ). Prisca and Aquila are saluted in v.^{3} as 'my fellow-workers in Christ Jesus,' and Timothy is referred to in v.^{21} as 'my fellow-worker.' Elsewhere the term is used of Aristarchus (Col 4^{11}, Philem^{24}), Clement and others (Ph 4^{3}), Demas (Philem^{24}), Epaphroditus (Ph 2^{25}), Jesus Justus (Col 4^{11}), Luke (Philem^{24}), Mark (Col 4^{10}, Philem^{24}), Philemon (v.^{2}), Titus (2 Co 8^{23}). It is the commonest of the designations used by St. Paul (cf. the use of the verb in connexion with the household of Stephanas, 1 Co 16^{16}: ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ὑποτάσσησθε τοῖς τοιούτοις καὶ παντὶ τῷ συνεργοῦντι καὶ κοπιῶντι). The Apostle and his fellow-workers were also fellow-workers with God (1 Co 3^{9}, θεοῦ γάρ ἐσμεν συνεργοί). Outside St. Paul's Epistles the only other use of συνεργός in the NT is 3 Jn^{8}, where hospitality to Christians is commended, 'that we may be fellow-workers with the truth.' Nothing further is known to us of the form which the work of Urbanus took, but it is clear that he assisted the Apostle in his missionary labours in some way well known to the readers of these salutations. We shall suppose him to have been resident at the time of writing in Rome or in Ephesus, according to our view of the destination of Ro 16. 'In the adjective "our" the Apostle may include with himself either the pair he has just named [Prisca and Aquila], or the whole of those mentioned in the list before Urbanus; or, on the other hand, his constant companions like Timothy, Silvanus, and Titus' (see C. von Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age*, Eng. tr., i. [1894] 394).

T. B. ALLWORTHY.

UTTERANCE.—The word 'utterance' is found five times in the AV of the NT: once in Acts (2^4) and four times in the writings of St. Paul (1 Co 1^5, 2 Co 8^7, Eph 6^{19}, Col 4^3). In the passage in Acts it does not represent any substantive in the original, the phrase translated 'as the Spirit gave them utterance' being literally 'as the Spirit gave them to speak' (ἀποφθέγγεσθαι). Where it occurs in St. Paul's Epistles it represents the Greek word λόγος, and in two passages (1 Co 1^5, 2 Co 8^7) it is used in conjunction with 'knowledge' (γνῶσις). In Col 4^3 the phrase of the AV 'a door of utterance' has been changed by the Revisers to 'a door for the word.' The meaning to be attached to λόγος has, therefore, been changed from the power of expression possessed by the speaker to the Divine message which he is charged to deliver.

The significance of the word in the NT seems to be the power of speech rather than what is actually spoken. This power is a gift of the Holy Spirit, bestowed on certain individuals, with the implication that it has been given for some special purpose. It might therefore be fittingly applied to the prophets (cf. 1 Co 14), though it is not so used in fact.

The Apostolic Fathers do not use λόγος in this sense.

R. H. MALDEN.

V

VANITY.—Neither in the OT nor in the NT is the word 'vanity' used in the sense of self-conceit or vainglory (see PRIDE): it is always a rendering of ματαιότης, which is an essentially Scriptural word, not being found in an ethical sense in the classical writers. There is, however, an adjective, rendered 'vain,' which has no corresponding substantive, namely κενός. Perhaps the prevailing sense of κενός is 'emptiness' or 'hollowness,' while μάταιος rather expresses 'futility' or 'fruitlessness,' and denotes an absence of aim or a purpose unfulfilled; but the two epithets are so nearly synonymous even on the showing of R. C. Trench (*NT Synonyms*^{9}, London, 1880, p. 180 f., where he defines κόπος κενός [1 Co 15^{58}] as 'labour which yields no return') that the distinction cannot always be pressed. J. B. Mayor on 2 P 2^{10} (see *The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter*, London, 1907) discusses the passages of LXX where ματαιότης is found, *e.g.* Ps 4^2 39^6 and the famous Ec 1^2 ('vanity of vanities'), and concludes that in these cases, as in 2 P 2^{10}, the word approximates to the Pauline use in Ro 8^{20} ('the creation was subjected to vanity') and denotes what is simply passing and transient. On the other hand, in Ps 26^4 119^{37} 144^8 and Eph 4^{17} he is of opinion that the word expresses moral instability, being used 'of men without principle on whom no reliance can be placed.'

As against the view of Mayor, it should be remembered that in Ro 8^{20} the meaning of resultlessness or ineffectiveness (see Sanday-Headlam, *ICC*, 'Romans'^{5}, Edinburgh, 1902, *in loc.*) is equally harmonious with the context as indicating the opposite of τέλειος, that is, the disappointing character of the present existence with its unfulfilled aims and its pursuit of ends never realized. The word is found in *Barn.* iv. 10; Polyc. *ad Phil.* vii. 2; Ignatius, *ad Trall.* viii. 2. On the whole, an examination of the passages where ματαιότης and μάταιος are found as well as compound words like ματαιολογία and ματαιοπονία tends to support the theory that 'vanity,' or ματαιότης (Heb. הֶבֶל, though in LXX the word is also a rendering of שָׁוְא), denotes 'either absence of purpose or failure to attain any true purpose' (J. Armitage Robinson, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*^{2}, London, 1909, on 4^{17}).

R. MARTIN POPE.

VEIL (καταπέτασμα).—The tabernacle was divided into two parts by means of a veil or curtain, which the writer of Hebrews calls 'the second veil' (τὸ δεύτερον καταπέτασμα, 9^3), to distinguish it from the screen which hung before the entrance to the Holy Place. It was of fine tapestry, and was suspended upon four pillars overlaid with gold (Ex 26^{31-32}). Josephus (*Ant.* VIII. iii. 3) calls it ἐνδότερον καταπέτασμα, and Philo (*de Gig.* 12) τὸ ἐσώτατον καταπέτασμα, but it was pre-eminently *the* veil (הַפָּרֹכֶת, while the curtain at the door of the Holy Place was known as מָסָךְ, tr. 'a screen' in RV), and it is the only one referred to in the NT. In He 6^{19} 'the place within the veil' (τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος), which only the high priest might enter once a year, is figuratively used of heaven, the inmost shrine into which Jesus, a High Priest of another order, has entered as a Forerunner. In 10^{20} the veil is allegorized as the corporeal and earthly nature of the Christ, who is said to have dedicated a way into heaven 'through the veil, that is, his flesh.' As the veil of the tabernacle, and that of the Temple, hung between the high priest and the shrine which was hallowed by the Shekinah, so Christ's frail humanity lay between Him and the glory of the heavenly sanctuary. His flesh had to be rent—as the Temple veil was rent (Mk 15^{38})—that He might enter, and by so entering He became a Pioneer and Path-finder for all seekers after immortality.

JAMES STRAHAN.

VENGEANCE.—The word 'vengeance' (ἐκδίκησις), with its corresponding substantive 'avenger' (ἔκδικος, 1 Th 4^6, Ro 13^4), is an essentially NT word and never carries with it the suggestion of arbitrary or vindictive reprisals: it is always a just retribution, and a retribution inflicted by God Himself or His instruments (1 P 2^{14}). If the idea of wrath is associated with the use of the word, as in Ro 3^5 13^4, such 'wrath' (ὀργή) is the eternal righteousness or justice of God acting in harmony with His revealed will. In both Ro 12^{19} and He 10^{30} the words 'Vengeance is mine; I will repay' are quoted somewhat loosely from Dt 32^{35} (ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδικήσεως ἀνταποδώσω). The verb (ἐκδικέω) occurs in the parable of the Unjust Judge (Lk $18^{3, 7, 8}$) in the sense of affording protection from a wrong-doer and so vindicating the right of the injured person. It is then applied by our Lord to the Divine vindication of the 'elect,' the phrase used being ποιεῖν τὴν ἐκδίκησιν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν, which suggests the protection of persevering saints as well as the just penalty inflicted on their aggressors.

In the ethics of Christianity the Golden Rule solves the problem of private and personal revenge. Revenge at the bidding of momentary passion or as the gratification of a selfish emotion is resolutely condemned by the teaching of Christ, and forgiveness takes the place of the old savage law of retaliation (see Mt 5[38-48]). Of the assertion 'Vengeance is mine,' W. H. Moberly (in *Foundations*, London, 1912, p. 280) writes: 'This limits, but at the same time consecrates, the notion of retribution. The disinterested infliction of retribution is sometimes a moral necessity'; and he further quotes T. H. Green (*Principles of Political Obligation*, § 183): 'Indignation against wrong done to another has nothing in common with a desire to revenge a wrong done to oneself. It borrows the language of private revenge just as the love of God borrows the language of sensuous affection.'

Punishment, if it is to carry any moral weight, must involve the vindication of law, and consequently the new ethic of Christianity which controlled the conduct of the Apostolic Church is based on love, which rules out of revenge the element of private and personal malevolence (see some cogent remarks by J. S. Mackenzie, *Manual of Ethics*[4], London, 1900, p. 404 f.). The repetition of the quotation from Dt 32[35], in the form in which it comes to us in two such representative Christian writings as the Epistles to the Romans and the Hebrews, shows clearly that the Christian consciousness had grasped the idea of punishment as in effect a Divine prerogative. The private individual has not to assume judicial functions which properly belong to a recognized legal tribunal or 'powers' regarded as Divinely ordained (Ro 13[1-6]).

On the relation of the subject to war, E. Willmore (*HJ* xiii. [1915] 340) describes how the doubts of a friend—a Territorial soldier—as to the moral rightness of war (based on 'Vengeance is mine,' etc.) were resolved by reading of the atrocities of Belgium and the nature of German atheism. 'Vengeance belongs to God,' he wrote; 'then we are God's instruments.' War as a method of giving expression to the law of international righteousness is admittedly repugnant to the Christian conscience; but until the method is superseded as the result of a *consensus gentium*, a Christian nation is not absolved from the duty of vindicating either by offensive or by defensive warfare the eternal principles of right and justice.

R. MARTIN POPE.

VESPASIAN.—Titus Flavius Vespasianus was Roman Emperor from 1st July A.D. 69 to 24th June (other authorities, 23rd July) 79, and ruled under the style Imperator Cæsar Vespasianus Augustus (sometimes Imperator Vespasianus Cæsar Augustus). He sprang from an obscure family, his grandfather having been a citizen of the Sabine country-town Reate, who served as a centurion on the side of Pompey against Julius Cæsar in the Civil War till the battle of Pharsalus (48 B.C.), after which he returned home.

Vespasian was brought up by his grandmother Tertulla on her estate at Cosa in Etruria. Flavius Sabinus, the father of Vespasian, was a highly respected revenue official in Asia Minor, who afterwards removed to Switzerland, where he died. Vespasian's mother, Vespasia Polla, was of better family than her husband, for her father, a citizen of Nursia in the Sabine country, had been a military tribune, and her brother was a senator.

Vespasian was born on 17th November A.D. 9, at Falacrine, a place near Reate. His elder brother, Flavius Sabinus, had attained senatorial rank, and Vespasian was ambitious to follow in his footsteps. As quæstor he was allotted to the province Crete and Cyrene. He held the office of ædile under Caligula, probably in 38, and the prætorship in 39. In this year, on 30th December, his eldest child, the future Emperor Titus (see art. TITUS), was born, his mother's name being Flavia Domitilla. In the year 41–42 Vespasian was sent to Germany in command of a legion, at that time stationed at Argentoratum (Strasbourg), and fought against the Germans. With this legion, the Legio II. Augusta, he crossed to Britain in the expedition of 43, and conquered two powerful tribes, twenty towns, and the Isle of Wight. In consequence he obtained *ornamenta triumphalia* in the triumph of 44, and further honours later. On 24th October 51, in November and December of which year Vespasian was *consul suffectus*, his second son Domitian was born. After this date Vespasian was in temporary retirement. His patron Narcissus, the powerful freedman of Claudius, died in 54, and Agrippina, widow of Claudius and mother of Nero, pursued his former friends with hatred. She also perished in 59, when Vespasian was proconsul of Africa. In favour of his rule in Africa this at least can be said, that he returned from the province in financial embarrassment. In the year 66 he accompanied Nero on his theatrical and musical tour to Greece, but incurred the Emperor's disfavour through his lack of interest in the performances.

The Jewish War provided Vespasian with an opportunity which he was not slow to seize. Judæa had always been a hot-bed of dissension, more particularly since the commencement of Roman rule. There were disputes between the Jews and the Syrians, risings, Messianic expectations, and dissatisfaction with the procuratorial administration. All these causes contributed to the colossal rebellion against Rome. Gessius Florus, who became procurator of Judæa in 64, outraged Jewish feeling in every possible way, particularly by robbery and massacre. Cestius Gallus, governor of Syria, after a short success against Jerusalem, was forced to retire. War could not then be avoided. Nero felt compelled to recall Vespasian to Court as the only suitable man to inflict the deserved punishment on the Jews. The precise status conferred upon Vespasian is uncertain; he was to co-operate with Licinius Mucianus, the competent but ambitious governor of Syria. Sending his son Titus very early in 67 to bring a legion from Alexandria, he himself went from Nero's quarters in Achaia over the Hellespont by land to Syria, and collected the Roman forces there. From Antioch he marched to Ptolemais, where Titus joined him. Their combined forces amounted to three legions, twenty-three cohorts, six squadrons, and a large number of Asiatic auxiliary troops, or a total of 60,000 men. His first aim was to subdue Galilee, and in this campaign the most important phase was the stubborn siege of Jotapata. Jaffa was taken about 26th June, and Jotapata, after about 40 days' resistance, was captured about 2nd July. Among the captives taken was Josephus, the commander of the Jewish forces in Galilee, and the future historian of the war, who was kindly treated by Vespasian. On 5th July Vespasian left for Ptolemais, and thence he went to Cæsarea on the coast. There he put two legions into winter quarters, and sent the third to Scythopolis. Certain of the troops were sent to besiege Joppa, the headquarters of the Jewish pirates. Vespasian himself joined Herod Agrippa at Cæsarea Philippi, and after twenty days marched against the cities Tarichea and Tiberias, which had revolted from him. Titus brought the army from Cæsarea and met his father at Scythopolis. The Roman party in the city surrendered Tiberias to Vespasian. Vespasian came to Tarichea after Titus had besieged it. A small naval victory was won by the Romans. After the capture of Tarichea, Gamala and Gischala were also taken, and the rebellion, so far as Galilee was concerned, was crushed.

One legion being sent to Scythopolis, with the other two he marched again to Cæsarea on the coast. Jamnia and Azotus were besieged, and thus in the end of 67 Jerusalem was cut off from the sea. In the winter of 67–68 Vespasian made arrangements for the government of the besieged district, and began to employ his army against the capital. His plan was to destroy all opposition elsewhere before proceeding to the siege of the capital, a plan necessitated by due regard for his communications. So he took Gadara, 27th February 68, and left the rest of Peræa to be conquered by a subordinate, Placidus. Having heard reports of the rising of Vindex in Gaul, he returned hurriedly from Cæsarea by Antipatris, Thamna, Lydda, and Jamnia to Ammaus, where he established one of his legions. Proceeding to Idumæa, he left troops there, and marched by Ammaus through Samaria to Jericho, where he arrived about 24th June 68. The city fell into his hands. After a visit to the Dead Sea, he established various camps in Judæa, in order to surround Jerusalem on all sides.

On returning to Cæsarea he learned of Nero's murder. The news delayed his advance on Jerusalem. When the further news of Galba's accession came, it was necessary for him to await Galba's orders, because Nero's arrangements had by his death become null and void. He sent Herod and Titus to Rome to obtain these orders. Titus' departure followed in the first half of 69. In Corinth he learned of the murder of Galba, of the arming of Vitellius, and of the accession of Otho. Leaving Herod to go on his way, Titus returned to Vespasian at Cæsarea. The armies of Mucian and Vespasian had already taken the oath of allegiance to Otho. Meanwhile the war languished. On returning to Cæsarea from a short journey to the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, Vespasian learned that Vitellius had become Emperor, having been recognized as such by the senate on 19th April. Vespasian and Vitellius were personal enemies, and the former was not ready to submit to the elevation of the latter without a struggle, in spite of his distance from the centre of the Empire and the consequent difficulty of operations. Vespasian's hesitation was removed by the attitude of his troops, who were jealous that the German legions had been able to create an Emperor. They received with absolute silence Vespasian's proposal that they should take the oath to Vitellius. The support of Mucian removed the last trace of Vespasian's hesitation. The charm of Titus had brought the two erstwhile jealous governors into friendly relations; so that it may be said that Titus got the Empire for his father. Vespasian had made sure of the support of the prefect of Egypt, Tiberius Julius Alexander, and now wrote to tell him that he was making a bid for the Empire, and counted on his support. It was this Alexander who in Alexandria on 1st July 69 proclaimed Vespasian Emperor, and made the two legions in Egypt take the oath to him. It was not till 22nd December that the senate conferred all the titles and privileges of Emperor upon him, such as the *tribunicia potestas*, the title 'pater patriæ,' the supreme pontificate, etc. As Emperor, Vespasian held the ordinary consulship eight times. The censorship was held by Vespasian and Titus together in 73.

The year 69 was notable chiefly for the continued prosecution of the Jewish War. Before 15th July all the troops in Judæa and Syria as well as Egypt, and certain client-princes, had taken the oath to Vespasian. The necessary military and financial preparations were made to assert his claim against Vitellius. Vespasian marched to Antioch and, after entering into relations with the Parthians and Armenians, accompanied Titus to Alexandria. The aim of this visit was to occupy Egypt, as it was one of the chief centres of the corn supply, a rich province, and a suitable base of operations. Dispatches were sent to all the generals and armies, and Mucian undertook the campaign against Vitellius. Anicetus, a freedman of the last Pontic king Polemo, attempted to create a rising in favour of Vitellius, but he was crushed and put to death. About the end of November Vespasian heard that Mucian had fought a decisive battle at Cremona in N. Italy (29th October). Early in November Mucian had also sent a legion to put down the Dacians, who took advantage of the unsettled state of the Empire to attack the Roman military camps in Mœsia. Mucian's army numbered about 20,000 men, and with him the Byzantine fleet co-operated. The army crossed Asia Minor by Cappadocia and Phrygia. Meanwhile the Illyrian army had declared for Vespasian. The result of this was that in all six legions were added to his forces. A number of other legions, however, adopted a waiting attitude. Antonius Primus, commander of the seventh legion, had been ordered to remain at Aquileia, but of his own accord he marched into Italy. The Adriatic and Tyrrhenian fleets deserted to Vespasian. Antonius Primus, in the night battle at Cremona already mentioned, defeated the Vitellians utterly. Three legions in Spain and one in Britain now came over to Vespasian. In Rome his party, led by his brother, did not fare so well; for on 19th December Sabinus was captured and put to death. Domitian, however, escaped with his life. On 21st December Antonius came to Rome and captured it, the capture being followed by the death of Vitellius. Domitian was welcomed by the army as Cæsar, and the next day the senate recognized Vespasian as Emperor. At the same time the Flavian generals received honours. Early in 70 the interests of Vespasian were in the hands of Mucian, who meantime enjoyed all the prestige of the *princeps*. There were serious disturbances in Germany and Gaul, in which Julius Civilis, a man of noble descent among the Batavi, played a prominent part. At first he allowed the troops to declare for Vespasian, but afterwards he explained that he wanted to fight for freedom from the yoke of Rome. Defection spread widely. Mucian, accompanied by Domitian, had been preparing a counterblow. It is not necessary to give the details of the campaign. Suffice it to say that the Roman dominion was speedily restored. In the first half of the year disturbances in Africa had been quelled, and the Sarmatians, who had invaded Mœsia, were defeated.

Vespasian received the news of his recognition by the senate early in January, while he was still in Alexandria, where his financial arrangements were mocked at by the people. He postponed his departure till the summer, and travelled by Rhodes and Greece to Corcyra and Calabria. The exact date of his arrival in Rome is unknown. The restoration of the city, which had suffered seriously in the recent disturbances, early engaged his attention. In particular, the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus was rebuilt, and the documents which had perished in the Record Office were, as far as possible, replaced. A road was built in Sardinia. In this year also a consular legate was sent to govern the province Cappadocia, instead of a procurator as hitherto. In 71, probably in the middle of June, Titus arrived in Rome, and about 1st July the joint triumph over Judæa took place (see art. TITUS). As a sign of universal peace the temple of Janus was closed, and the building of a Temple of Peace begun. Aqueducts and streets in the city were restored at the cost of the Emperor. Lucilius Bassus completed the work of the subjugation of Judæa.

Palestine was now made the private property of the Emperor, like Egypt; 800 veterans were settled at Ammaus, about 3 or 4 miles from Jerusalem, and the old Temple tax (Mt 17^{24}) had to be paid to Jupiter Capitolinus. Important changes were made in the constitution of the legions at this time, especially by the discharge of those that had proved disloyal. Loyal discharged soldiers were settled in *coloniæ*. In Britain the gentle Vettius Bolanus was replaced by the more vigorous Petilius Cerialis. About this time the worship of the Emperor was established in Africa. In 72 Sardinia and Corsica, previously a senatorial province, became Imperial. In the same year Antiochus IV. of Commagene revolted from Rome, but was defeated and captured by the governor of Syria, Cæsennius Pætus. Antiochus was ordered to live at Lacedæmon, and his sons were allowed to come to Rome, where they obtained the citizenship. Commagene was taken over and added to the province Syria.

The year 73 was marked by the exercise of the censorship on the part of Vespasian and Titus. The activities of this office, which had for the most part fallen into disuse, were manifold. For example, these colleagues planned anew, or refounded, the city of Rome. The constant problem of the overflowing of the Tiber also engaged their attention. The permanent camps at Vindonissa and Carnuntum were enlarged. Thus the Danube line was strengthened against the troublesome Danube peoples, and the towns Scarbantia and Savaria on the road to Aquileia were protected. Vespasian took away the liberty Nero had restored to Greece, and made it again a province Achaia, on the perfectly good ground that the Greeks had ceased to understand how to use liberty. As a senatorial province it was governed by an ex-prætor with the title proconsul, as it had been previously in St. Paul's time. A rising of the Jews was subdued in this year, and the town Masada, the last stronghold of the Sicarii in Palestine, was destroyed. They, however, aroused the Alexandrian Jews against the Empire. As a punishment the secondary temple at Heliopolis was destroyed, by order of the Emperor. A further disturbance in Cyrene needs mention only. In 74 the regulation of the Tiber was continued, and the censorship came to an end. In recognition of the support which Spain had given to Vespasian, the whole free population of the province was given the partial Roman citizenship known as *ius Latii*. Another aspect of censorial duty was the purging of the orders. Many unworthy members of the senatorial and equestrian orders were ejected. The patrician families were (in 73) increased from 200 to 1000, among the many men thus promoted being Cn. Julius Agricola, later the governor of Britain. About this time a number of Stoic and Cynic philosophers, who were of anti-monarchical tendencies, were expelled from Rome. From inscriptions only do we learn of important military operations in Germany (*e.g.* the Black Forest) at this time, accompanied by the building of a new road with fortresses, perhaps to keep the way open between the Rhine and the Danube. The repair of a road in Sardinia is also recorded for this year. In 75 the Temple of Peace, begun in 71, was completed and opened. Of this richly adorned temple, which included a library, not a trace remains. In the same year a colossal statue of Nero (100–120 ft. high), which had stood in his Golden House, was converted into a statue of Apollo as the Sun-god, the protector of the Flavian house. It was afterwards removed by Hadrian, but the base is preserved. Many pieces of public land in Rome, Italy, and the provinces which had been illegally taken possession of by private persons were taken back by the State. The boundary of Rome was also extended. Rutilius Gallicus (Statius, *Siluæ*, I. iv. 83) collected taxes, re-imposed by Vespasian, in the province of Africa, the boundary line of which was at this time definitely fixed. About this period Vespasian seems to have given help to Vologæsus, king of the Parthians, against the Alani, a northern tribe which invaded Parthia. It was in this connexion probably that a road was built in Little Armenia. We hear also of important repairs to roads in the province Asia. In 76 the authorities mention repairs to the Via Appia, and great works on the roads, etc., in Africa. In the same year Vologæsus adopted a hostile attitude to Rome, but was compelled to ask for peace. In this war the father of the Emperor Trajan, as legate of Syria, took part. Sextus Iulius Frontinus, as legate in Britain, gained a victory over the Silures. By a statute of the same year certain officers and men of the household troops were given the right to enter on legal marriage. In 77 Vespasian erected in Rome, south of the Templum Pacis, a building, which after successive alterations and restorations became the church of Saints Cosmas and Damian. In the same year important work was done on roads in Italy, Spain, and elsewhere. For 78 there are records of road-building in Dalmatia and Bithynia. In the same year there was a successful campaign, conducted by Rutilius Gallicus, against a German tribe, the Bructeri. One of their leading women, a prophetess Velēda, was brought captive to Rome. It was probably in the same year that Agricola's period as governor of Britain began; before its end he had almost destroyed the Ordovices and recovered the island Mona (probably Anglesey) for the Romans.

The year 79 was the last of Vespasian's rule. There were great road- and bridge-building operations carried out in Hispania Bætica (modern Andalucia). The rebel Iulius Sabinus, of the Gaulish tribe of the Lingones, had for nine years been in hiding, but was in this year discovered, brought to Rome, and condemned, with his wife. In this year also there was a conspiracy against Vespasian, fomented by two men whom he had regarded as friends, Aulus Cæcina Alienus and Titus Clodius Eprius Marcellus. Titus, Vespasian's son, had obtained knowledge of the guilt of the first, invited him to his table, and had him struck down, before Vespasian had an inkling of the plot. Eprius, after being tried and condemned by the senate, took his own life. While on a visit to Campania, Vespasian had a slight attack of fever. He returned to Rome, and from there went to his usual summer residence, Aquæ Cutiliæ, in the Sabine land, near Reate. There he fought the disease manfully, giving unbroken attention to business. Certain symptoms led to the report that Titus had given him poison. He died on 24th June in his sixty-ninth year, after a reign of almost ten years.

After his death he was, like most of the Emperors, deified by the senate. He had been a worthy Emperor, with the solid qualities characteristic of the best of the Italians. After the folly and waste of the Neronian period, such a rule as his was at once a necessity and a blessing to Italy. His chief services to the State were his care for finance and at the same time for the roads of the Empire, as the details enumerated above will have shown. He deliberately founded a dynasty, and, to secure it, made his sons Titus and Domitian joint-rulers with himself during his own life-time. He was on the best of terms with the senate, to which he showed great respect. The doctrinaire Stoics, especially Helvidius Priscus, constituted an element hostile to the Emperor. By habitually making one or other of his sons his colleague in the consulship, he retained the presidency of the senate in the hands of his family. The senate itself he strengthened by the introduction of worthy Italians and provincials, and he also made promotions of suitable persons to the equestrian order. Knights and freedmen found in this reign greater scope for their activities, in official positions under the Emperor himself. He took a very great interest in the provinces, a number of which he had personally visited. As one who owed his elevation to the army, he busied himself with its organization. He lived simply and thriftily, and encouraged teachers of rhetoric, poets, and artists, but banished philosophers and astrologers.

Of his attitude to Christianity nothing is known for certain, but it has been plausibly conjectured that, since in Nero's time Christians were condemned only for crimes punishable in any case, while in Trajan's time it is clearly established that confession of Christianity was in itself a crime, the changed attitude is due to an administrative principle settled under Vespasian (W. M. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire before* A.D. *170*, pp. 242, 252–319).

Literature.—The ancient authorities are: **Josephus**, *BJ*, bks. iii.–vii., in the composition of which memoirs of Vespasian himself were used; **Tacitus**, *Histories*, bks. i.–v. (reaching only to autumn 70); **Dio Cassius**, bk. lxvi., existing now only in the abridgment of Xiphilinus; **Suetonius**, *Vespasian*, and later authorities; the rich collection of inscriptions is put together by **H. C. Newton**, *The Epigraphical Evidence for the Reigns of Vespasian and Titus* (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, xvi.), Ithaca, N.Y., 1901. Modern works are **V. Duruy**, *History of Rome*, Eng. tr., 6 vols., London, 1883–86; **H. Schiller**, *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*, i. [Gotha, 1883] 390–400, 499–518; **J. B. Bury**, *A History of the Roman Empire*^{2}, London, 1896, pp. 368–381, etc.; **A. von Domaszewski**, *Geschichte der römischen Kaiser*, ii. [Leipzig, 1909] 145–154; **K. Weynand** in Pauly-Wissowa, vi. 2623–2695 (an admirable detailed monograph). On Vespasian's connexion with Christianity, **W. M. Ramsay**, *The Church in the Roman Empire before* A.D. *170*, London, 1893.

A. Souter.

VESSEL. — Though the drift of the passage 'That each one of you know how to possess himself of his own vessel in sanctification and honour' (1 Th 4^4) is clear, the exact meaning to be attached to 'vessel' (σκεῦος) has long been a matter of dispute. Some take it to refer to the body; others interpret it as meaning 'wife.' The first interpretation is adopted by many early writers, and is found as far back as Tertullian (*de Resurrectione Carnis*, 16): 'Caro . . . vas vocatur apud Apostolum, quam jubet in honore tractari.' This meaning is adopted by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Calvin, Beza, and many others.

No objection can be raised to this sense of σκεῦος. The term 'vessel of the soul' is applied to the body by classical writers, *e.g.* Lucretius, iii. 441: 'corpus, quod vas quasi constitit ejus (*sc.* animæ)'; and the passage 2 Co 4^7 gives the same idea: Ἔχομεν δὲ τὸν θησαυρὸν τοῦτον ἐν ὀστρακίνοις σκεύεσιν. But this interpretation forces an unnatural meaning on κτᾶσθαι, which can mean only 'to acquire,' not 'to possess' or 'to keep.' Chrysostom, who saw this difficulty, tried to get over it by explaining κτᾶσθαι as equivalent to 'gain the mastery over': ἡμεῖς αὐτὸ κτώμεθα, ὅταν μένῃ καθαρὸν καὶ ἔστιν ἐν ἁγιασμῷ· ὅταν δὲ ἀκάθαρτον, ἁμαρτία. But this meaning does not fit in with ἐν ἁγιασμῷ, etc.

The interpretation of σκεῦος as 'wife' is held by Augustine: 'ut sciret unusquisque eorum suum possidere vas, hoc est, uxorem' (*c. Jul.* IV. x. 56). With this agree Schott, de Wette, and many German commentators, and, among English, Alford, Jowett, and Ellicott. Lightfoot seems unable to decide.

Hence neither word presents any difficulty, as κτᾶσθαι is used of marrying a wife: καί γε Ῥοὺθ τὴν Μωαβεῖτιν τὴν γυναῖκα Μααλὼν κέκτημαι ἐμαυτῷ εἰς γυναῖκα (Ru 4^{10} LXX); ὁ κτώμενος γυναῖκα ἐνάρχεται κτήσεως (Sir 36^{29}).

The sense of the passage, then, will be that men should avoid fornication, and that, if a man cannot exercise continence, he should marry. The same thought occurs in 1 Co 7^2: διὰ δὲ τὰς πορνείας ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἐχέτω. The objection which has been raised, that the injunction would thus be made to apply to men only, is not serious, for, as is often the case, the corresponding obligation on the part of the woman is implied. Lightfoot considers it a more serious objection that by using such an expression as σκεῦος κτᾶσθαι the Apostle would seem to be lowering himself to the sensual view of the marriage relation, and adopting the depreciatory estimate of the woman's position which prevailed among both Jews and heathen at the time, whereas it is his constant effort to exalt both the one and the other. But is it the fact that the term σκεῦος was necessarily depreciatory?

On the whole, the second interpretation seems to harmonize the better with the context and to avoid the difficulty of a strained interpretation of κτᾶσθαι, but it must not be overlooked that many names of weight are in favour of the first.

Morley Stevenson.

VESTURE.—See Clothes.

VIAL.—See Bowl.

VINE (ἄμπελος, βότρυς, ἀμπελών).—Apart from the Gospels, the only books in the NT containing a reference to the vine or to grapes are the Epistle of St. James (3^{12}) and the Apocalypse (14^{18}). In 1 Co 9^7 a vineyard supplies the subject for one of St. Paul's rhetorical questions. Wine is frequently alluded to, chiefly in apostolic exhortations against excess in this direction (see art. Abstinence).

In the apocalyptic vision, as elsewhere in the NT, the work of judgment is compared to the vintage. In the OT both the vintage and the wheat-harvest are used as similes of the overthrow of the enemies of Jahweh, but here the wheat-harvest represents the ingathering of the faithful (see art. Harvest).

In Palestine the vintage is the latest crop gathered in the autumn. In the warmer parts of the country it commences at the beginning of September. There are few countries so well adapted for the cultivation of the vine, and the extensiveness of the industry in ancient times is attested by the numerous presses and vats found all over the country. From the Mishna we learn that vine-culture was still flourishing about A.D. 200, but with the coming of the Arabs it almost entirely disappeared. Within the last century, however, it has revived under European influence, and large numbers of imported vines have been planted by German and Jewish colonists.

The mode of their cultivation depends on the natural characteristics of the particular district. In very stony soils parallel ridges are made of the loose stones, and the vines are planted near the side of one or other of these ridges. The shoots are trained up these primitively constructed walls, carried over the top, and brought down to the other sides by stones attached to them. Where, however, the conditions permit, and the vineyards are extensive, the plants are arranged at a considerable distance apart, and are allowed to grow to a height of about 6 or 8 ft.; the bearing shoots supported by poles are carried horizontally across to the adjoining row. In ancient times they were carefully fenced in to protect them from human spoliators, on the one hand, and from the trespasses of sheep and cattle, whose partiality for vine-leaves is well known, on the other (cf. Ps $80^{12. 13}$, Ca 2^{15}, Is 5^{2}). Apparently every vineyard had its own wine-press. In many cases it is difficult to say whether the fruit-press under consideration was an olive-press or a wine-press. Those which are deep and well adapted for treading were probably wine-presses.

No doubt many of the large quantities of grapes produced in olden days were used for *dibs*, a thick sweet juice which is still made in Syria, and which was probably used to a much greater extent in ancient times when cane-sugar was unknown.

See, further, artt. ABSTINENCE, HARVEST.

LITERATURE.—H. B. Tristram, *The Natural History of the Bible*^{10}, London, 1911, pp. 402–418; W. M. Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, 3 vols., ed. do., 1881–86, *passim*; J. C. Geikie, *The Holy Land and the Bible*, do., 1903, pp. 50–52, 74; H. B. Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*^{2}, do., 1907, p. 254 f.; J. B. Mayor, *The Epistle of St. James*^{3}, do., 1910, p. 125; C. Bigg, *ICC*, 'The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude,' Edinburgh, 1901, p. 168; *The Speaker's Commentary*, iii. [London, 1881] 776; R. A. S. Macalister, *The Excavation of Gezer*, 3 vols., do., 1912, *passim*; *DCG* ii. 800 f., 824; *SDB*, pp. 959, 973 f.; *HDB* iv. 868–870. P. S. P. HANDCOCK.

VIPER (*ἔχιδνα*).—Apart from the Gospels, the only passage in the NT in which reference is made to the viper is in Ac 28^{3}. The viper mentioned here is probably the *Vipera aspis*, which is fairly common on most of the larger islands in the Mediterranean, but is no longer found in Malta. The last-named fact has been urged as an objection to the story, but that argument is singularly invalid. Wolves were found in England centuries after this viper at Malta, but they are extinct to-day, and it would be still more remarkable if poisonous vipers had managed to survive in Malta after so many centuries (cf. R. B. Rackham, *The Acts of the Apostles*, London, 1901, p. 492). On the other hand, the suggestion that the viper in question is rather to be identified with one of the non-poisonous species which are still found in the island is discountenanced by the whole context. It is manifest that the writer regards the incident as an extraordinary preservation from imminent danger (cf. Mk 16^{18}). The *Vipera aspis* is very partial to wood, and it is significant that the viper in Ac 28^{3} came out of the firewood. The aboriginal forest has been cleared in Malta, and accordingly the disappearance of these venomous reptiles which infested the woods is merely what one would expect. See, further, SERPENT, ASP.

LITERATURE.—H. B. Tristram, *Survey of Western Palestine*, London, 1884, p. 140 ff., *Natural History of the Bible*^{10}, do., 1911, p. 276 f.; *SDB*, p. 837; *HDB* iv. 460.

P. S. P. HANDCOCK.

VIRGIN, VIRGINITY.—1. Metaphorical usage.—St. Paul regards himself as the paranymph—the one who brings the bride to the bridegroom on the marriage day. The Corinthian Church is the intended bride, and St. Paul's ambition is to present her, a chaste virgin, to Christ. (The Rabbis ascribed this honour to Moses in the case of Israel.) Just as Israel was regarded by the prophets (Hos 2^{19}, Is 62^{5}, etc.) as the bride of Jahweh, so St. Paul regards the Church here (2 Co 11^{2}). The figure was used by our Lord Himself. To Him His earthly sojourn with His disciples was like a marriage feast and His removal was regarded as the time of their widowhood (Mt 9^{15}). Elsewhere the Apostle (Eph $5^{25\text{ff.}}$) urges husbands to love their wives 'as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself up for it; that he might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word, that he might present the church to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing.' Here Christ Himself is at once Paranymph and Bridegroom, and in both cases the days of the Church's espousals are in the future—at the Parousia. In 2 Co 11^{2} St. Paul uses the thought to safeguard the Corinthians from deception, so that the fate of Eve, whom the serpent beguiled, might not be theirs. St. John has the same figure (Rev 21). He sees the bride adorned for her Husband. It is noteworthy that marriage is used by both as a fit symbol of this most glorious reality. St. Paul regards Christian marriage as in some way deriving its glory from the true Marriage—of Christ and His Church (Eph $5^{27\text{ff.}}$). In Rev 18^{23} the voice of the bridegroom and the voice of the bride are typical of earthly joy, and their absence in overthrown Babylon (Rome) is a proof of its utter destruction; so also Jeremiah in regard to Jerusalem (25^{10}); cf. Jos. *BJ* VI. v. 3.

2. Quasi-metaphorical usage.—In Rev 14^{4} *παρθένοι* is masculine (W. H. Simcox, *Cambridge Greek Test.*, 'Revelation,' Cambridge, 1893, *in loc.*, says this is the first example of this usage). In later ecclesiastical literature this usage becomes common, and 'virgins' is so used at times in our own language. Thus Jeremy Taylor: 'But Joseph [*i.e.* Mary's husband] was a virgin, and had kept under all his inclinations to loose thoughts' (*Life of Christ*, ed. London, 1811, vol. i. p. 207). St. John himself is styled a virgin by Jerome—'a Domino virgine mater virgo virgini discipulo commendatur' (*c. Jov.* i. 26)—and by others, *e.g.* Photius: *τοῦ παρθένου καὶ εὐαγγελιστοῦ Ἰωάννου* (see Lexicons, *s.v.* *παρθένος*). Whether St. John or any of the other apostles was married we cannot say, save in St. Peter's case (cf. Eus. *HE* iii. 30). The passage in Rev 14^{4} is, 'These are they which were not defiled with women; for they are virgins.' Is the term here literal or not? T. C. Edwards (on 1 Co 7^{25}) says that it is obviously metaphorical, and so also B. L. Wordsworth (quoted by Alford on Rev 14^{4}), and many more. Had the words 'with women' been wanting, this meaning would be the natural one, and the reference would be to those who as the true bride of Christ refused to give worship to Cæsar; but the words 'with women' make the literal interpretation practically certain, and the passage indicates not so much a depreciation of marriage as an ascetic horror of immorality. There is also the feeling (probably based on the writer's experience) that the man who was bound up with wife and children found it more easy to compromise and more difficult to accept martyrdom. The horrible possibility would arise in such cases of a man having to obey the Divine call of faithfulness unto death in the face of weeping wife and children (cf. the beautiful story of Peter leading his wife to martyrdom saying, 'Oh thou, remember the Lord' [Clem. *Strom.* vii. 11; Eus. *HE* iii. 30. 2], a story which if true proves that marriage was not an insuperable obstacle to the highest fidelity). There were always in the Church celibates for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake, but not at this time as an organized body, or in obedience to ecclesiastical orders. Long after this Paphnutius, himself a celibate, opposed a motion to make celibacy binding on the clergy; cf. Soz. *HE* i. 23: 'But Paphnutius, the confessor, stood up and testified against this proposition; he said that marriage was honorable and chaste, and that cohabitation with their own wives was chastity, and advised the Synod not to frame such a law, for it would be difficult to bear, and might serve as an occasion of incontinence to them and their wives; and he reminded them that according to the ancient tradition of the church, those who were unmarried when they took part in the communion of sacred orders were required to remain so, but that those who were married were not to put away their wives. . . . The Synod concurred in his counsel, enacted no law about it, but left the matter to the decision of individual judgment, and not to compulsion' (*Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Oxford, 1891, p. 256). While the writer here does not directly oppose marriage yet he does regard virginity for the Lord's sake as a privileged position and as receiving from the Lord a corresponding reward, and, although the number 144,000 is an apocalyptic ideal, yet we may safely infer that there was a considerable opinion in favour of celibacy in St. John's day. He would, however, agree with St. Paul that unless a man could exercise continence of desires—as so many of the so-called monkish celibates could not — he had better marry.

3. Literal usage.—(*a*) In Acts 21^9 we read of Philip the evangelist at Cæsarea and his four virgin daughters who were prophetesses. These daughters lived at home with their father and entertained St. Paul and his companions. Whether they were bound by a public vow of virginity we know not. It is curious to note that Clement of Alexandria in Eus. *HE* iii. 30 says: 'For Peter and Philip begat children; and Philip also gave his daughters to husbands' (*τὰς θυγατέρας ἀνδράσιν ἐξέδωκεν*). It is possible, however, that Philip the apostle is referred to (*ib.* iii. 31), in which case he also had two daughters prophetesses and 'another daughter who lived in the Holy Spirit.' The probability is that Clement—as evidently Eusebius—identifies the two names. From the saying in Acts we cannot infer the existence thus early in the Church of an order of virgins. A later age saw the conditions of their own time in the Apostolic Age. They 'peopled the Apostolic age with virgins living in community and presided over by the Virgin Mary: see, for example, *Dormitio Mariæ* (Tischendorf, *Apocal. Apocr.* 1861), p. 96 f.; *Coptic Apocr. Gospels*, F. Robinson, 1896. But this picture has no historical authorisation, and is simply the reflex of a subsequent institution' (J. A. Robinson, in *EBi* iv. 5252).

(*b*) The *locus classicus* for our subject is 1 Co 7^{25-38}. St. Paul here discusses the question of the marriage of virgins (*i.e.* maidens of marriageable age) as a specific instance of the question of marriage in general, and he does so not abstractly or exhaustively but in view of a definite situation. He makes it clear that marriage is no sin, not even though in his view this world-age is speedily coming to an end. He says also that he has no command from the Lord, either directly or indirectly, on this question. What he gives is his own opinion (*γνώμη*), not, however, as an *obiter dictum*, but as the opinion of one who knows his Lord's mind.[*] He recommends, however, in view of the present necessity, of the shortened earthly horizon, of the straits to which Christians were put, and of the fact that marriage made it more difficult for parties to face these conditions, that they remain as they are, married and unmarried alike. He widens this to apply to circumstances, business, emotions even. His opinion is based, not on any idea as to the spiritual superiority of virginity in itself, but on the view that the fashion of the world is passing away, and that for the married there might arise the fearful alternative of loyalty to Christ or loyalty to the ties of home. In 1 Timothy, where the outlook is different, he advises young widows to marry, while the older ones should be loyal to their first faith, evidently to their resolution not to marry. The Apostle sees clearly the objections to his views, especially in the case of daughters of marriageable age. Such a daughter ought not to be kept from marrying if she had been already promised, or if her moral life was endangered thereby, or if it shocked public opinion. In such cases let her marry. But if the father was firm in his resolution to keep her a virgin, if his heart was convinced that this was best, and if he had come to this resolution freely without external pressure, then he is right in keeping her a virgin. Nothing is said of the maiden's own opinion, unless from v.^{28} we infer that the father should not put pressure on the daughter if she desired a reasonable marriage. It is evident that the Apostle is face to face with a situation so different from the conditions of our own time—when the end of the age is not regarded as imminent, when social conditions are based on political and civil freedom—that we have to be very careful in drawing modern practical inferences from his words. There is also no hint of an order of virgins, and the Apostle deprecates ecclesiastical or even apostolic interference with the liberty of the individual.

This passage, however, has been recently explained as referring not to marriageable daughters at all but to what are known as 'virgines subintroductæ' (or *συνείσακτοι*).[*] In later times unmarried women and widows resided with the clergy in their homes—a monk in the desert might have his 'uxor spiritualis.' Both parties were under vows of virginity and yet lived together and sometimes slept together. Latterly the practice became a scandal. It is to this custom, according to some, that the Apostle is here referring, and his recommendation is that where the woman has fallen in love either with him who cohabits with her or with another then marriage should take place: where, however, firmness of purpose in virginity exists, this condition of cohabitation should continue. The reader is referred for further information on this topic to art. 'Agapetæ,' *ERE* i., by H. Achelis, who with hesitation explains St. Paul as referring to this custom—an explanation which the present writer cannot accept. In 1 Co 9^5, where St. Paul speaks of a 'sister as wife' (*ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα*), Jerome (*c. Jov.* i. 26) and others found a reference to this custom. As our Lord was ministered to by women of substance so were the Apostles, but this view is almost certainly wrong. The earliest Christian writer who seems to mention this form of living together is Hermas, and although he writes in visions and similitudes it is quite possible that he knew the custom and approved of it. The passages are *Sim.* IX. ii. 3, X. iii.; *Vis.* II. ii. 3 (see notes by A. Hilgenfeld, *Nov. Test. extra Canonem receptum*, Leipzig, 1876, *in locis*). At first this custom may have arisen from the highest spiritual motives among those to whom sexual intercourse even in marriage was degrading, and it may have been practised by married persons who resolved to live in absolute chastity;[†] but as events proved it was bound to end in disaster. It is almost certain that St. Paul does not refer to this custom in 1 Co $7^{25\text{ff.}}$ or anywhere else, nor is there any hint of it in the NT.

(*c*) From 1 Ti 4^3 we learn that even in St. Paul's time there were those who forbade marriage, and in the 2nd cent. the practice of abstaining from marriage became common. Justin (*Apol.* i. 15) refers to many men and women of sixty and seventy who had been from infancy disciples of Christ and had kept themselves unpolluted (see E. von Dobschütz, *Christian Life in the Primitive Church*, Eng. tr., London, 1904, p. 261 f., for the growth of the feeling in favour of ascetic virginity). But in the Pastoral Epistles there is no reference to virgins. Even the deaconesses are not required to be unmarried (1 Ti 3^{11}); and, as we saw above, the younger widows are to marry again so that they may not be a burden on the Church funds, and so as to save them from sexual temptation. It was only in the 4th cent. that virgins became a definite Church order, although there are references to individual virgins earlier as existing both in orthodox and in heretical circles. St. Paul advises older widows who are on the Church rolls for relief to adhere to their decision to remain unmarried, and these seem to have been called *virgines* * (see Ign. *ad Smyrn.* 13, 'I salute . . . the virgins who are called widows'), but they are not so named in the NT (see art. WIDOWS). The question as to the perpetual virginity of Mary is not raised in the NT, although it is usually raised by commentators in the discussion concerning 'the brethren' of our Lord. Jerome maintained the *Aei-virginitas* on *a priori* grounds as to the superiority of the virgin life, and he tried to defend it from Scripture (see J. B. Lightfoot, *Galatians*^{5}, London, 1876, p. 252 f.; J. Eadie, *Galatians*, Edinburgh, 1869, p. 57 ff.; for a spirited vindication of the Helvidian view, with which the present writer agrees, see F. W. Farrar, *Early Days of Christianity*, London, 1882, vol. i. bk. iv. ch. xix.).

---

[*] It was on this text (Vulgate) that the distinction between precepts of law (*præcepta legis*) and counsels of perfection (*consilia evangelica*) was founded. The former were binding on all, the latter on a select few, and their superior excellence accumulated a store of transferable merit (works of supererogation), according to some. Yet it is possible to hold to the distinction without the ideas of supererogation and merit (see an excellent note in T. C. Edwards, *1 Corinthians*^{2}, London, 1885, p. 188 f.).

[*] The term was given at Antioch as a nickname to the female companions of Paul of Samosata (see Eus. *HE* vii. 30. 12).

[†] In the *Acts of Thomas*, § 51, we have an account of a converted youth who killed his wife because she refused to abide with him in chastity. The Apostle raised her again to life.

LITERATURE.—H. Achelis, in art. 'Agapetæ,' *ERE* i., and literature cited by him, gives information about 'virgines subintroductæ'; see also artt. 'Subintroductæ' and 'Virgins' in Smith and Cheetham's *DCA* ii. For 1 Co 7^{25-38} consult T. C. Edwards, G. G. Findlay (*EGT*), and Meyer-Weiss; for Rev 14^4, J. Moffatt (*EGT*) and H. B. Swete. H. C. Lea, *History of Sacerdotal Celibacy in the Christian Church*^{3}, 2 vols., London, 1907, gives the history.

DONALD MACKENZIE.

VIRTUE.—1. The term.—Ἀρετή (tr. 'virtue' in Ph 4^8, 2 P $1^{3.5}$ [AV and RV]; pl. 'virtues' AVm of 1 P 2^9) was the common heathen term for 'moral goodness.' In this sense it is used in the books of Maccabees. But it was also the LXX tr. of הוֹד ('magnificence,' 'splendour,' Hab 3^3, Zec 6^{13}) and תְּהִלָּה ('glory,' 'praise,' Is 42^{12} 43^{20}). In Ph 4^8 ('Whatsoever things are true . . . if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things') and in 2 P 1^5 ('In your faith supply virtue; and in your virtue knowledge') the reference is to a human attribute, and the sense is the ordinary classical one of moral excellence possibly coloured with its LXX meaning of 'praiseworthiness.' (The association of ἔπαινος with ἀρετή in the former passage suggests that this fuller significance is in the writer's mind; cf. the coupling of ἀρετή with δόξα in 2 P 1^2.) J. B. Lightfoot gives us the meaning of ἀρετή in Ph 4^8, 'Whatever value may reside in your old heathen conception of virtue' (*Philippians*, London, 1878, p. 162). In the other two NT passages (2 P 1^3, 1 P 2^9) the reference is to an attribute of God or Christ, and the LXX senses of 'glory' and 'praise' are more appropriate. G. A. Deissmann (*Bible Studies*, Edinburgh, 1901, p. 95 f.) contends that ἀρετή sometimes signifies neither the righteousness nor the praise of God, but the manifestation of His power. He compares 2 P 1^3 with an inscription of Stratonicea in Caria belonging to the earliest years of the Imperial period, and considers that in both ἀρετή bears the meaning of 'marvel.' 'Marvellous power' would well suit the context in 2 P 1^3 and 1 P 2^9.

2. The Christian conception of virtue.—(*a*) The *motives* of Christian virtue, according to the writers of the Apostolic Church, are: (1) the rewards and punishments of God's moral law (Gal $6^{7.9}$, He $10^{26f.}$, 1 Co $10^{1f.}$, etc.) and of the coming Day of the Lord (Ro $2^{5.6}$, 2 Th $1^{5f.}$, Ja $5^{7f.}$, 1 P 4^{17}, etc.); (2) the consciousness of a future life ('If after the manner of men,' *i.e.* from merely human motives, 'I fought with beasts at Ephesus, what doth it profit me? If the dead are not raised, let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die' [1 Co 15^{32}; cf. 2 Co 5^{10}]); (3) the promise of faith, reinforced by the inspiration of ancient heroes and the general exemplarship of Jesus (He 11. 12); the example of Jesus is specifically a motive for humility (Ph $2^{5f.}$) and generosity (2 Co 8^9); (4) the inspiration of Christian idealism—'the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus' (Ph 3^{14}), the recognition of a Divine mission ('Necessity is laid upon me; for woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel' [1 Co 9^{16}]); (5) highest of all, the imperative of the love of God (1 Jn., etc.), the constraining love of Christ (2 Co 5^{14})—the dynamic of the 'unio mystica.' Virtuous life is the natural fruit of the Spirit (Gal 5^{22}, etc.); hence also the justification of St. Paul's emphasis on 'faith'—communion with the Oversoul: right 'works' will proceed from right attitude.

(*b*) The *guiding principle* of Christian virtue is the 'royal law' (Ja 2^8)—the loving one's neighbour as oneself. 'He that loveth his neighbour hath fulfilled the law' (Ro $13^{8f.}$ 14^{15} $15^{1f.}$, 1 Co 8. 10^{24}, Gal 5^{13}, 1 Jn, etc.). The law of brotherly love limits the freedom of action which otherwise might belong to the strong Christian. 'All things are lawful; but all things are not expedient' (1 Co 10^{23}). Virtue must be interpreted not merely in the light of abstract right, but also in the light of brotherly service.

(*c*) *Christian* virtue stands in contrast to *Stoic* virtue, inasmuch as the latter (1) is uninfluenced by immortality, and (2) insists on the suppression of the emotions. 'The sage will console with them that weep, without weeping with them' (Seneca, *de Clem.* ii. 6). The general tendency of Christianity has been to exalt the amiable rather than the heroic qualities.

(*d*) *Asceticism* is not a virtue of the NT Church, yet there must be *self-mastery* and *self-restraint.* Marriage is lawful and honourable (1 Co 7, He 13^4), though with its dangers to supreme spiritual service (1 Co 7, Rev 14^4), but sexual immorality is strongly denounced (1 Th 4^3, 1 Co 5, etc.). The apostolic insistence upon elementary morality among the Christians is noteworthy. 'That is a reminder that the churches were composed of converts from heathenism, and lived in the midst of a heathen environment' (R. Mackintosh, *Christian Ethics*, London, 1909, p. 63).

(*e*) The communistic spirit of the early Church created *its own set of virtues*—mutual hospitality, contribution to the Church's poor, the ignoring of distinction between rich and poor believers (Ja 2^{1-4}). One also notes the stress laid upon loyalty to Church rule (1 Th 5^{13}, He 13^{17}, Jude ^{17}) and avoidance of Church divisions (see art. MURMURING). The references to 'false teachers' and schismatics are impressively severe.

(*f*) St. Paul appears to acquiesce in the system of *slavery*, and the apostolic ideals of womanhood are obviously imperfect. We must distinguish between the detailed virtues of the 1st cent. Church and the master-principle which inspired them. The implications of brotherhood will unfold with the progression of civilization. Christian principles abide, yet 'New occasions teach new duties; Time makes ancient good uncouth' (J. R. Lowell, *The Present Crisis*, 171 f.).

Consult, further, the various lists of virtues (Eph 4^{25} 5^3, etc.) and the various duties for special classes—husbands, wives, church officials, women, widows, young men, masters, slaves, etc.

---

* The Greek word χήρα, indeed, is used of a woman without a husband (either 'widow' in our sense or 'unmarried').

LITERATURE.—W. E. H. Lecky, *History of European Morals*^{8}, 2 vols., London, 1888; J. Vernon Bartlet, art. 'Didache,' in *HDB* v.; Newman Smyth, *Christian Ethics*, Edinburgh, 1892; T. B. Strong, *Christian Ethics* (*BL*), London, 1896; T. B. Kilpatrick, *Christian Character*, Edinburgh, 1899; J. Butler, *Fifteen Sermons* (1726), ed. R. Carmichael, London, 1856; J. R. Seeley, *Ecce Homo*^{5}, do., 1866; L. N. Tolstoy, *Religion and Morality*, 1894; R. W. Dale, *Laws of Christ for Common Life*^{5}, London, 1891. For fuller list of authorities see *ERE*, art. 'Ethics and Morality (Christian),' Literature, sect. 3.

H. BULCOCK.

VISION.—In modern English, 'vision,' from Lat. *videre*, 'to see,' is almost synonymous with 'sight,' but in the older use of the word the conception is that of images presented to the more or less abnormal states of consciousness, and generally produced by supernatural agency. The latter is the sense in which the Bible uses the term. It is the distinctive function of the seer (חֹזֶה and רֹאֶה) to see visions, and those isolated and exalted persons are well represented by Samuel, who is the only seer known to us by his proper name. In his childhood, we are told, the vision (חָזוֹן) was not widely diffused (1 S 3^{1}). The same word for 'vision' is found in Pr 29^{18} in the statement 'Where there is no vision, the people perish,' or 'cast off restraint.' Words from the same roots are frequently employed in Daniel and Ezekiel. Jeremiah warns the people against the visions of false prophets which are elaborated out of the uninspired minds of those whom God had not sent (14^{14} 23^{16}).

In the OT it is evident that visions, though often associated with dreams (Jl 2^{28}), are to be distinguished from them. Whilst dreams may be the medium for God's revelations, by way of 'special providences' during sleep, visions may occur during waking moments and by the exaltation or perhaps the transcendence of the natural powers of sight. A vision is thus the 'sight' or perception of spiritual realities, communicated either by means of the illumination or exaltation of the natural senses or by immediate consciousness through the supersession of them. It may be said that the evolution of the prophet in the OT involves a change from the state of rapture or ecstasy to that of ethical interpretation. Some writers affirm that the imagery of the revelation is supplied, in the case of the later prophets, by their own illuminated thought, whilst the truths themselves in more abstract form were the material of the communication. Whether this be so or not it is difficult to determine, inasmuch as the cases of vision in the NT and in more recent times imply a direct presentation in a concrete or personal form, or as an image before the consciousness.

The usual words in the NT are ὅραμα and ὀπτασία, the latter probably having a less objective significance than the former. In the report given to our Lord by the two disciples on their way to Emmaus of the vision of angels seen by the women, the word ὀπτασία is used (Lk 24^{23}). When St. Paul referred before Agrippa to the heavenly vision he spoke of the ὀπτασία (Ac 26^{19}), but in the account of the actual occurrence given by St. Luke the word ὅραμα was used (Ac $9^{10.12}$). That this word connotes a high degree of reality and objectivity is evidenced by the fact that it was used by our Lord when, referring to the Transfiguration, He warned His disciples to tell the vision (ὅραμα) to no man (Mt 17^{9}). Peter's vision, whilst it conveyed to him God's revelation as to his treatment of the conscientious Gentile, was presented in a concrete form, the objectivity of which seems never to have been questioned (Ac 10). On the other hand, when he doubted the actuality of the presence of the angel (12^{9}), and the deliverance which had been wrought, he thought he had seen a vision (ὅραμα).

Probably no recital of visions engaged the minds of the Christians in the 1st (if the earlier date be accepted) or the 2nd cent. more than that of 'The Shepherd of Hermas,' in which, somewhat after the style of Dante's *Divina Commedia*, teachings are presented for the instruction of the Church. The 'Shepherd' is the divine teacher, who imparts his lessons by means of precept and allegory, and the Church appears as an aged woman, whose features become increasingly youthful the oftener she is gazed upon.

LITERATURE.—*HDB*, artt. 'Vision' and 'Prophecy'; *Shepherd of Hermas* (Lightfoot [*Apostolic Fathers*, London, 1891] and other editions); F. W. H. Myers, *Human Personality and its Survival of Bodily Death*, do., 1907.

J. G. JAMES.

VITELLIUS.—Aulus Vitellius, son of Lucius Vitellius (consul A.D. 34) and Sextilia, was born either at Luceria or at Nuceria (in Italy) on 7th or 24th September A.D. 15. He spent his boyhood and early youth in the *entourage* of the Emperor Tiberius on the island of Capreæ (modern Capri). His addiction to chariot-racing made him a friend of Gaius (Caligula), and his fondness for dice-playing brought him the favour of Claudius; nor was he less acceptable to Nero. He attained the consulship in A.D. 48 along with L. Vipstanus Poblicola, and was also elected into various priesthoods. He held the proconsulship of Africa, one of the very highest posts in the Empire, apparently in A.D. 60–61, and in the following year was *legatus* to his own brother, who succeeded him in the proconsulship. His government is highly praised. After having superintended various public works, he was sent by Galba to northern Germany as governor. He entered the province on 1st December 68, and on 3rd January 69 he was hailed by the legions in Germany as Emperor, receiving also the honorary surname Germanicus. On conquering Otho (see art. OTHO), he was recognized as Emperor at Rome (19th April). He postponed the adoption of the title Augustus, and refused at first the name of Cæsar. He entered Rome, apparently in May, and was henceforth known officially sometimes as Imperator Aulus Vitellius Cæsar, sometimes as Aulus Vitellius Imperator Germanicus. He took over the office of chief pontiff on 18th July, and, after arranging the elections for ten years, he appointed himself perpetual consul. He was put to death at Rome about 20th December, after ruling eight months and some days.

His first wife was Petronia, daughter of Publius Petronius, *consul suffectus* of A.D. 19. She bore him a son, Petronianus. After divorcing Petronia, who became the wife of (Gnæus Cornelius) Dolabella, he married Galeria Fundana, whose father had held the prætorship, and had a son Germanicus, who was put to death by Mucianus (see art. VESPASIAN), and a daughter, who was betrothed to Valerius Asiaticus in A.D. 69 and befriended by Vespasian. It is reported that the pleasures of the table were Vitellius' chief concern, and certain dishes were named after him.

LITERATURE.—Ancient authorities are Suetonius, *Vitellius*; Tacitus, *Histories*, bks. i.–iii.; Dio Cassius (Xiphilinus' epitome), bks. lxiv., lxv.; Plutarch, *Galba*; inscriptions, particularly those of the Arval Brothers. Modern authorities are A. v. Domaszewski, *Geschichte der römischen Kaiser*, ii. [Leipzig, 1909] 97–113; V. Duruy, *History of Rome*, Eng. tr., 6 vols., London, 1883–86; J. B. Bury, *A History of the Roman Empire*^{2}, do., 1896, pp. 337–349; E. Klebs, P. de Rohden, and H. Dessau, *Prosopographia Imperii Romani*, 3 vols., Berlin, 1897–98, iii. 449 f. (the facts succinctly stated by H. Dessau).

A. SOUTER.

VOCATION.—See CALL.

VOICE.—The word 'voice' (φωνή) is used in the NT of any tone or inarticulate sound, whether of animate beings or inanimate things, *e.g.* Lk 1^{44}, 'the voice of thy salutation,' or the sound of thunder, wind, water, and musical instruments. More frequently it implies the articulated utterance of a speaker, whether the speech be jargon or intelligible. The exact signification of φωνή—a very common word in early Christian literature—whether literal or metaphorical, articulate or inarticulate, is to be determined by the context.

In 1 Co 14^{1-19} St. Paul treats of the subject of tongues (*q.v.*) and declares that mere articulation without intelligibility is of no moment. Even the sound of inanimate instruments such as the flute or the harp is useless, if there are no intervals in the music; for no air can be made out by the listener if the laws of harmony are ignored. Prophecy is superior to *glossolalia* because it conveys a spiritual message in language that can be understood. The Apostle adds, 'There are ever so many kinds of language (γένη φωνῶν) in the world, every one of them meaning something' (v.^{10}) (Moffatt, *The NT: A New Translation*, London, 1913). In his use of the word St. Paul includes both the speech of the human voice in its many languages and the notes of musical instruments.

In the Apocalypse φωνή is found very frequently. The formula 'I heard a voice' or 'a great voice' or 'the voice that I heard' (1^{10} 4^{1} 5^{11} $6^{6.\,7}$ 9^{13} $10^{4.\,8}$ 12^{10} $14^{2.\,13}$ 16^{1} 18^{4} 19^{1} 21^{3}) applies to the voice of God, or of the Lamb, or of the angel of Christ, or of one of the angels of the Presence or of the whole concourse of angels. The voice nearly always implies a personality, even when it is compared to 'a trumpet speaking' (4^{1}); but it is applied to the utterance of the beasts (6^{5}) as well as their riders (6^{6}). It is to be noted that in the Apocalypse the voices of the unseen world frequently, though not invariably, convey a distinctive and intelligible message or aspiration or doxology.

In the NT φωνὴ θεοῦ, 'the voice of God,' which is equivalent to the command of God, is an expression found in He $3^{7.\,15}$ 4^{7}, all passages being quotations from the LXX (Ps $94[95]^{7}$); cf. *Barn*, viii. 7. The phrase 'the voice of the Lord' used in Ps 29 metaphorically of thunder is quoted in Ac 7^{31} by Stephen of God's self-revelation to Moses.

For Bath Ḳol see art. 'Voice' in *DCG*, art. 'Bat Ḳol' in *JE*, art. 'Bath Kol' in *PRE*^{3} ii. 443 f., and G. Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, Eng. tr., Edinburgh, 1902, p. 204 f.

'The voice of God'—the command or call of God—to the soul is not in either OT or NT an audible message, but rather an inward impression wrought within the consciousness of the recipient by the operation of the Divine Spirit. The objectivity or otherwise of the accompanying phenomena, whether of vision or of sound, is to be determined by the evidence of the context. Take the classical example of the narratives of St. Paul's conversion in Ac 9^{1-22} 22^{3-16} 26^{9-18}. Here we have an intense realization of the presence of the Risen Christ, of the actual words He addressed to the Apostle, and of a succeeding colloquy. To the Apostle's consciousness the call of Christ took the form of an audible appeal and conversation, just as later on Augustine was to hear the 'Tolle, lege,' or authoritative command of God which resulted in his spiritual illumination. The phenomena of sound and speech were valid for the awakened soul in both cases, though the exact message was heard by each alone; cf. the statement that St. Paul's companions 'stood speechless, hearing the voice, but seeing no man' (Ac 9^{7}), *i.e.* they heard a sound, but no articulate utterance. It is easy to understand how the language of the senses—especially seeing and hearing—came to be metaphorically employed in all religious literatures to express the spiritual apprehension of the Divine and the Infinite. 'Sometimes the symbol and the perception which it represents become fused in that [the surface] consciousness: and the mystic's experience then presents itself to him as "visions" or "voices," which we must look upon as the garment he has himself provided to veil that Reality upon which no man may look and live' (E. Underhill, *Mysticism*^{2}, p. 93).

LITERATURE.—The student must consult dictionaries like *DCG*, Grimm-Thayer, and E. Preuschen's *Vollständiges griech.-deut. Handwörterbuch zu den Schriften des NT*, Giessen, 1908–10, for the passages where 'voice' occurs; but for the larger question of the relation of sensual perception to supersensual realities see E. Underhill, *Mysticism*^{2}, London, 1911, passages quoted under 'Auditions' in the Index, p. 587.

R. MARTIN POPE.

VOTE.—In his defence before Agrippa, St. Paul said 'when they were put to death, I gave my voice (ψῆφος, RV 'vote') against them' (Ac 26^{10}). In Greek judicial procedure, pebbles (ψῆφοι) were used—black for condemnation, and white for acquittal (A. O. Seyffert's *Dict. of Class. Antiquities*, ed. H. Nettleship and J. E. Sandys^{5}, London, 1899, p. 333^{a}). Amongst the Romans, voting papers (*tabellæ*) were used (W. Ramsay, *Manual of Roman Antiquities*, London, 1866, p. 108). In the Jewish Sanhedrin, decisions were given by word of mouth (*HDB*, art. 'Sanhedrin'). It is very doubtful whether Saul was a member of the Sanhedrin. Most probably, when he spoke of his vote, he was expressing his approval of the sentence of condemnation pronounced against the Christians. The word is also found in Rev $2^{17\,bis}$, 'To him that overcometh (νικῶντι) . . . will I give a white stone,' etc. In Greek judicial procedure, the man who was acquitted was spoken of as 'having overcome' (νικήσας) (C. G. Wilke and C. L. W. Grimm, *Clavis Nov. Test.*, Leipzig, 1888, *s.v.* ψῆφος). (For other interpretations see Smith's *DB*, artt. 'Stones' and 'Hospitality'; *ExpT* i. [1889–90] 1.) In both instances the word is used metaphorically.

JOHN REID.

VOW.—The word 'vow' occurs twice (as tr. of the Greek word εὐχή) in the AV of the NT (Ac 18^{18} 21^{23}). In both passages it has been retained by the RV. In Ac 18^{18} we are told that St. Paul, when on his homeward route at the close of his second missionary journey, had the hair of his head cut at Cenchreæ before sailing from the port, 'for he had a vow.'

In Ac 21^{23} reference is made to four members of the Church at Jerusalem who had a vow upon them. St. Paul had just returned from his third journey, and disquieting rumours had preceded him to Jerusalem. It was reported that he was teaching all the Jews of the Dispersion 'to forsake Moses, telling them not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs' (Ac 21^{21}). Grave offence was thereby being given to the Jewish Christians, who were all 'zealous for the law.' Accordingly, James and the elders urged the Apostle to seize the opportunity of vindicating his character which circumstances offered. By purifying himself with the men who had the vow, and by bearing the expenses incidental to its due completion, he would be able to prove that he had not abandoned the ancient custom of his nation.

There is nothing distinctively Christian about such vows as these. Indeed, the whole point of the course urged upon St. Paul lay in the fact that the vow was a purely Jewish custom, which would be completed in the Temple by a purely Jewish rite.

Such vows are not uncommon in the OT: *e.g.* the detailed exposition of the vow of the Nazirite in Nu 6^{1-22} (the LXX here translates the Hebrew word נֶדֶר, which is rendered 'vow' in the EV, by εὐχή). They consist of an obligation, commonly self-imposed, to observe some special form of ceremonial purity for some specified time. The duration of the vow was marked by allowing the hair of the head to grow freely, its expiration by trimming the hair in the normal manner, and by the offering of certain special sacrifices. The vow of a Nazirite might be for life, as in the case of Samson (Jg 13^7), or might even include an entire clan for several generations, as in the case of the Rechabites (Jer 35^{6-11}). The terms of St. Paul's own vow are unknown; but it is to be noted that it was terminated at a distance from Jerusalem, and therefore without sacrifices. As his departure from Cenchreæ was virtually the end of the evangelistic work of his second journey, he may have considered that his vow expired automatically at that point. Or he may have terminated it in view of the impossibility of maintaining on shipboard the conditions which it imposed.

The only other passage in the NT in which the word *εὐχή* occurs is Ja 5^{15} ('the prayer of faith' [EV]). The idea of a vow may be present here, but is certainly not prominent. *εὐχή* is used once in what may be called the technical sense by Clement of Rome (*ad Cor.* I. xli. 1). J. B. Lightfoot (*Apostolic Fathers*, pt. i. vol. ii., London, 1890, p. 292) translates *θυσίαι εὐχῶν* by 'free-will offerings,' *i.e.* offerings made in discharge of vows which have been voluntarily undertaken.

The NT gives us one example of a vow of a rather different kind. In Ac $23^{13f.}$ we read that more than forty of the Jews bound themselves with a curse (*ἀνεθεματίσαμεν ἑαυτούς*) not to eat or drink until they had killed St. Paul.

We see, therefore, that to a Jew a vow was an obligation of a religious, or semi-religious, character, incurred for some definite, specified time. Publicity was of its essence, for while it lasted the person who was under it was distinguished by unmistakable outward signs. And the expiration of the vow was, as a rule, marked by special sacrifices in the Temple. The word *εὐχή* is not used by Ignatius or Polycarp in this sense. But in Ignatius' *Epistle to Polycarp* (5) there is a reference to vows of celibacy: 'If any one is able to abide in chastity to the honour of the flesh of the Lord, let him so abide without boasting. If he boast he is lost; and if it be known beyond the bishop, he is polluted.' Here we have for the first time a type of vow which is distinctly Christian and differs in certain important respects from its Jewish predecessors. (1) It is a vow of celibacy. Amongst Jews, to whom the continuance of the holy nation was a matter of supreme importance, abstinence from marriage was virtually unknown. The idea that the celibate is in itself higher than the married life was altogether alien from Jewish thought. The development of Christian thought on this point belongs to a later period of Church history and therefore lies outside the scope of this article. For an illustration of the tendency we may compare the interpolated passages in Ignatius' *Epistle to the Philadelphians* (see Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, pt. ii. vol. iii.^{2}, London, 1889, p. 209) with St. Paul's teaching (1 Co 7). (2) It is a vow for life. (3) Its value consists in its privacy. The Christian who has taken such vows is not to be distinguished outwardly in any way. He is not to wear any distinctive dress or to withdraw from the ordinary concerns of life. He is to recognize that his principal danger is pride, and, though celibate in fact, must not let it be known that he is celibate in principle. Thus, though we have here the germ of the idea which bore fruit in the monasticism of later ages, we are still a long way from the 'monastic profession' with its distinctive externals and narrow delimitation of 'the religious life.'

R. H. MALDEN.

VOYAGE.—See ROADS AND TRAVEL, PAUL.

W

WAITING.—Waiting involves expectancy or hope (*q.v.*), being related to an event or contingency regarded as still in the future. It finds varied expression in the apocalyptic atmosphere of early Christianity with its expectation of an immediate Parousia (*q.v.*). Of its more general form, as distinguished from this Parousia-expectation, we can find no better illustration than Ro 8^{19}, where St. Paul vividly describes the eager longing (*ἀποκαραδοκία*) of all creation which is waiting for the sons of God to be revealed, that is, the issue of the world-sifting process of life and history in the ultimate triumph of the good (see *ExpT* xxii. [1910–1911] 71 f. for *ἀποκαραδοκία*). In the succeeding verses ($8^{23.25}$) the Apostle expounds the experience of full sonship, and identifies this with 'the redemption of our body,' for which the believer is in this stage of existence ever waiting. In each of these passages the verb used is a compound of *δέχομαι* in the form *ἀπεκδέχομαι*. It is used again in Gal 5^5 in reference to an issue of Christian experience, namely 'the hope of righteousness' (*ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης*); but, as a rule, the verb is applied to the Parousia, as in 1 Co 1^7 and Ph 3^{20}, while in 1 P 3^{20} it is found in an absolute sense, of the longsuffering of God in the days of the Flood, though the context suggests that what is waited for is the repentance and moral resurrection of mankind.

Other compounds of the same verb, namely *ἐκδέχομαι* and *προσδέχομαι*, are also found to express the notion of waiting. The former, with the suggestion of selection or concentration, is found in 1 Co 16^{11}, He 10^{13} 11^{10}, Ja 5^7, *Ep. Barn.* x. 11 (*τὸν ἅγιον αἰῶνα*), 2 Clem. xii. 1 (*τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ*) and xx. 3 (*ταχὺν καρπόν*). The latter, with the suggestion of welcome, is found in the Synoptics (Mk 15^{43}, Lk $2^{25.38}$ 23^{51}) and in Ac 23^{21} 24^{15}; it is also found in Tit 2^{13} (*τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης κτλ.*), Jude ^{21}, and Herm. *Vis.* III. xii. 2 (*τὴν ἐσχάτην ἡμέραν*).

The same thought is conveyed by such compounds of *μένω* as *περιμένω* (Ac 1^4) and *ἀναμένω* (1 Th 1^{10}). This mood or attitude of the spiritual life finds a parallel in the waiting on or for the Lord (קִוָּה) in the Psalms *passim*, indicating the spirit of expectancy which can be satisfied only by a token of the Divine favour in the form of 'salvation' or some manifestation of the Divine will.

R. MARTIN POPE.

WALK.—See CHRISTIAN LIFE.

WALL.—The explorations of recent years have yielded a rich store of materials for reconstructing the fashion of the walls of cities in ancient times. It can now be said with a great measure of definiteness to what period the remains of walls belong. This is of much importance as a test of the reliability of tradition. An instance falling within the

Apostolic Age is found in the wall of Damascus, referred to in Ac 9^{25} (cf. 2 Co 11^{33}). Examination of the wall as it now stands reveals three kinds of masonry—Turkish, Arabic, and Roman, the last in the lowest courses. The window shown as that by which St. Paul was let down is above the Turkish wall (cf. art. BASKET), so that the tradition has little value.

The walls of Jericho are mentioned in He 11^{30} (cf. Jos 6). The allusion is to the narrative of the OT, and gives no insight into the local conditions during apostolic times. The recent excavations of Sellin, following previous surveys of other explorers, enable us to trace the history of Jericho, both in OT times and in the time of Christ. The walls, outer and inner, of the Canaanite Jericho have now been laid bare for a considerable part of their circuit, and much insight has been gained into the life of the ancient city. The first conclusions drawn after excavation have been somewhat modified (see *PEFSt* xlii. [1910] 54 ff., 234; cf. *ExpT* xxi. [1909–10] 353 ff.). The remains of the Roman or Herodian Jericho are a mile or two south of the ancient city.

The remaining examples of *τεῖχος*, a city wall, are grouped in Rev 21, where there are six occurrences of the word (vv.$^{12. 14. 15. 17. 18. 19}$). Although fully 200 ft. in height (or in breadth), the wall is insignificant compared with the height of the city itself (12,000 furlongs). The foundations are represented as monoliths of precious stone, filling the interval between adjoining gateways. See, further, art. GATE.

Walls of houses (*τοῖχος*) are referred to only metaphorically. The 'whited wall' of Ac 23^{3} is usually explained in the light of Mt 23^{27}, where there is a reference to the practice of whitewashing the *cippus* (cf. Dt $27^{2. 4}$), or memorial stone, which marked the presence of graves (or rather, *ossuaria*). The practice extended to the stone door leading into underground tombs (see *EBi*, art. 'Tomb'), and to monuments on a large scale, if they chanced to contain graves. Apart from the reference to the dead, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the practice of treating the walls of houses with a coating of whitewash in order to freshen the exterior would suggest such a figure of speech. It would be most pointed in the case of Ananias, the high priest, if he sat to judge in a white robe, which clothed a character that was not white (see W. M. Furneaux, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Oxford, 1912, p. 360).

The 'middle wall of partition,' *μεσότοιχον* (ἅπαξ λεγ. in the NT) *τοῦ φραγμοῦ* of Eph 2^{14}, is a metaphor having its origin in the practice of building dividing walls, which were found between the rooms of ordinary houses, or between adjoining properties. While the figure of speech may well stand apart from the *chel*, or barrier, which marked off the Temple precincts in the narrower sense, and gave the limit not to be passed by any Gentile, we can imagine that this fence would be the *φραγμός* in especial to the Jewish mind. Some commentators think it did suggest the figure (Westcott); others think any kind of fence would serve the purpose (Meyer). Alford thinks the primary allusion is to the rending of the veil at the Crucifixion.

W. CRUICKSHANK.

WANDERING STARS.—The Epistle of Jude is an earnest warning against false teachers with a strong denunciation of them. In vv.$^{12. 13}$ the writer uses one metaphor after another to depict the falseness, sensuality, and apostasy of these men. The list ends with 'wandering stars, for whom the blackness of darkness hath been reserved for ever.' *ἀστέρες πλανῆται* are words used to distinguish the planets from the fixed stars; but the regular motion of the planets would supply no fit comparison for the author's idea, and we must rather see a reference to meteors or shooting stars, whose sudden and terrifying appearance, rapid transit, and speedy disappearance into a darkness rendered more intense by contrast would be a fitting picture of the short-lived fame and hurtful influence of the false teachers, and a prediction of that abyss of darkness into which they were hurrying.

MORLEY STEVENSON.

WAR.—Of the three great Asiatic religions which have poured into Europe, the youngest has never found any difficulty about war; to Islām war is a power, not a problem. The Qur'ān sanctions and enjoins warfare upon non-Muslims as part of the propaganda of the mission. To 'fight in God's way,' *i.e.* on a *jihad*, or holy war, is a pious duty, and the Muhammadan who falls in battle against the infidels is *ipso facto* a martyr.

'Say, "Fighting therein [in the sacred month] is a great sin; but turning folks off God's way, and misbelief in Him and in the Sacred Mosque, and turning His people out therefrom, is a greater in God's sight; and sedition is a greater sin than slaughter"' (*Qur'ān*, tr. E. H. Palmer, ii. 213); 'What ails you that ye do not fight in God's way, and for the weak men and women and children?' (iv. 76); 'O thou prophet! urge on the believers to fight. If there be of you twenty patient men, they shall conquer two hundred' (viii. 67); 'When ye meet those who misbelieve—then strike off heads until ye have massacred them, and bind fast the bonds!' (xlvii. 4); 'O thou prophet! fight strenuously against the misbelievers and hypocrites and be stern towards them; for their resort is hell, and an evil journey shall it be' (lxvi. 9).

In practice toleration of infidels has been not uncommon, partly owing to political considerations, but in theory the 'curse and smite' policy is put forward.

Muhammad held up Joshua for the admiration of his followers as a model fighting captain of the Lord, and in ancient Israel also war was sanctioned by religion. Jahweh was a 'man of war,' and Israel fought their way from the Red Sea into freedom. 'He teacheth my hands to war' (Ps 18^{34}) is the proud, grateful word of David, or of the community voicing the Davidic ideal. But the altered political situation after the Exile had re-set the primitive and naive view of war (cf. *HDB* v. 635 f.). In Judaism the Semitic custom which determined the relation of the people to war as tolerated, or even under certain circumstances enjoined, by the principles of their faith, as an enterprise for which warriors were consecrated before they fought at all, had undergone a change at the period when Christianity arose in Palestine. Even earlier, in a battle-song like the 68th psalm, militarism is abjured: 'Scatter thou the people that delight in war' (v.^{30}). Judaism, before Christianity, abhorred aggressiveness and discouraged military rapacity. The Hebrews warred in later days for the defence of their religion and country rather than for aggrandizement. But even the older conception of a theocracy under arms for the defensive, which had flashed up brilliantly in the Maccabæan wars (cf. 2 Mac $15^{15f.}$) against a corrupt and domineering civilization, had given place to a fairly general repudiation of revolt against the Romans—a repudiation which the authorities, who were passivists, voiced for more or less prudential reasons. 'The Zealot and the "passivist" were really agreed on the general principle, but they differed on the question of expediency. The former would exercise his military rights at once, while the latter would wait for God to take the initiative' (S. J. Case, 'Religion and War in the Græco-Roman World,' in *AJTh* xix. [1915] 190). Pious Jews were not agreed whether they were bound to start the rebellion which would inaugurate the armed intervention of Messiah or whether they were to wait for His orders or even whether He would not do all the fighting for them. At the same time, the working compromise at the opening of the 1st cent. A.D. covered hot ashes, which might flame up; two elements still survived in Jewish religion—the intractable passion for national freedom and supremacy which was represented in an extreme form by the Zealots, and the strain of militant messianism which glowed in apocalyptic circles.[*] The problem of Christianity's relation to war, during the primitive period, is partly determined by these two factors in the contemporary situation. We must therefore begin by taking account of their bearing upon the ideas and practice of the early Church.

1. The teaching and practice of Jesus in relation to war.—The religion of Jesus was never intended to spread by force of arms. So much is clear from the teaching of the Gospels. He never aimed at heading a Galilæan revolt against the Roman power, and in fact He explicitly discouraged all attempts to exploit His personality and influence for nationalistic ends. He deliberately disappointed such hopes. It is a fair verdict that some sections of His teaching cannot be understood (cf. H. M. Hughes, in *ExpT* xxvii. [1915–16] 151 f.; K. Lake, *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, London, 1911, p. 392 f., *The Stewardship of Faith*, London, 1915, p. 30 f.) apart from the theories of the Zealots or the dagger-men of the age (cf. *DAC* i. 103; H. B. Sharman, *The Teaching of Jesus about the Future*, Chicago, 1909, p. 113 f.), whom He implicitly repudiates. He is not an Essene, opposed to war, but He is not a Zealot. One of His disciples, Simon, had originally belonged to that party, but Jesus evidently had offered him a nobler outlet for his enthusiasm. The mere fact that He stood aloof from such aspirations must have seemed intensely unpatriotic, even to the Pharisees. Josephus is speaking more as a pro-Roman than as a Pharisee when he argues that, as the Jews have never succeeded in war, they are evidently meant by God to be pacifists (see below), but the Pharisaic party practically acted on a policy of inaction. They opposed the Zealots. Only, they opposed Jesus even more.

> 'At great political crises he who opposes the patriots is not so likely to be considered their worst foe, as he who ignores them. It was not that our Lord preached submission to Rome, though no doubt the decision as to the tribute money was capable of being represented in that light—it was that He raised a spirit which moved in another plane than that of resistance or submission to imperial power. He created a weapon (it would seem) and withheld it from the service of the State. It will be found, in general, that no other treason is felt so deadly as this. To use power *against* the State is penal;—to hold power, and not use it *for* the State, is, to the zealot for the State, far more hateful. Christ would neither join the alliance with worldly power, nor the fanaticism of revolt against worldly power.'[†]

And, as Jesus declined to be drawn into any revolutionary movement of His own nation, as He 'withdrew' (Jn 6^{15}) when an enthusiastic crowd of Galilæans would have forcibly made a king of Him, as He seems to have shown no sympathy with the Galilæans whom Pilate had ruthlessly murdered (Lk 13^{1-2}), so He withheld His own party from resenting by force any attack or outrage on themselves. When the Jew would retaliate, if he could, and take up arms against any foreign power which violated his religious scruples or profaned his sacred possessions, the disciple of Jesus was to suffer patiently and passively. Neither hot word nor quick blow was to defend His faith. Like the great prototype of their Leader, who was led as a lamb to the slaughter, His followers were to let their throats be cut, unresisting sheep as they were, butchered by the cruel knife (cf. Ro 8^{35-36}).

In the apocalyptic address of the Synoptic tradition the disciples in Judæa are warned that they will 'hear of wars and rumours of wars' (Mk, Mt; 'of wars and disturbances,' Lk); but they are not to be scared. Why? Because this does not mean the end of all things yet. Mark and Matthew regard these terrors as the first stage of the end, while Luke, who omits the apocalyptic ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων ταῦτα, rather suggests that they are simply prior to the end; but in either case the outlook is the same. There will be international strife as well as physical catastrophes. But Christians are never for a moment supposed to take any part in the former; it is a clash of pagan powers. In the invasion of Judæa the disciples will suffer, but they are bidden withdraw to the hills and leave Jerusalem to its fate, since the 'City of Peace' had failed to recognize 'the things that belonged to' her true peace. There is no active rôle for them in this grim prelude of the final tragedy. It is now the period of the end, but they have no concern with the issue between Jews and Romans; it will be a miserable time, throbbing with social anarchy and the horrors of an invasion, with convulsions and delusions, but soon the Son of Man will appear to muster His non-combatant elect for safety and bliss, lifting them right out of the jarring, untoward world. It was not His design to 'restore the kingdom to Israel' (Ac 1^{6}). He had no faith in the nationalistic fury and programme of Judaism. He foresaw a catastrophe, and His regulations for the disciples were made in view of a crisis, not only for the Jews but for the universe.

When the siege of Jerusalem by the Romans was imminent, the local Christians did withdraw to Pella. Whether this was in consequence of the apocalyptic oracle preserved in the Synoptic tradition, or whether this oracle reflects to some extent the course of affairs, it is not easy to say. The main point of interest for us here is the interpretation of the spirit of Jesus upon which the primitive Church acted, and out of which this apocalyptic address arose. The Palestinian Christians disavowed any connexion with the national cause of Judaism. The vultures were gathering over the corpse of Jewish nationalism. Why should they linger beside it? It is possible that this policy was not adopted unanimously; the language of Mt 24^{10-12} may hint at Jewish Christians who, in the excitement of the crisis, took a more popular line. 'The Jewish war saw at least one Essene heading the rebels, and others in the ardent ranks of the Sicarii and the Zealots' (*ERE* v. 400). If the stress of war produced this cleavage in the ranks of the pacific Essenes, it may have had a similar effect upon the local Christians. But the majority, or at any rate the vital section, must have been those who fled to Pella and abandoned Jerusalem to its fate. That policy of abstention from the use of force in aid of Jerusalem or in defence of themselves against persecution may have been trying, but it was thoroughly consonant with the trend of the teaching of Jesus. Under no circumstances did He contemplate any active measures on the part of His disciples as patriots or as attacked persons. The position of affairs indeed ruled out a militant attitude. The eschatological outlook rendered the downfall of Jerusalem a foregone conclusion, and in this way made for quietism.

---

[*] Both were combined in the revolt of Bar Cochba (*c.* A.D. 135), for Rabbi Akiba made the tragic mistake of hailing him as the fulfiller of Nu 24^{17}. The rebellion was so serious, especially after the outburst against Trajan, that Hadrian had no alternative but to crush Judaism as a national menace to the empire. After this, war ceased to be a serious outlet for Jewish nationalism or religion. The vitality of the Jews 'was thenceforth pressed into two channels only: (*a*) the study and cultivation of a curiously subtle and profound, but narrow and in many ways morbid, system of theology and law . . . (*b*) international commerce and trade' (Emil Reich, *General History of the Western Nations*, ii. [London, 1908] 273–274).

[†] Julia Wedgwood, *The Message of Israel*, London, 1894, p. 305.

Besides, His kingdom was not of this world; no Christians who had understood His instructions could dream of allying themselves with the dagger-men in Jerusalem or even with the loyalist Jews who manned the walls of the city so heroically, in the spirit, though not with the success, of their ancestors who faced pagans with 'the high praises of God on their lips and a two-edged sword in their hands' (Ps 149^{6}). As for self-defence, His own word in Gethsemane (Mt 26$^{52-54}$) to the disciple who impulsively struck with a sword was sufficient: 'Put your sword back into its place; all who draw the sword shall die by the sword. What! do you think I cannot appeal to my Father to furnish me at this moment with over twelve legions of angels? Only, how could the scriptures be fulfilled then—the scriptures that say this must be so?' He had already told the disciples that they were being sent out like sheep among wolves, defenceless against any brutal attack; He had censured the Elijah-spirit in the two disciples who were indignant at the churlish behaviour of a Samaritan village; He had bidden His followers face arrest, ill-treatment, and death itself, rather than be untrue to their confession; and the refusal of armed help for Himself was only the climax of the regulations which He had laid down for their conduct.*

These regulations were followed by the early Church. There was never any serious fear of armed rebellion on the part of Christians against the Roman power. From St. Paul onwards responsible Christian teachers inculcated submission to the legal authorities. Christians had to accept civil government as they had to accept the weather in the world of God. Towards the end of the 1st cent. the insane suspicions of Domitian led him to arrest some grandsons of Judas the brother of Jesus, on the ground that rumour connected the descendants of David with a revolutionary movement. But, when he found they were horny-handed sons of toil, simple peasants of Palestine, instead of turbulent Jews or influential agitators, and when he heard that Christ's kingdom was a pious dream of the far future, he dismissed the alleged revolutionaries with contempt (Eus. *HE* iii. 20). Malicious cries might be raised by the Jews that these Christians were overt agitators, setting up 'another king, called Jesus' (Ac 17^{7}); but the conduct of the Christians disarmed suspicion as a rule. It is true that in the 2nd cent. Christianity did seem often to the authorities to be a secret, immoral, Eastern society, which might be harbouring political designs. But, whenever investigations were made, the idea of a political menace disappeared. Although the Christians were still regarded as adherents of a perverse *superstitio*, *i.e.* a religion which was not the Roman religion, they were steadily drawing away from the Jews, and this helped to clear their character, so far as the suspicion of rebellion went. Whoever were 'assidue tumultuantes,' it was not they. The authorities did not know much about Jesus, but they knew plotters when they saw them, and Christians had little difficulty in establishing their peaceful character. To the Romans both Jews and Christians seemed obstinate creatures. Only, Jewish obstinacy would seethe into rebellion now and then; the Christians merely offered a passive resistance. When they were afterwards put to death for high treason, it was not because they rose in armed revolt. The charge of disloyalty did not rest upon their disposition to fight for themselves. Their Jesus had not come to draw the sword.† What they believed about His policy is well expressed in this beautiful description from the 2nd cent. *Epistle to Diognetus* (7): 'Was He [Christ] sent, as one might suppose, to set up a sovereign rule, to make men fear and shudder? By no means. He sent Him in gentleness and meekness,* as a king might send his royal son; He sent Him as God, sent Him as a man to men, sent Him to save, to use not force but persuasion—for force is no attribute of God (βία γὰρ οὐ πρόσεστι τῷ θεῷ). He sent Him to summon, not to persecute; sent Him to love, not to judge.' There is a slight flavour of sentimentalism in these words, but, so far as they go, they are adequate and accurate. It is the Fourth Evangelist who says that Jesus set Himself to win the heart of the world ('he that hath the bride is the bridegroom'), but the truth that Jesus came to reign by other powers than those of the sword is written over all the Gospels.

It is in the Lucan writings, not only in Acts (cf. S. Buss, *Roman Law and History in the NT*, London, 1901, p. 322 f.) but in the third gospel as compared with Mark and Matthew, that the most numerous references to war and the army are to be met. Luke, *e.g.*, not only omits the disarming rebuke of Jesus in Gethsemane (Mt 26^{52}), but (i.) preserves the tradition that John the Baptist, instead of ordering the soldiers † who consulted him to leave the army, merely told them that it was their duty to abstain from what was called *concussio*, or the ill-treatment of civilians, *i.e.* from extorting money by violence ‡ and making false charges; they were also to be content with their pay (Lk 3^{14}). The negative part of the counsel (μηδένα διασείσητε μηδὲ συκοφαντήσητε) is not quite clear. The 'violence' may mean overbearing poor civilians, and soldiers had many opportunities of taking such unfair advantage, not only in war but in the police-duties which they discharged during a peace. If extorting money by threats is not covered by διασείσητε, it is embraced by συκοφαντήσητε, which also could connote rough treatment, as is plain from the *Passio S. Perpetuæ* (iii.), where the hapless martyrs are exposed not only to privations in gaol but to hard usage from their guard of soldiers (στρατιωτῶν συκοφαντίαις πλεἰσταις). The soldiers bullied the prisoners, in order to get money from them for certain privileges and slight relaxations of the prison regime. The general sense of John's advice is therefore plain, and the point is that, if John the Baptist was not a Theudas, he was not a 'pacifist.' Furthermore, among the special parables, or rather illustrations, of St. Luke's gospel, we find (ii.) the only § military one (14$^{31-32}$) which Jesus is recorded to have spoken. It is an illustration of forethought and deliberation. 'What king sets out to fight against another king without first sitting down to deliberate whether with ten thousand men he can encounter the king who is attacking him with twenty thousand? If he cannot, when the other is still at a distance, he will send an embassy to do homage to him.' The prudent action of Toi, King of Hamath, as told in the LXX text of 2 S 8$^{9f.}$ (cf. H. St. John Thackeray, in *JThSt* xiv. [1913] 389–399), is an OT illustration, if not a source, of the parable. But this analogy is as old as Socrates. When Glaukon asked him how it was possible to enrich a State at the expense of its enemies, he replied that it was quite possible if the State first made sure that it was stronger; otherwise, it would run the risk of losing what it already possessed. 'Consequently, when one will consider with whom he may fight, he must find out his own State's strength and the strength of his opponents, so that, if the force of his State be superior, he may counsel aggressive measures, whereas, if it be inferior to its opponents, he may advise caution' (Xen. *Mem.* iii. 6. 8; and again in iv. 2. 29). A third item (iii.) in St. Luke's contribution to the martial aspect of the gospel-story is the detailed reference to the siege-operations of the Roman army when it invested Jerusalem in the war of A.D. 67–70 (19$^{39-44}$, 'a time is coming for you when your enemies will throw up ramparts round you and encircle you and besiege you on every side and raze you and your children within you to the ground, leaving not one stone upon another'; also 21[20], where the apocalyptic allusion of Mk. and Mt. to Dn 12[11] is replaced by the concrete and historical 'Jerusalem surrounded by armies'). This, like the sentence in Mt 22[7] (where the Roman στρατεύματα are agents of God's retribution on His disobedient people, as the Assyrians had been in Is 10[4], etc.), is a water-mark of the date of the gospels. But the outstanding item (iv.) is the puzzling bit of conversation just before Jesus and His disciples left the upper room for Gethsemane, a fragment of tradition preserved by St. Luke (22[35-38]) alone. 'And he said to them, "When I sent you out* with neither purse nor wallet nor sandals, did you want for anything?" "No," they said, "for nothing" (v.[35]). Then He said to them, "But he who has a purse must take it now (ἀλλὰ νῦν), and the same with a wallet; and he who has no sword must sell his coat and buy one (v.[36]). For I tell you, this word of scripture must be fulfilled in me: *he was classed among criminals.* Yes, there is an end to all that refers to me (καὶ γὰρ τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει)" (v.[37]). "Lord," they said, "here are two swords!" "Enough! enough! (ἱκανόν ἐστι)," He said' (v.[38]).

---

* Cf. F. Naumann, *Briefe über Religion*^{5}, Berlin, 1910, p. 58 f., and C. Hargrove, 'The Warlike Context of the Gospels,' in *HJ* xiv. [1916] 366–379.

† The true meaning of a passage like Mt 10^{34} was explained in the *Clementine Recognitions*, ii. 26–31, as Mic 7^{6} was in *Sanhedrin*, 97*a*: the sword which Jesus brought is the symbol of division in families and households caused by one believing and others refusing to believe.

* Cf. 2 Co 10^{1} (διὰ τῆς πραΰτητος καὶ ἐπιεικείας τοῦ Χριστοῦ).

† Auxiliary troops of Rome or mercenary soldiers of Herod, not necessarily of Jewish birth (cf. G. A. Smith, *Jerusalem*, London, 1907, i. 348 f.).

‡ For the general 'Prussian' attitude of Roman soldiers to civilians, Juvenal's 16th satire is an accessible piece of evidence; but officers were also held responsible for the conduct of their men (cf. Vopiscus, *Vita Aureliani*, 7: 'Si vis tribunus esse, immo si vis vivere, manus militum contine . . annona sua contentus sit. De praeda hostis non de lacrimis provincialium habeat'). For a specific case of military extortion in A.D. 37, in some Egyptian village, see Grenfell and Hunt, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, ii. [1899] 184. This browbeating or blackmailing is the point of the allusion in Sir 36^{31} (^{26}): 'Who trusts an armed band that roams from city to city?'

§ Except that of the strong man armed, in Mk 3^{27} (cf. Is 49$^{24f.}$, *Ps. Sol.* 5^{4}), etc., an allusion to His own defeat of Satan in the temptations.

(*a*) The least unsatisfactory interpretation is to suppose that Jesus was speaking of the dangers that awaited the disciples in the immediate future, when His arrest and death would alter their circumstances. Formerly, they did not need to provide for themselves. Now, they must look to their livelihood and even their very existence, for neither will be secure. 'Take your purses and wallets with you now, and equip yourselves with swords.' We can imagine Jesus uttering these words with a realistic touch of grave suggestiveness. The supreme crisis is at hand. You are going now into an enemy's country, and you will need to cut your way out of the difficulties created by My death as a so-called criminal. He did not mean literally that they were to use force against force, or to defend themselves against physical attacks; His words were a proverbial and metaphorical expression for alertness in view of the critical situation ahead. But the disciples were too prosaic to catch this meaning. They evidently thought that He intended them to defend Himself and themselves against the Jews; they were armed with a couple of swords or long knives (cf. v.[49]), and they naively hastened to assure Him of their equipment. They pulled out the weapons. Would these do? 'Enough! enough! that will do!' Jesus replied, with a sigh and a note of something like irony in His words. It was useless to discuss the matter any further with men who could so misunderstand Him.

This allusive interpretation ('Totus hic sermo allegoricus est: quasi dicat, "Vixistis adhuc in pace, commilitones, nunc vero bellum instat acerrimum, et caeteris rebus omissis de unis armis cogitandum." Quaenam autem illa sint arma, ipse, quum in horto precaretur et Petrum gladio ferientem reprehenderet, suo exemplo docere maluit, quam importune hoc loco stupidis adhuc et ad res istas non satis attentis discipulis explicare' [Beza]), favoured by writers like Strauss and Keim, has been recently defended by Burkitt, in his *Gospel History and its Transmission*, Edinburgh, 1906, p. 140f. The words of this passage, he observes, 'are among the saddest words in the Gospels, and the mournful irony with which they are pervaded seems to me wholly alien from the kind of utterance which a Christian Evangelist would invent for his Master. . . . It is impossible to believe that the command to buy a sword was meant literally and seriously: it is all a piece of ironical foreboding.' He adds that the words 'afford us a very welcome glimpse into the mind of our Lord. They shew us that there was in Him a vein of what I have no other name for but playfulness, a tender and melancholy playfulness indeed, but all the more remarkable that it comes to outward expression in moments of danger and despondency.' But the passage, even in this light, remains unique. On any interpretation of it, the connexion of the verses is a difficulty. V.[35f.] seem to refer to the future experiences of the disciples by themselves; it is almost impossible to believe that they were expected to make all these new preparations before they started for the garden of Gethsemane. Yet v.[38] seems to imply that the disciples at any rate, if not Jesus Himself, thought of the imminent danger in the garden. Furthermore, v.[37] comes in abruptly, although it is possible to see a link between it and the foregoing words without undue straining. This is furnished in one way by—

(*b*) The literal interpretation, which assumes not only that Jesus advised the disciples to defend themselves in future by force, if need be, but also that He intended to use force in order to prevent Himself from being assassinated. It was only when He found that He was to be arrested officially by agents of the government, instead of being murdered by the hired ruffians of the hierarchy, that He stopped His disciples from taking active measures in His defence (v.[51]).† The latter verse, however, does not fit in smoothly with this reconstruction of the scene.

(*c*) A more plausible modification of the literal interpretation is to suppose, with J. Weiss (*Die Schriften des NT*², Göttingen, 1907–08, i. 513 f.) and F. von Hügel, that this word of Jesus was connected with a special situation which never recurred. He went up to Jerusalem to set men ablaze (Lk 12[49f.]), to kindle a fierce conflict in which He was destined to perish Himself, but out of which He hoped His disciples would be able to force a passage. His words refer to this exclusively. He is momentarily depressed, and reverses His earlier instructions to His followers. When He says, 'Enough!', He resigns Himself to the disciples' misapprehension of the seriousness of the situation for Himself; there is no thought, in His mind, of offering any resistance to His enemies. Jesus has no illusions about His own fate; 'but, as to His disciples, He hopes that they will be able to cut their way out and escape, and He feels that they will be morally free to do so. But even this much He adverts to only for a moment; since, when they offer Him the two swords, and He says "It is enough," He has already dropped that passing attention to this earthly contingency, and, in a sad, ironical reference to the non-comprehension by the disciples of the magnitude of the coming trouble, and to the obvious inadequacy of these physical defences, if physical force were really to be used, He breaks off the discussion by this short, ambiguous word' (F. von Hügel, in *CQR* lxxix. [1915] 262). This is preferable, at least, to the literal interpretation, according to which the closing words are either couched in a vein of sad, ironical resignation, as if Jesus felt how little the disciples realized that their physical preparations were quite inadequate to the crisis, or as if Jesus seriously thought that two swords would be sufficient for the defence which He intended should be made against His captors in the garden. The early Church was divided as to the meaning of the passage. Augustine (*c. Faustum*, xxii. 77) appears to take the words literally, though he is not clear about what the injunction meant. Peter, he thinks, was told only to carry a sword, not to use it! 'No doubt the intention of the Lord in ordering them to carry arms and not to make use of them was obscure. But it was for Him to give proper orders and for them to obey without any reserve.' Origen, as we might expect, spiritualizes the words of Jesus. But by the middle of the 9th cent. Isho'dad of Merv reports that 'in many copies, instead of "Let him buy a sword and take it," it is written, "Pray for your enemies."' The text evidently was so difficult that early pacifists tampered with it. Isho'dad himself spiritualizes the words of Jesus, as an injunction 'to teach them figuratively that henceforth they must take care of themselves' (M. D. Gibson, *Horæ Semiticæ*, v. [Cambridge, 1911] 198 f.).

The choice lies, in all likelihood, between (*a*) and (*c*), and the balance of probability is slightly in favour of (*a*). In either case, the singular and militant tone of the saying is the best proof of its genuineness; it is more easy to understand why it should have been passed over by the other evangelists, if they knew it, than how it could be invented by apostolic tradition. What measures of self-defence could it have been devised to justify? The early Christians did not defend themselves against attacks (cf. Ro 8[38], 1 P 3[14]). Even the peaceful Essenes carried arms, to defend themselves against robbers (Jos. *BJ* ii. 125: διὰ δὲ τοὺς λῃστὰς ἔνοπλοι). But, so far as we know, the primitive disciples of Jesus did not go about their work armed. We do not find anything in their primitive record that would suggest the need of putting a word like this into the lips of Jesus. That is one inference to be drawn from the passage. Another is that, whether it is taken in the light of (*a*) or of (*c*), it cannot be set up against the other pacific sayings which are so characteristic of the teaching of Jesus; if it is literal, it is only meant for a special occasion, and not laid down as a rule which supersedes the entire earlier instructions of our Lord against resisting evil. No more flagrant abuse of it could be imagined than that of Pope Boniface VIII. in his famous Bull *Unam Sanctam* (Nov. 1302), which gave the imprimatur of the Lateran Council to the view not only that the two swords denoted the spiritual power and the temporal power ('in hac eiusque potentate duos esse gladios, spiritualem videlicet et temporalem evangelicis dictis instruimur'), but also that the latter as derivative must be subordinate to the former ('oportet autem gladium esse sub gladio, et temporalem auctoritatem spirituali subjici potestati').

2. Militant messianism and the primitive church.—The influence of the militant spirit in some circles of messianic faith presents a more complicated problem. So far as Jesus was concerned, the views of His mission which we have already outlined are enough to prove that He stood aloof from all the current expectations of a national supremacy for Judaism as the dominant power on earth. He compared the spread of His kingdom to the dropping and the sprouting of seed; His emissaries were sent out to teach and to heal, not as an organized force of armed adherents. Even the apocalyptic aspect of His kingdom was non-militant. The conceptions of a book like Enoch were influential; yet, when we read a passage like 56[5f.], which describes the last onset of the pagan powers upon Israel, stirred up like lions and wolves to attack the holy city but ruined by quarrels and finally annihilated, we feel at once the difference between this apocalyptic outlook of nationalism and the hopes of the primitive church. The Son of Man whose sword is drunk with the blood of the mighty opponents of Israel (62[6f.]) is not the Son of Man in the Gospels; Jesus can be stern, but this is not His kind of sternness; and, when a sword is given to the sheep (*i.e.* the pious Jews) wherewith to rout their brutal enemies (90^{19}), we instinctively think of the sword or knife by which the early Christians were constantly butchered (Ro 8^{36}; cf. Rev 5^{6}). Yet the apocalyptic eschatology did carry with it suggestions of martial exploits, which may have appealed to some members of the primitive church. We have only to look at the setting from which the fulfilment of a prediction[*] about Jesus as the peaceful conqueror was taken, in order to see how closely the OT predictions of Him were bound up with more or less incongruous elements. War-weariness had prompted some fair dreams of peace in the older Jewish literature, but it should never be forgotten that the peace was to be the result of a conflict;[†] only, as the international situation had so altered that the saints could not win the battle for themselves, they were generally content to wait till God or His messiah chose to intervene supernaturally in order to win it for them, or at any rate to call on them for aid. The very increase of a belief in demons and in the Satanic dominion which confronted God and stood behind the opposing powers of human life, did not altogether remove this conflict from the region of actual war. No stable peace could be looked for in the future unless and until the non-Jewish world had been reduced to subjection or annihilated along with the devil and his angels. The messianic interpretation of psalms like the 2nd and the 110th, which originally depicted a martial monarch, like the mediæval St. Louis of France, kept such beliefs and hopes alive. No doubt, when the little groups of Christians succeeded to this tradition, it was re-set for them by their conception of Jesus. Their ardent expectation of His return in order to take them safe to heaven prevented the large majority of them from cherishing the least interest in the fortunes of the world around them. Eschatology tended to insulate and isolate the Christians far more than the Jews. Their faith detached them from the destinies of nations. The figure of Diocletian would have been intelligible to them; the figure of Constantine never. The last thing of which they dreamed was the conversion of the Roman empire, and much less its subjugation by their celestial Lord. The sovereignty of God meant to them another kind of rule than that of a theocracy on earth, such as the fanatical Zealots dreamed of, who believed that God would not help them in their messianic hope unless they struck together a blow for faith (Jos. *Ant.* XVIII. i. 1). But, while this was true theoretically and, in the main, practically, while the rôle of Christians was to hold the fort till they were relieved by the appearance of their messiah on the clouds of heaven, their literature shows occasional traces of another mood.

---

* Referring to the mission of the twelve (in 9[3]) or the commission of the seventy (in 10[4]).

† Cf. O. Pfleiderer, *Primitive Christianity*, ii. [London, 1909] 181, and A. Loisy, *Les Évangiles synoptiques*, Paris, 1907–08, ii. 554–558, following the earlier hints of Schleiermacher and Renan, and followed by E. A. Sonnenschein, in *HJ* xiii. [1915] 865 f.

So far as the gospels go, it is again St. Luke's which suggests that the Apostolic Age had slightly affected the primitive outlook.

Twice we meet suggestions of this kind. The first group (*a*) is less important, viz. the references in the birth narrative; the second (*b*) in $18^{7f.}$ carries more significance. (*a*) The former contains the militant imagery of the Magnificat and the Benedictus—for the only allusion to the sword (2^{35}: 'a sword shall pierce through thy own soul also') is of course metaphorical. But the warlike terms of the songs are religious reminiscences of the OT—*e.g.* of Hannah's song—and are fundamentally[*] figurative also. Jesus did not come to 'put down the mighty from their seats' in Cæsarea Philippi or at Rome; John was arrested by Herod, according to Josephus, because the Jewish ruler feared that his popularity would develop revolutionary tendencies, but John's mission was not to 'deliver the Jews from the hand of their' Roman 'enemies.' Oriental symbolism is enough to account for such terms in those hymns of the primitive Palestinian church (cf. J. G. Machen, in *Princeton Theol. Review*, x. [1912] 1–38). This interpretation is not affected by the song of the angels at the birth of Jesus (2^{14}), which, in the mistranslation, 'on earth peace, good will toward men,' especially when it is unconsciously read in the light of Milton's *Ode on the Nativity*, seems a definite programme of peace. The peace proclaimed is between God and man, however, not between man and man. The gospel is not announced as an international league of peace. Charles Wesley was right when he put these two lines of interpretation into his Christian hymn—

> 'Peace on earth, and mercy mild,
> God and sinners reconciled!'

The line of the angels' song is meant to allay any suspicion of God's goodwill towards men. 'Of God's goodwill to men, and to all creatures, for ever, there needed no proclamation by angels,' says Ruskin (*Val d'Arno*, x. 253). But this was precisely what did need to be proclaimed, in view of human sin and ill-will towards God. The coming of Jesus implies and proves that the divine thoughts to men are thoughts of peace and not of evil, that the suspicions of God which sin prompts are unjustified, and that He intends to create harmony between men and Himself. There is now 'peace on earth for men whom He favours.' And this message is sung by a detachment of the angelic στρατία!

It is a very different matter when we turn to (*b*) the language of $18^{7f.}$, where, after describing how even a selfish and callous magistrate will attend to a widow's complaint, if she is only persistent enough, Jesus asks: 'And will not God see that justice is done to his elect who cry to him by day and night? Will he be tolerant to their foes [ἐπ' αὐτοῖς, as in Sir 35^{22}, of which this passage is a reminiscence]? I tell you, he will quickly see justice done to his elect.' The wording is judicial, but justice in the East was military in the last resort, and that is the meaning here. The Sirach passage describes the confident hope that God will effectively interpose on behalf of the oppressed who cry out bitterly against the tyrannical power of the overlords. These pagan oppressors will be put down from their thrones, and Israel, the mourning widow, relieved. The Lucan words suggest that some saying of Jesus has been sharpened in the course of transmission through a period of what seemed to the Apostolic Church to be almost intolerable misery. It is a momentary relapse into the terms if not into the spirit of militant Jewish eschatology. But the wonder is that such relapses were not more frequent. Besides, the cry for vengeance on the foes of religion is the Oriental expression of the innate yearning for justice in the moral order. The note of impatience with God's apparent toleration of evil men and His intolerable delay (cf. 2 P 3^{9}), as well as the longing for the speedy end of things in order that the present distress may be relieved, is not so definite and characteristic as the appeal for retribution, however, and, as this is loudly echoed in[†] Rev 6^{10-11}—the great *Quousque* of the church—it obliges us to look back upon the course and trend of religious feeling which prompted it.

War, in the present, had been regarded by Israel as occasionally a punishment of the nation for wrong-doing; the prophets had taught that faithlessness to Jahweh might be requited by invasion and defeat at the hands of a foreign power raised up by Jahweh for that purpose. The people might need to be chastised or purged by some 'bitter and hasty' outside conqueror, although eventually Jahweh throws away His very tool (cf., *e.g.*, the Book of Habakkuk and Dt $32^{25f.}$). This is still recognized not only in the *Psalms of Solomon* but as late as the *Pirke Aboth*, where (5^{11}) 'the sword comes upon the world for the suppression of justice and the perversion of justice, and for those who do not explain the Torah according to rule' (*i.e.* for heterodox ways).[*] Even in the Zadokite document (Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, ii. 816) the militant messiah himself destroys the disloyal by the sword for their disobedience to the new covenant ($9^{9f.}$). But the last-named prediction is eschatological, and it suggests the three war-scenes in the last act of the drama, as eschatology usually shaped the future course of the world. (*a*) Wars and bloodshed, the 'wars and rumours of wars' of which the Gospels speak, precede the dawn of the messianic age; international strife ushers in the new era here as in the contemporary astrological scheme of Hellenism,[†] but it is not war waged upon Israel. The people of God may suffer in the conflict, but they are not the objects of the pagan campaign. (*b*) Then comes a campaign of God or messiah against the opponents of Israel, who are supposed to be instigated by Satan and his agents. This hope, which thrills through one class of apocalypses, including Enoch, Baruch, the Psalter of Solomon, and the early Jewish strata of the Sibylline Oracles, is still maintained in 2 Es $13^{33f.}$; the colours of the sketch vary, from Is 24–27 downwards, but the general outline remains the same; the assault of the massed pagans is a failure, and they are enslaved or annihilated, so that the saints can now enjoy the peace for which they have lived and longed. Nevertheless, these dreams of peace are always based on war; Jahweh or messiah must do for the people what they cannot do for themselves, *i.e.* rout and overpower the foe. 'The allegiance of the nations is evidently thought of as growing out of their fear and awe in the presence of the irresistible God. He reigns as a great conqueror. He fights no more because there is nobody left to oppose him. The peace that is to prevail is a peace that has been conquered by the sword of Yahweh. The day of Yahweh which is to usher in the Golden Age is the day of battle upon which he from the heavens sets the battle in array and once for all overthrows all his foes, whether spiritual or temporal.'[‡] As the demonology developed, the foes became more supernatural, not so much isolated powers as agencies of a transcendental evil realm; but the human instruments of the Satanic delusion were never entirely left out of the picture. Then (*c*) the closing battle between God and the spiritual hosts of Satan rounds off the campaign and the drama of the ages. This is a single combat, so far as God or messiah is concerned; even less than in (*b*) is there any real place for hosts of men or of angels aiding the divine conqueror. They may escort Him, but by a breath or a word He wins the victory single-handed. Thus evil is finally routed where it originally arose—in the spiritual, supra-natural region.

---

[*] In Zec 9^{9}; cf. the present writer's *Theology of the Gospels*, London, 1912, pp. 163–164.

[†] To take a parallel from history: the sincere and intense craving for peace and order, and the enthusiastic hopes entertained of Augustus, as a donor of quiet to the empire, were due to the weariness felt by Romans who had come through the internal strife of the later Republic. But the peace of Augustus was not disarmament; it was to be the result of a strong, wise, non-aggressive ruler—in a word, a peace resting on the master of the legions. The ideal monarch, who is the hope of a Hebrew lyric like the 72nd psalm, also rules by 'crushing the oppressor'; his justice and good order win him widespread homage and secure peace, but he enforces good government by the sword, if need be.

[*] There is a parallel (see, further, F. H. Chase, *TS* i. 3 [Cambridge, 1891], pp. 31 f., 147 f.) in the eleventh Benediction of the early Jewish liturgy: 'Restore our judges as at the first, and our counsellors as at the beginning; remove from us grief and suffering; reign thou over us, O Lord, thou alone . . . and for slanderers let there be no hope, and let all wickedness perish as in a moment; let all thine enemies be speedily cut off, and the dominion of arrogance do thou uproot and crush, cast down and humble speedily in our days. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who breakest the enemies and humblest the arrogant.' This primitive petition may be 'for the restoration of political autonomy, but it seems more probable that the significance is Messianic' (Abrahams, in *Authorised Daily Prayer Book*, London, 1914, p. lxiv). Perhaps; and yet the messianic outlook includes the national supremacy. Would a primitive Christian, especially if he had been trained in this discipline, always be able to pray 'Thy Kingdom come' without similar associations?

[†] The older cry in Enoch $47^{1f.}$ runs: 'In those days shall have ascended the prayer of the righteous, and the blood of the righteous from the earth before the Lord of Spirits. In those days the holy ones who dwell above in the heavens shall unite with one voice . . . on behalf of the blood of the righteous which has been shed . . . that justice may be done them, and that they may not have to suffer for ever.' The Son of Man enables the elect themselves to annihilate the enemy ($48^{8f.}$).

Living in an atmosphere which was charged with such militant elements, an atmosphere breathed by some of the most ardent and earnest souls of the age, did Christianity in the early church become affected by this hot air? To answer this question, we must first of all glance at the Pauline eschatology and christology.

The prevalent idea that the crucifixion had been a disastrous strategical error on the part of the supernatural Powers of evil in the universe (1 Co 2^8) was naturally connected with the idea that Jesus had then and there triumphed over these dethroned authorities of the present age. The forgiveness secured by Christ at His death and resurrection is, in one aspect, a signal triumph over the hostile demon-spirits (Col $2^{13f.}$): 'he cut away the angelic Rulers and Powers from us, exposing them to all the world and triumphing (θριαμβεύσας) over them in the cross.' They are disarmed and rendered impotent to injure Christians. St. Paul drives home the paradox by his military metaphor. The cross is not the ignominious defeat of Jesus; it marks the open subjugation of His supernatural foes, it is a trophy of His victory, which has decisively stripped them of their power. The metaphor is military, as in the martial quotation of Eph 4^8, but it is more than a metaphor. The human soul is beset by those real supernatural forces, and the victory of Jesus inaugurates the peace and freedom of His people (so 1 P 3^{22}). Thus it is that Athanasius (*de Incarn.* xxiv. 4) takes the crucifixion—although he proceeds, in his passion for demonology, to add (xxv. 5 f.) that Jesus was lifted up on the cross to 'clear the air' from the demons who infested it and beset the human soul with their stratagems. In 1 Co $15^{23f.}$ the last battle in the campaign is described, when death is finally annihilated after the rout of all the anti-divine authorities and powers; then and only then does the triumphant Christ, at the end of the ages, hand over His royal authority to the Father. Even if τάγμα ('each in his own division') in v.^{23} is not a military metaphor, as παρουσία, the visit of a potentate, certainly is, the following passage definitely depicts a Christian replica of (*c*) above, and human as well as supernatural foes are included in the rout which brings the messianic reign to a successful conclusion.[*] The influence of the tradition in the 110th psalm is felt here as elsewhere, even, *e.g.*, in an epistle like Hebrews, where the primitive eschatological idea of the enthroned Christ waiting in heaven until His enemies are humiliated and forced to do homage, or, as the Oriental phrase went, 'put under his feet' ($10^{12f.}$), is out of keeping with the author's characteristic scheme of things. In Hebrews the expression is almost entirely figurative. But in the Pauline eschatology the realistic idea emerges in the apocalyptic prediction of 2 Th $1^{7f.}$ and $2^{13f.}$, where the apostle hints that King Jesus must ultimately intervene to defeat the lawless one whom even the restraining power of the Roman empire could not hold in check. The mysterious opponent is a sort of false messiah, issuing from Judaism, and invested with a Satanic authority which produces apostasy on the verge of the end. The delusion sweeps Jews and pagans alike into an infatuated rebellion against God. St. Paul has nothing to say about the fate of Satan, who instigates the outburst. It is the victims and tools of Satan who are destroyed; those who at present persecute Christians and those who dare to engage in the last and imminent struggle to their own doom—'men who will pay the penalty of being destroyed eternally.' This apocalyptic prediction draws upon sagas like those in Daniel and in the *Ascensio Isaiæ*; it is from the former especially that the note of self-deification as a trait of the last deceiver is derived.

---

[*] Josephus (*BJ* vi. 40) makes Titus ask his troops confidently, at the siege of Jerusalem, 'What do their dissensions and famine and siege mean, except that God's wrath is against them and His aid on our side?'

[†] The parallels, which are sometimes close, are collected by F. Boll, *Aus der Offenbarung Johannis*, Leipzig, 1914, pp. 130–135.

[‡] J. M. P. Smith, 'Religion and War in Israel,' in *AJTh* xix. [1915] 30.

[*] Ultimately, this messianic triumph goes back to the cosmological myth of a contest between God and the powers of the abyss; but, long before Christianity, the myth had been moralized and developed, so much so that an incidental glimpse of this hinterland, like that in Ps 89^{10} ('thou hast broken Rahab in pieces'), seems almost foreign to the OT.

Half a century later the ardent messianic hope of a campaign against antichrist (cf. *DAC* i. 67 f.), which breathes through this passage in 2 Thess., broke out again under the strain of the Domitianic persecution. In 2 Thess. the hot air of the later Judaism, with its apocalyptic anticipation of the *jus talionis* applied by God to the enemies of His people and His cause, produces a climax of history which is judicial * rather than distinctively military. The moral order is vindicated by an overwhelming manifestation of the divine glory which sweeps all enemies of Jesus and of Christians to ruin. The outraged conscience becomes indignant and even vindictive at the sight of cruelty to itself or to others. The relief of the distressed elect means the doom of their foes, and the encouragement offered is the hope of such a speedy and crushing intervention. Christians need not stir a finger. Their very suffering sets in motion the divine engine of retribution against these wanton foes of goodness. This is emphatic enough, but it is when we pass forward to the apocalypse of St. John (cf. *DAC* i. 71 f.) that we come upon what is by far the most explicit reproduction of this militant messianism, from the livid horse of 6^8 (for the horse is invariably a martial figure; cf. *DAC* i. 585 f.) onwards, amid the horrors and terrors of the period which the prophet anticipates in the near future, when Christians are harried ruthlessly by the authorities for refusing to join in the Imperial worship. The prophet repeats unflinchingly the message of Jesus: submit patiently to the trial (13^{9-10}), do not resent the cruelty and injustice of the ordeal.

'Let any one who has an ear listen:—Whoever is destined for captivity, to captivity he goes: † whoever kills by the sword, by the sword must he be killed. This is what shows the patience and faith of the saints,' viz. abstaining from the use of force, when they were sent to prison or put to death for declining to invoke the emperor's genius and throw a few grains of incense on the altar. Even when the pagan hordes from the East are roused by God to attack and destroy Rome, the saints rejoice, but it is the rejoicing of those who 'stand still and see the salvation of God' in the rout of their oppressor; they take no active part in the campaign.‡ The prophet maintains the primitive Christian standpoint on this issue. There is no question whatsoever of an armed revolt against the State. The duty of Christians is simply to wait, under any storm of persecution, until God intervenes to inaugurate the reign of the saints by destroying their tyrant. But this passivity is accompanied by a certain vindictiveness (cf. the taunt-song in ch. 18 and $19^{1f.}$). Now vindictiveness, which is the temptation of moral indignation, is often more likely to beset those who can do nothing but look on than those who are able to take some active part in avenging atrocities. So it is here. The Christians exult over Rome's doom, and their satisfaction is bound up with an attitude of grim quietism. This is thrown into relief against a singularly dramatic background of militant supernatural power in action, depicted on the ordinary lines of apocalyptic hope. Such a hope becomes intelligible when it is remembered that its heart is 'the doctrine of the approaching Judgement, and the doctrine of the approaching Judgement was in essence an expression of the Jews' unquenchable conviction that God would not altogether allow His Chosen People to perish in their struggle with the Civilization of the heathen world' (Burkitt, *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, London, 1914, p. 49). Already this had been partially moralized and made transcendental. Now it is Christianized, perhaps as far as it ever could be. The prophet will have his people remain unintimidated by the last threats; he assures them that it is the fury of desperation—of a foe whose end is near. 'The devil is come down to you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time.' St. John encourages the church by the thought that the quarrel between them and the Roman power is God's affair, a Satanic challenge of their God which can have only one ending. But this thought is worked out in a series of predictions which are sometimes truculent and weird; the adversary of God is no longer a political power, it is an incarnation of supernatural evil; the Roman State is an inspiration of the devil, and the final struggle is between the protagonists of good and evil. This Asiatic Christian prophet allows no considerations of patriotism to qualify or check his exultant anticipations of the doom that is to fall upon the Roman empire. He anticipates, as some of the later Sibyllinists did, the triumph of the East over the West; only, the antipathy is based on a resentment not of Rome's economic maladministration but of her irreligious policy in the Eastern and especially the Asiatic provinces. There is to be an end, before long, to the fascination, the impiety, and the luxury of Rome—all due to her possession by the evil one! The victory already won over the dragon in the upper world is being followed by the dragon's final campaign on earth; * in the crushing offensive taken by God the prophet sees a bloody rout of the enemy, messiah in action as a triumphant conqueror, and the total destruction of all Satan's hosts, human and supernatural. The divine retribution is worked out in history. The transcendental and supernatural transformation of messiah's conquest is as obvious as in the later Jewish apocalyptic, more obvious indeed at several points, but this does not mean that the historical process is evaporated into a spiritual sequence. The book lent itself to allegory, but allegory was the last thing in the writer's mind. The author or prophet is dealing with realities of this world; the Roman religious policy is to him the supreme device of Satan, and the seriousness of the situation calls out the powers of God and His messiah. It is a holy war which ends in a ghastly Armageddon for the wanton world-power which has proudly defied the moral order and stained itself with blood, especially with the blood of the Christian martyrs. Not until this victory has been won ($19^{7f.}$ $21^{2f.}$) can the warrior-messiah celebrate His marriage; but, once the divine commandant has triumphed, He and His Bride, the Church, have an endless day of peace and bliss before them.†

---

* This is true even of the Epistle of Jude (v.$^{14f.}$), where a flaming quotation from Enoch describes the capital sentence upon the impious; but the previous description of the deity as issuing from his camp (ἐκ τῆς παρενβολῆς αὐτοῦ, 1^4) in battle array is omitted.

† The seven-fold evil of the sword, in *Test. Benj.* 7^2, is: bloodshed, ruin, tribulation, captivity, dearth, panic, and destruction.

‡ All that they have to do is to await the vengeance which God takes on their behalf. So an earlier apocalyptist had preached, in the *Secrets of Enoch* 50^{3-4}: 'Endure for the sake of the Lord every wound, every injury, every evil word and attack. If ill-requitals befall you, return them not either to neighbour or enemy, because the Lord will return them for you and be your avenger on the day of great judgement, that there be no avenging here among men.'

* Most of these ghastly touches (*e.g.*, 14^{20}; cf. En 100^3) have precedents, if not sources, in the militant apocalyptic messianism; *e.g.* the formation of angelic hosts to destroy the wicked is a commonplace of the apocalyptic strategy against evil (which was supernaturalized).

† It is only fair to contrast this with the Jewish *Psalms of Solomon* in the 1st cent. B.C., where the political quietists who claim to be the righteous party in Israel accept the sufferings

It is a proof of the quietist temper in early Christianity that, even when a book of such ardent language and spirit was admitted to the canon, it did not make the church swerve from the path of non-resistance into rebellion against the Roman empire. The church adhered to the 'loyalist' passivity of St. Paul on this issue. The section of St. John's apocalypse which resisted the spiritualizing interpretation longest was the prediction (20^{1-6}) of the saints' reign on earth; what the book seems to have fostered was chiliasm rather than militarist hopes of a supernatural kind, even though the military setting of the eschatology is prominent in its pages as it is not in 2 Thessalonians. It is true that the chiliasm itself had a martial setting, but at first it was not interpreted in a militant sense. The early chiliasts were not Fifth Monarchy men. There was a danger of this, but the danger was never real in the early centuries. The ideal of Christianity remained peaceful—an important point, for no aspirations of martial success were excited in the church's mind, and there was no glorification of the sword. In the main[*] the church kept, practically as well as ideally, to an eschatology which was not coloured by the militant hopes of this apocalyptic tract.

3. Martial metaphors and illustrations.—But, if it is difficult to estimate the extent to which some primitive Christians took a realistic view of their new messianic hope in its eschatological outlook, there is no dubiety raised by their description of the Christian life in military terms. The one passes into the other through the conception of Satan as the inspirer of heresy (*e.g.* Ro 16^{20}) and persecution (1 P 5^8; cf. *DAC* i. 294), as the foe to be resisted. The very resistance tends to assume militant forms of expression. As the Persian dualism had contributed to develop the demonology of the later Judaism, it intensified the sense of moral conflict. Mithraism was one outcome of this tension, in the later days. But the dualism never became so sharp, metaphysically and morally, in Christianity or even in Judaism; Satan was never considered to be on anything like equal terms with his divine antagonist. Note how this militant expression of the faith prevailed. Early Christians spoke of themselves as soldiers of God, just because they were not literally soldiers as, *e.g.*, the Maccabees had been. They were not even crusaders. Their military language is purely metaphorical and figurative. But it is none the less significant on that account. And it is curiously widespread. The early Christian writers drew upon agriculture, architecture, slavery, law, marriage, sea-faring, and even the games, to illustrate their faith, but scarcely any one of these departments of life furnished such a number of apt and favourite metaphors for the heroic aspect of the new religion as the Roman army. When we consider that these Christians had as yet no rank or standing in the Roman world, and also that they inherited traditions of a resolutely pacific nature from their Lord, this becomes all the more remarkable. In one aspect it was part of the de-orientalizing of Christianity. As 'messiah' was replaced by the equivalent 'Lord,' so 'carrying the cross' involved ideas which were more intelligible to non-Semitic people when they were expressed in military figures. More than once we feel that the early Christians were sensible of the paradox and even delighted in the use of such language. To state the gospel of peace in terms of warfare was a telling as well as an intelligible method of self-expression. To say that their faith was 'the victory which conquers the world,' or that by bearing persecution and suffering they were 'more than conquerors,' was to put a new edge on language. Besides, their principles were so well known that these militant terms could be employed without the smallest risk of misconception, either to themselves or to those who overheard them.

Take the Pauline epistles, to begin with. St. Paul never calls himself the soldier of God or of Jesus Christ, but in two of his latest letters, when he was in daily contact with the Roman troops in his captivity, he describes Epaphroditus (Ph 2^{25}) and Archippus (Philem ^{2}; cf. *DAC* i. 89) as his fellow-soldiers.[*] St. Paul's experience of Roman soldiers was happier than that of Ignatius. The latter was disgusted with them. He calls his armed escort a set of wild brutes (*ad Rom.* v. 1): 'I am bound fast to ten leopards (that is, a company of soldiers), who, the better they are treated, grow worse and worse.' When pious Christians gave these soldiers money (see above, p. 648),[†] in order to get access to Ignatius, the guard did not cease to ill-treat him; they only became more brutal and bullying to their prisoner. St. Paul makes no complaints against his military guard (Ac 28^{16}), and indeed we know that not only the procurator Felix (Ac 24^{23}) but the officer of the Imperial regiment (*DAC* i. 123 f.) who conducted him to Rome behaved with courtesy and consideration (Ac 27^3)—a feature which more than once recurs in the red record of the martyrs, for soldiers had police-work to do, and they could alleviate a prisoner's lot, if they chose. St. Paul's epistles draw repeatedly and lavishly on the military vocabulary. Thus, the apostolic instructions which were to regulate the practice of the church at Thessalonica are called by the technical military term *παραγγελίαι* (1 Th 4^2), as in 1 Ti 1^{18} (*ταύτην τὴν παραγγελίαν παρατίθεμαί σοι*), in order to emphasize their authority. A similar note of discipline is struck in 2 Th $3^{6f.}$, where the church is told that it must not degenerate into a disorderly mob of individuals who break their ranks (*παραγγέλλομεν δὲ ὑμῖν, κτλ.*); also, mutineers are to be avoided, just as the Roman general Germanicus had ordered in the case of a mutiny (see Lightfoot's *Notes on Epp. of St. Paul*, London, 1895, p. 129). On the contrary, churches which are free from insubordination and united in a common obedience to the orders of the gospel are commended; it is a pleasure, the apostle writes to the Colossian Christians (Col 2^5), 'to note your steadiness and the solid front of your faith in Christ,' which no specious heresies had been able to break; and the Philippian Christians are congratulated on having presented an undivided front against persecution and suffering (Ph $1^{27f.}$: 'Let me know you are standing firm in a common spirit, fighting side by side like one man for the faith of the gospel. Never be scared for a

---

of Pompey's invasion, in the hope of an ultimate triumph of messiah. The triumph leads to a reign which is not military, but it means a national predominance of Israel; and 'the purely ethical interest is subordinate to the national one, and more particularly to the Pharisaic programme' (E. F. Scott, *The Kingdom and the Messiah*, Edinburgh, 1911, p. 48).

[*] The *Acta Pauli* (see below), perhaps contemporary with Celsus, show how the language, if not the actions, of Christians could give rise to suspicions of treason.

[*] Sirach's naive remark (37^{5-6}) is rather different:

'A good friend fights with one's enemy,
  And holds the shield up against adversaries:
Forget not a comrade in conflict,
  And forsake him not when thou art taking spoil.'

Still, this could be partially turned into metaphor, as by Julian (*Orat.* viii. 242A: *τοῦ πιστοῦ φίλου καὶ προθύμου συνασπιστοῦ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς κινδύνους ἀπροφασίστου κοινωνοῦ*) in his grateful praise of Sallustius. Cæsar used to address his troops not as soldiers but by the term 'comrades' (Suet. *Cæs.* 67: 'Blandiore nomine *commilitones* appellabat'); but St. Paul addresses his two friends neither as their leader nor in flattery. They and he are serving side by side in the ranks of God.

[†] Perpetua and her friends paid in order to get occasionally out of the foul, dark cell into the larger prison ('constituerunt praemio ut paucis horis emissi in meliorem locum carceris refrigeraremus' [*Passio S. Perpetuæ*, iii.]). Josephus mentions a similar case in *Ant.* xviii. 233.

second by your opponents, etc.'; 4^3: 'These women . . . have fought at my side in the active service of the gospel, along with Clement and the rest of my fellow-workers').[*] Thrice the pay of the soldier is mentioned: in Ro 6^{23} ('The wages of sin is death,' where ὀψώνια, meaning the rations and pay of the soldier, which he gets as his due, is contrasted with the χάρισμα,[†] or free gift of eternal life); in 1 Co 9^7, where the right of an apostle to be supported at the expense of the church is defended or illustrated by the analogy of a soldier in the legions ('Does a soldier provide his own supplies?'); and in 2 Co 11^8, where he explains to the Corinthians that he had not accepted any remuneration from them because he had 'made a levy on other churches, taking pay (ὀψώνιον) from them so as to minister to you.' In addition to the trumpet[‡] sounding for the charge (1 Co 14^8: 'If the trumpet sounds indistinct, who will get ready for the fray?'—the assumption being that all are brave enough to serve if they only hear the signal, whereas the coward in Theophrastus, *Char.* xxv. 5, sits in his tent and grumbles that τὸ πολεμικόν is sounded only too distinctly!), the familiar and splendid procession of triumph, accorded to a successful general at Rome, is used to describe the success won by God through St. Paul's preaching missions: 'Wherever I go, thank God, he makes my life a constant pageant of triumph in Christ' (2 Co 2^{14}). The second epistle to the Corinthians has two other military allusions of interest, besides that in 6^7 to weapons for attack and defence—one to envoys or ambassadors (cf. *DAC* i. 52) who press the offer of peace (5^{20}: 'I am an envoy for Christ, God appealing by me, as it were—be reconciled to God, I entreat you on behalf of Christ'), the other to an evangelist's work as storming the citadel ($10^{3f.}$: 'I do live in the flesh, but I do not make war as the flesh does; the weapons of my warfare are not weapons of the flesh, but divinely strong to demolish fortresses[§]—I demolish theories and any rampart thrown up to resist the knowledge of God, I take every project prisoner to make it obey Christ, I am prepared to court-martial any one who remains insubordinate, once your submission is complete'). The latter passage, with its siege-metaphor, which Philo had already employed (*e.g.* *de Confus. Ling.* 26, on Jg 8^9, *de Abrah.* 26, 38), is a vigorous account of St. Paul's activity in fighting for the good cause till it was triumphant; he claims to make a trenchant attack on all church theories, however formidable, which in his view dispute the freedom and authority of the gospel; he will give them no quarter; any notion subversive of the faith starts him to take the offensive; the pride and rebelliousness which are entrenched in the human mind, even within the church, are a perpetual summons to him. The siege of Mansoul is a challenge to his powers. And he emphasizes at the end his apostolic authority over the members of the church; he will court-martial any seditious and disorderly person.

Hardly any passage is so vivid with military allusions, except the description[*] of the Christian armour in 1 Th 5^8 and Eph $6^{10f.}$. The former reference to faith and love as the coat of mail, and the hope of salvation as the helmet of the Christian, implies (1) that faith in God and mutual love are a unity, and that, instead of requiring to be protected, they form the real protection of the Christian character against the moral dangers that threaten the church in the last days; they are ours to be used, not to be admired or laid aside as too good and delicate for contact with the rough world. (2) What protects the vital centre of the Christian life is hope of the future salvation which is imminent; this is a Christian addition to the OT imagery which St. Paul probably has in mind; to lose hope is to lose everything. He is saying metaphorically what is put otherwise in Lk 21^{28} ('when these things begin to happen, look up and raise your heads; for your release is not far distant'). In Eph $6^{10f.}$ the details are much enlarged, and the supernatural opponents are brought into the foreground. 'Be strong in the Lord and in the strength of his might; put on God's armour [best description of the Roman πανοπλία in Polyb. VI. xxiii. 2 f.] so as to be able to stand against the stratagems of the devil' [as the inspirer of heresies—cf. 4^{14}—and persecutions]. The devil, I say, 'for we have to struggle, not with blood and flesh but with the angelic Rulers, the angelic Authorities, the potentates of the dark present, the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly sphere.[†] So take God's armour[‡] [a military phrase; cf. Jth 14^3; Jos. *Ant.* xx. 110, etc.], that you may be able to make a stand upon the evil day and hold your ground by overcoming all the foe. Hold your ground, tighten the belt of truth [which keeps everything in its place] about your loins, wear integrity as your coat of mail, and have your feet shod with the stability[§] of the gospel of peace; above all ['the Roman πανοπλία consists first of all in the shield'—five feet by two and a half (Polybius)], take faith as your shield, to enable you to quench all the fire-tipped darts[‖] flung by the evil one, put on salvation as your helmet,[¶] and take the Spirit as your sword'; *i.e.*, the writer adds, 'the word of God'—the idea being, apparently, that an apt and ready memory of Scripture would form an effective means of counteracting and defeating evil suggestions (cf. the use of the OT by Jesus in His temptations). The long passage closes by an appeal for prayer[**] as a further means of success in the Christian conflict. With prayer there is (v.^{19}, εἰς τοῦτο ἀγρυπνοῦντες) the suggestion, though it is no more than a suggestion, of alertness, as of a sentry on duty; this is also hinted at in other semi-military passages like Ro 13^{12} and 1 Th $5^{6f.}$, but the most direct allusion to the divine sentinel is one which occurs in Ph 4^7 ('God's peace shall keep guard over your hearts and minds in Christ Jesus')—a thought echoed by Francis Thompson in 'A Fallen Yew':

'The hold that falls not when the town is got,
The heart's heart, whose immurèd plot
Hath keys yourself keep not!

Its keys are at the cincture hung of God;
Its gates are trepidant to His nod;
By Him its floors are trod.'

---

[*] So Ignatius begins his letter to the Christians of Magnesia (*ad Magn.* i. 1) by praising 'the splendid order' of their devotion to God (τὸ πολυεύτακτον). Even σύνζυγος in Ph 4^3 may be equivalent to *commilito*.

[†] Tertullian's love of military phrases leads him to translate even χάρισμα by an army term, *donativum* (*de Resurr. Carnis*, 47). See below, p. 655.

[‡] In the opening stanza of his hymn on St. Paul (*Hymni et Sequentiæ*, lxvii.) Abelard compares him to such a trumpet:

'Tuba Domini, Paule, maxima,
De coelestibus dans tonitrua,
Hostes dissipans, cives aggrega.'

The effect of the trumpet-call upon a camp is vividly described in the pseudo-Aristotelian *de Mundo* (399^b), which is not much later than the NT.

[§] The battering-ram was twice used against Jerusalem, by Pompey (*Ps. Sol.* ii. 1) and by Titus (Josephus, *BJ* VI. i. 3). These siege-machines are discussed and described in Justus Lipsius, *Poliorceticôn* (Amsterdam, 1605), bk. iii.

[*] Like Wis $5^{17f.}$, it is modelled on the description of the Divine Warrior in Is $59^{17f.}$, but, unlike Wis., it applies the imagery to the individual saint. The details of the armour, in Roman days, are discussed in bk. iii. of Justus Lipsius, *De Militia Romana* (editio ultima, Amsterdam, 1604, with illustrations).

[†] The difficulty of this phrase, ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, led to the Syriac (pesh.) *v.l.* ὑπουρανίοις, and also to the idea (Chrysostom, Theodoret, etc.) that the words meant, 'our struggle is for (possession of) the heavenly sphere.' Origen, in his 11th Homily on Joshua (110), explains that perfect Christians like St. Paul fight against the spirit-forces of demons, whereas the immature Christian has still to fight against flesh and blood (*i.e* the passions).

[‡] *i.e.* be fully equipped—a metaphorical use, already popular (*e.g.* Tacitus applies the simile to an orator [*Dial.* 32], and Philostratus to the serious arguments of a philosopher [*Vita Apoll.* vi. 16]). The Roman confessors (Cyprian, *Epp.* xxxi. 5) apply this text to themselves, as they await martyrdom in A.D. 250 during the Decian persecution; they are being trained by Christ as an army in their prison, before being called upon to meet the foe in the open, *i.e.* in martyrdom.

[§] Plutarch says that Marcus Cato 'showed himself effective with his hands in battle and sure and steadfast of foot' (*M. Cato*, i.), *i.e.* he never slipped and so failed to get in his blows. Officers usually wore leather boots; ordinary soldiers had thick, nailed sandals.

[‖] The πυροβόλα mentioned by Plutarch (*Camillus*, xxxiv.). Cf. Livy's description of the *phalarica* used at the siege of Saguntum: 'etiamsi haesisset in scuto, nec penetrasset in corpus, pavorem faciebat, quod, quum medium accensum mitteretur, conceptumque ipso motu multo majorem ignem ferret, arma omitti cogebat, nudumque militem ad insequentes ictus praebebat' (xxi. 9). The metaphor of repelling darts is used by Seneca in the last paragraph of the 53rd of his *Epistles*: 'Incredibilis Philosophiae vis est ad omnem fortuitam vim retundendam. Nullum telum in corpore eius sedet; munita est et solida; quaedam defatigat; et velut levia tela laxo sinu eludit; quaedam discutit, et in eum usque qui miserat respuit.'

[¶] 'He was covered by his helmet and breastplate at all parts of the body where he could be mortally wounded' (Jos. *BJ* vi. 88).

[**] One of Tertullian's daring metaphors, in this line, is of the church, as it were, besieging God by prayer ('ad deum, quasi manu facta, precationibus ambiamus orantes' [*Apol.* 39]).

The military allusions in the Pastoral epistles are of high importance. One is adduced to illustrate the undivided attention required of a true evangelist and leader in the church: 'Join the ranks of those who bear suffering, like a loyal soldier of Christ Jesus. No soldier gets entangled in civil pursuits; his aim is to satisfy his commander' (2 Ti $2^{3f.}$).* The special vocation demands absorption, and hardships are to be borne as part of one's duty in the ranks (cf. Seneca, *Ep. Mor.* cxx.: 'Civem esse se universi et militem credens, labores velut imperatos subiit'). The writer might have chosen other metaphors—*e.g.* that of priests, as St. Paul does in another connexion (1 Co 9^{13})—but he prefers the military to the sacerdotal (cf., *e.g.*, Servius' comment on Verg. *Æn.* vi. 661: 'Hi qui sacra maxima accipiebant renunciabant omnibus rebus, nec ulla in his nisi numinum cura remanebat') figure, in order to give the idea of undivided attention. It is the same conception which Jesus sets in unmilitary language, in Lk $9^{57f.}$. The other allusion, to 'the good fight' (1 Ti 1^{18}: 'I transmit these instructions to you, Timotheus my son, . . fight the good† fight on these lines, keeping hold of faith and a good conscience'—as weapons which cannot be dropped without danger to life), proves afresh that στρατεύεσθαι is practically an equivalent for living up to the Christian position in this world.

It is in a Roman document, like the *Epistle* of Clemens Romanus (xxxvii.), however, that we find the organization and discipline of the army held up definitely as a pattern to the Christian church (cf. *DAC* i. 217). What St. Paul had expressed in the metaphor of the body and its members (1 Co $12^{14f.}$) Clement puts in military language, before he echoes the Pauline metaphor. 'My brothers, let us serve with all earnestness in our army, after His faultless commands. Let us consider those who serve our [*i.e.* the Roman] generals. With what excellent order, how readily, how submissively they discharge their appointed duties! Not all of them are prefects, nor tribunes, nor centurions, nor in command of fifty men, or the like, but each in his own rank executes the orders of the Emperor and the generals. The great cannot live without the small, nor the small without the great;‡ there is a blending § of all ranks and one makes use of the other.' The moral is that rich and poor, wise and humble, ascetics, and all other varieties in the church must learn to render mutual help and avoid insubordination; the dutiful member must not decline to help if he is not promoted—an idea already put in military language by Cicero (*ad Attic.* iv. 6: 'Immo etiam in bellum et in castra. Ergo erimus ὀπαδοὶ qui ταγοὶ esse noluimus? Sic faciendum est') and still more aptly by Seneca (*de Tranquill. Animæ*, 4: 'Quid si militare nolis nisi imperator aut tribunus? etiamsi alii primum frontem tenebunt, te sors inter triarios posuerit, inde voce, adhortatione, exemplo, animo milita').

Similarly, there is quite a military tinge in the advice given by Ignatius to the church or clergy of Smyrna (*ad Polyk.* vi. 2): 'Give satisfaction to Him whom you serve [στρατεύεσθε; cf. 2 Ti 2^3], and from whom you receive your pay [ὀψώνια, as above, p. 654]—let none of you be found a deserter.' The supreme reproach of cowardice in the OT had been the word of Ps 78^9: 'The children of Ephraim, being armed and carrying bows, turned back in the day of battle.' Ignatius, like the early Christians, preferred to take the contemporary illustration of desertion from the legions. Then he proceeds: 'Let your baptism remain as your shield, your faith as helmet, your love as spear [an item never mentioned in 1 Th 5^8 or in Eph $6^{13f.}$], your patient endurance as armour; let your works be your deposits, that you may receive the arrears due to you.'

The latter allusion is to the custom of payment in the Roman army (cf. Grenfell, Hunt, and Hogarth, *Fayûm Towns and their Papyri*, London, 1900, p. 252 f.). Soldiers at the moment received only half of the *donativa*,* or bounties, awarded to the army on any special occasion; the other half of these gratuities was deposited in the bank or common purse (*follis*) of the regiment, together with any sums which the soldiers chose to deposit of their own accord. At the conclusion of their term of service they were entitled to receive these arrears and whatever stood to their credit in the bank. It was their own property, exempt even from the *patria potestas*.

The rest of the paragraph is partly an echo of NT allusions, with the characteristic addition of the word on baptism. The reference to desertion, a reference as old as Plato (*Apol.* 28 D, the famous refusal of Socrates to desert his post, which Epictetus [i. 9. 22 f.] quotes against rash and cowardly suicide), had already been made by a Christian writer like Clement, who observes (xxi. 4), 'It is right that we should not be deserters from His will,' and argues that in a world where God is present at all places there is no escape for the guilty: 'What world shall receive those who would desert from Him?' None, he replies, quoting Ps $139^{7f.}$ to clinch his reasoning (xxviii. 2 f.). Unfaithfulness to God, which the Hebrew † had preferred to express in terms of the marital relationship, was generally stamped by the early church not as 'adultery' but as 'desertion'; there were exceptions to this, of course, perhaps the most notable being the *Commonitorium* of Vincent of Lerins, who adjures all Catholics to 'adhere to the holy faith of the holy fathers' by proving themselves 'genuine sons of mother church' (xxiii.). But Christians went more often to the army than to the family for metaphors to denote disloyalty. They could not select any term with more fateful associations than 'deserter' to convey their detestation of cowardice under persecution. An excellent specimen of this figure is afforded by Commodian's *Instructiones* (l., lii. [ii. 9, 11]), and the allusions to fighting against the lower passions ‡ (Ro $6^{13f.}$ 8^7 12^{21}, Ja 4^1, etc.), which are equally common, as they had been in pagan writers (*e.g.* Lucretius, *de Rerum Natura*, v. 43 f.), are also illustrated finely by the same writer (liii., lxiii. [ii. 12, 22]) in his verse, as well as by Clement of Alexandria in the prose of the *Quis dives salvetur?* (25), although nothing equals the extraordinary description of the battle against the flesh and the devil which Arnobius Junior in the 5th cent. addressed to a young married lady at the Roman court (cf. G. Morin, *Études, Textes, Découvertes*, i. [Paris, 1913] 383 f.).

---

* This text and military parallel became a special favourite (*e.g.* Origen, *Princip.* iv. 24, *in Num. Hom.* 25, etc.), particularly when the ascetic or clerical ideal had to be defended in the early church. It is quoted, *e.g.*, in 8th cent. *Barlaam and Joasaph* (xxxix. 351; cf. also xviii. 160: οἱ συνασκηταί μου καὶ συστρατιῶται).

† τὴν καλὴν στρατείαν. καλός is almost as untranslatable as the mediæval French *prud'homme*, which sometimes is not very distant from it in meaning.

‡ Cf. Sophocles, *Ajax*, 159 ff. (tr. F. Storr):

'Without the great the small
Ill could guard the city wall;
Leagued together small and great
Best defend the common state.'

§ Perhaps a reminiscence of the fragment from the *Æolus* of Euripides, which is cited by Stobæus, *Florileg.* xliii. 20.

* See above, p. 654. Tertullian translates Eph 4^8: 'dedit data filiis hominum, id est donativa,' and in the *Acts of Perpetua* (i.) *donativa* is the Latin equivalent for χαρίσματα. The word passed into English; it occurs in a 17th cent. Roman Catholic version of Damiani's hymn 'ad Perennis Vitæ Fontem':

'O Christ, true soldier's Crown, when I
These arms shall have laid down,
Endenized in full liberty,
Me as Thy free-man own;
There to receive, among the blest,
My donative of rest.'

† Philo, however, employed the military expression: 'It is quite proper for the subordinates and lieutenants of God, as for generals in war, to punish severely deserters who abandon the ranks of the Just one' (*Decal.* 33). So in *de Gigantibus*, 15, where he explains that the meaning of Nimrod (Gn 10^9) is 'deserter.'

‡ This recurs in Minucius Felix (8: 'Quod corporis humana vitia sentimur et patiamur, non est poena, militia est'), but it had been a favourite illustration with 4 Maccabees, and also with Philo, *e.g.* in *de Ebrietate*, 25, where he allegorizes Ex 32^{17-19} (making the camp, where the sound of war is heard, to represent the body with its tumultuous, unruly passions), or in *de Posteritate Caini*, 54. In view of a passage like Ro 8^{5-7}, where φρονεῖν τι is associated with a military allusion, it may be recalled that this difficult NT expression could mean 'side

Clement's martial references are not characteristic, not nearly so characteristic as the nautical or musical, but they are sometimes striking. Thus, after describing the proclamation of the gospel by Christ (*Protrept.* xi. 116), he adds: 'When the loud trumpet peals out, it musters the troops and proclaims war; and shall not Christ, breathing a melody of peace to the ends of the earth, muster His own soldiers of peace? He has mustered the bloodless army of peace, by His blood and by the word, and assigned them the realm of heaven. The trumpet of Christ is His gospel. He has sounded this trumpet, and we have heard it. Let us arm ourselves with the armour of peace.' Then he quotes loosely from Eph $6^{14\text{f.}}$, putting in the sacramental touch of the sword-blades being dipped in the water of baptism to temper their edge—a touch which even Ignatius had not attempted in his military reference to baptism (*ad Polyk.* vi. 2: *τὸ βάπτισμα ὑμῶν μενέτω ὡς ὅπλα*). Similarly, when Clement has to speak of God's discipline, he compares it not only to parental training and medical treatment but to the military discipline of the refractory (*Pæd.* i. 8, 65): 'As the general has a good end in view and acts for the admonition of his subordinate officers when he imposes fines, corporal punishment, fetters and abject disgrace on offenders, sometimes even inflicting death, so that great General of ours, the Logos, who is in command of the universe, admonishes those who will not be amenable to his law, in order to release them from the bondage, deceit, and captivity of the adversary and overthrow the passions of the soul, thus conducting them peacefully to the sacred harmony of citizenship.' Again, to insult or injure a Christian is to dishonour the Christian's God, for 'as those who maltreat soldiers insult the general, so the mishandling of his consecrated ones is contumely shown to the Lord' (*Strom.* vii. 3. 21). The supremacy of Christ is thus described: 'The Son of God never leaves his watch-tower . . . all the host of angels and divine beings is subject to Him' (*Strom.* vii. 2. 5).

Later, in the early part of the 3rd cent., Minucius Felix, the Roman lawyer, betrays a genuinely humanitarian view in his dialogue; he drops several remarks about war—*e.g.* about the rapacious policy of invasion and oppression which had built up the Roman state (25), about the frequency of it ('When was there ever an alliance of empires, which began in good faith and ended without bloodshed?' [18]), and about the melancholy truth which the Greek tragedians had already noted, that 'in the heat of battle it is the better men who generally fall' [5], but he boldly claims the Christian martyr as the true conqueror (37). So does the author of 4 Maccabees (*e.g.* 1^{11} 18^{4}), which was a favourite book in some circles of early Christianity; but the point is different. The Jewish homilist reflects that the endurance of Eleazar and his brother as martyrs for the Torah defeated the tyrant by rousing the martial spirit of the Maccabæan fighters, who so resented the cruelties inflicted by Antiochus on their patient brethren that they broke into successful revolt. Minucius Felix takes another view of the victory won by a martyr.

'How fair a spectacle it is to God when the Christian joins battle with pain, when he is arrayed against threats, punishments, and torture, when in triumph and victory he exults over the very man who has sentenced him! For he conquers who obtains the object for which he contends. What soldier would not be emboldened to challenge danger under the eyes of his general [in *de Bell. Gall.* ii. 25, when Cæsar was rallying his right wing against the Nervii, his very appearance nerved the troops. 'Cuius adventu spe inlata militibus ac redintegrato animo, cum pro se quisque in conspectu imperatoris etiam in extremis suis rebus operam navare cuperet']? For no one receives a reward before he is put to the proof; and yet a general does not give what he does not possess; he can only glorify military service, he cannot preserve life. Whereas the soldier of God is neither forsaken in pain nor put to an end by death.'

The concentration of the soldier idea upon the martyrs * was inevitable; in the long period of persecution the martyrs came to be regarded more and more as the fighting-line of the church against the devil, and, if the conception of the Christian life as a warfare was not reserved for them, it acquired, in connexion with them, an accent and emphasis of its own.

Two extracts will serve to bring this out, both from the literature of the 2nd century. Thus, in A.D. 177, the churches of Lyons and Vienne, describing the outburst of local persecution as due to the devil, add that Christians were enabled to bear the brunt of the attack, because 'the grace of God acted as their general against him (*ἀντεστρατήγει δὴ ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ*) . . . and they joined battle with him' (Eus. *HE* v. 1), *i.e.* by their passive resistance to the violence of the mob and by their adhesion to Christ in face of dreadful sufferings and threats. The refusal to apostatize is the weapon of the Christian, and his inspiration is the grace of God, which suggests and maintains these tactics of defence. Then, again, Tertullian writes as follows in A.D. 197 to Christians who were lying in prison awaiting martyrdom (*ad Mart.* 3): 'Granted, O blessed men that a prison is irksome even to Christians. We were summoned to the active service (*militiam*=campaigning) of the living God at the very moment when we repeated the words of the sacrament [*sacramenti verba*, *i.e.* the baptismal confession, regarded as the Christian's oath of fealty and allegiance]. No soldier takes luxuries with him on a campaign; he goes out to battle not from a bedroom, but from narrow, pitched tents, where all sorts of hard, rough, and unpleasant experiences abound.' When he turns to encourage the women, he develops the figure of training for the athletic games, but the male Christians are reminded of their oath of loyalty to Christ as general, in the deadly warfare against evil. Their very harmony—and Tertullian (*ib.* 1) pleads for this, since even martyrs sometimes quarrelled in those days as afterwards—is an effective weapon of war against the devil; Satan wins a triumph if he can succeed in making imprisoned Christians fall out among themselves.

In fact, by the 3rd cent., especially through the Latin Christians of Northern Africa, the ritual and organization of the church began to be infused with military expressions. Thus, 'burden' in Mt 11^{30} is rendered *sarcina*, the soldier's load, by Tertullian. A term like *σύσσημον* had been used by Ignatius (*ad Smyrn.* 1), echoing the OT—*e.g.* Is 49^{22} 62^{10}, where Jahweh raises His standard in Jerusalem for men to rally round; Jesus, says Ignatius, was crucified 'in order to raise an ensign for all ages by means of his resurrection, for his saints and loyal people.' It is not far from this to the cognate use of *vexilla*, and, after the cross had been set upon the standards of the army by Constantine, the vogue of *τρόπαιον* became increasingly popular in the vocabulary of Christian writers. *Feretrum* had been already used metaphorically by Tertullian, practically as equivalent to 'trophy'; in lauding the virtues of Job (*de Patientia*, 14), he exclaims: 'What a trophy (*feretrum*) God set up over the devil in a man like that! What a banner (*vexillum*) did He raise over the Adversary of His glory, when this man, in reply to all the load of bad news, uttered nothing but thanks to God! . . . And so he who worked hard for the victory of God, repelling all the darts of temptation by the breastplate and shield of his patience, presently received his health of body from God's hand.' But words of still greater importance were to be taken over from the troops. 'Legion' had already become a popular term for a large and powerful number (cf. *DCG* ii. 23). This, however, was only the first of such borrowed words, and one of the least significant. A far more vital case was that of *sacramentum*. If this term for a binding promise was not adopted by the church on account of its apt associations as the oath of loyalty, it was the military

---

with,' as in Lucian's *Zeus Tragoedus* (17), where Zeus observes that the Athenian sophist Timocles was on the side of the gods in the debate and championed their interests (*τὰ ἡμέτερα ὁ Τιμοκλῆς ἐφρόνει καὶ ὑπερεμάχει*). It is more practical and real championship that the apostle demands, however. A further illustration of *φρονεῖν* in this sense occurs in Aristoph. *Pax*, 638 f.—a passage which exemplifies the false accusations noted below (p. 658).

* Subsequently, from Origen onwards, upon the ascetics as the real soldiers of God, and later still upon the monks. Pachomius, one of the founders of Egyptian monasticism, had been a soldier under Constantine, just as Loyola had been a Spanish officer before he founded the Jesuit order in the 16th century.

suggestiveness of absolute devotion that certainly helped to popularize it (cf., *e.g.*, Tertullian, *de Spectaculis*, 24). The troops swore individually to obey their general's orders to the letter, never to desert, and always to be ready to face death unflinchingly for the Roman State. When the Christian answered the questions put at baptism, he assumed as real responsibilities and pledged himself to an equally heroic allegiance (see E. Debacker, in *Musée Belgique*, 1909, pp. 147–155). So with *statio*, which meant outpost or picket duty, when soldiers had to keep awake and do without food, a more dangerous, trying, and responsible position than that of the ordinary sentries of the camp. *Stationarii* was one of the military metaphors adopted by Judaism even. But by the middle of the 2nd cent. (Herm. *Sim.* v. 1) *statio* had begun its long career in the Christian vocabulary as a technical term for fasting and vigils, since fasts, as Ambrose (*Serm.* 25) afterwards explained, 'protect us from attacks of the devil; in fact, they are called *stationes* because by standing (*stantes*) and staying in them we repel the foes who plot against us.' In Tertullian this military vocabulary[*] is already rooted and thriving; in Cyprian it is full-blown—especially the idea (see above, p. 656) that Christians are fighting for their faith under the General's eye (*e.g.*, *Ep.* x. 2, lviii. 4, lx. 2, lxxvi. 4). The bishops and clergy are the officers, the laity are the rank and file of the Christian army. On *statio*, Cyprian observes (*de Orat.* 19) that the term 'is derived from the model of war—for we are God's army (nam et militia Dei sumus),' and (*de Jejuniis*, 10) 'soldiers, though ever mindful of their military oath (*sacramenti*), are still more true to their outpost duties (*stationibus*).'

How far the term 'soldier of Christ' had become current even before Tertullian may be gathered from the *Acta Pauli* (*DAC* i. 32). The presbyter of Asia Minor who composed this religious historical novel tells, in the section of the 'Martyrdom' (cf. L. Vouaux, *Les Actes de Paul*, Paris, 1913, p. 278 f.), how Nero's cupbearer Patroclus confessed that he had been raised from the dead by 'Christ Jesus, the king of ages,' after falling like Eutychus (Ac $20^{9f.}$) from a height. 'The Cæsar answered (ταραχθεὶς) woefully, "Then he is to rule the ages and destroy all kingdoms?" Patroclus tells him, "Yes, he destroys all kingdoms and he will live alone for ever, and not a kingdom will escape him." Nero then struck him on the face and said, "So you fight for (στρατεύῃ) this king, Patroclus, even you?" "Yes, lord Cæsar," he replied, "he raised me from the dead." Then Barsabas Justus the flat-footed, and Urion the Cappadocian, and Festus of Galatia, Nero's chief men, said, "We fight also for him, for the king of ages." So Nero imprisoned them, inflicting fearful torture on them of whom he had been extremely fond, and ordered the soldiers of the great King to be sought out' (2). When St. Paul appears, he declares, 'Cæsar, we gain recruits not only from your command but from the whole world. Our orders are to refuse no one who will fight for my king.' When the guard offers to let St. Paul go, instead of killing him, he declines: 'I am not a run-away (δραπέτης) from Christ, but a loyal (ἔννομος) soldier of the living God' (4). Finally St. Paul appears after death (6) to Nero, saying, 'Cæsar, here is Paul the soldier of God. I am not dead but alive,' and threatening the emperor with doom. This illustrates the semi-political tinge of eschatology (see above, p. 653) and it brings out afresh the martyr-application to which reference has been already made. 'The noble army of martyrs' is an English misrepresentation of the original 'martyrum candidatus exercitus' in the 4th cent. hymn of praise, but 'noble' answers to the feelings of the early Church towards those faithful soldiers of Christ. A 5th cent. hymn, attributed to Ambrose, hails them as

'Ecclesiarum principes,
Belli triumphales duces,
Coelestis aulae milites.'

They are ranked next to the apostles and the prophets; they are also promoted at death more rapidly than the rank and file of the Church militant. Titus, or at any rate Josephus (*BJ* vi. 47), is sure that 'the souls of brave men, which are parted from their bodies by the sword in battle, are taken up by the ether, the purest of the elements, and set among the stars, where they shine forth as beneficent daemons and heroes friendly to their posterity.' This is an almost exact parallel to the early Christian belief about the martyrs as soldiers of God who have died in battle, or been burned, beheaded, and flayed alive for their Leader. They pass immediately into glory. For example, the Scillitan martyrs, on receiving their death-sentence and on the point of being led away to execution, thank God: 'To-day we are in heaven.' The special honour thus paid to the martyr in early Christian eschatology does not seem to be paralleled by any corresponding feature in rabbinic eschatology. It is a distinctive homage offered by the Church to her champions in the early battles against paganism.

This rich and varied use of military metaphors, however, throws no light upon the opinions cherished by the early Christians about war in itself. Three of the writers who explicitly oppose war, Tertullian, Origen, and Cyprian, are in fact lavish in their use of military terms. Origen, in his homilies on Joshua and Judges, *e.g.*, delighted to allegorize the most martial passages in the OT, and Cyprian did more than almost any one else to domicile the idea of the church as the army of God, with Christ as its *imperator*, the martyrs and confessors as the leaders, the *sacramentum* of baptism, the *stationes* of fasts and vigils, and heretics or schismatics as rebels against the *castra dei*. Origen's allegorizing of the OT enabled him, of course, to counter Marcion's repudiation of it as too militant for the Christian church. As a pacifist he uses military language, just as Bernard, the celibate, loved the vocabulary and ideas of marriage—though, unlike Bernard, Origen did not allow the vocation in question to any one. Similarly, Lucretius detested war (i. 28 f.), but he employs military figures with force in order to illustrate his theme (*e.g.* in ii. 5 f., 40 f.). These illustrations from St. Paul onwards merely indicate the martial environment of the new religion within the Roman world of the first three centuries; they no more prove that the church encouraged or even approved of war than the less frequent allusions to the games and the theatre prove that these were sanctioned by the conscience of the primitive Christians. Besides, the use of military illustrations is not confined to Christian writers by any means. The newer advocates and exponents of moral philosophy, and in especial of Cynicism and Stoicism, frequently employ metaphors culled from the Roman army to adorn their semi-religious convictions.

The disciple of Poseidonius who wrote the pseudo-Aristotelian treatise *de Mundo* about A.D. 100 (?) declares that 'God is in the universe as the helmsman is in the ship, the general in the army' (400^{b}), the only difference being that God's rule causes Him no trouble or fatigue. Seneca could compare human life to a campaign ('vivere, Lucili, militare est' [*Ep. Mor.* xcvi. 3]), which absorbed the serious man ('nobis quoque militandum est: et quidem genere militiae, quo numquam quies, numquam otium, datur. . . . Quidni malit, quisquis vir est, somnum suum classico quam symphonia rumpi?' [*ib.* li. 5]); he could summon men to cheerful resignation under the divine discipline by reminding them that 'it is a poor soldier who whines as he follows his captain' (*ib.* cvii. 9); he is particularly delighted (*ib.* lix. 5: 'movit me imago ab illo posita') with a military simile of Q. Sextius, who compared the wise man deploying his virtues against evil to an army marshalled against an enveloping attack; he insists that the moral life is promoted not by coaxing and subtle addresses but by such manly demands as those of an officer to his troops ('in aciem ducturus exercitum, pro conjugibus ac liberis mortem obiturum, quomodo exhortabitur? . . . Dux ille Romanus, qui ad occupandum locum milites missos, quum per ingentem hostium exercitum ituri essent, sic adlocutus est: ire, commilitones, illo necesse est unde redire non est necesse! Vides quam simplex et imperiosa Virtus sit' [*ib.* lxxxii.]). The Cynic philosopher, in Lucian's Βιῶν Πρᾶσις (8), declares that he 'fights like Hercules, against pleasures, not as a conscript but as a volunteer, his aim being to purify human life.' The slave-philosopher Epictetus also draws some of his most impressive appeals from the terminology of the military profession. Thus, after explaining that every man has a guardian angel or indwelling spirit (δαίμων), he proceeds (i. 14): 'You ought to swear an oath to this divine being just as the soldiers do to Cæsar. These hired soldiers swear to regard the safety of Cæsar above all else; will not you swear, and swearing keep your oath, when you have received such a number of great boons? And your oath? Let it be this: never to disobey, never to blame, never to find fault with anything he gives to you, never to do or to suffer against your will anything that is needful. Is this oath like the oath of the soldiers? Why, they swear to honour no one above Cæsar; you swear to honour no one above yourself.' Or, again, in a passage which recalls 2 Ti 2^4 even more than 1 Co 7^{35}, he observes (iii. 22. 69) that the genuine Cynic must not be expected to entangle himself with ordinary duties: 'In the present state of things, which resembles an army on active service, the Cynic must be free from all distractions in order to serve God with his entire attention,' instead of being tied down to domestic cares. Nor must you blame the Cynic for being a busybody (*οὔτε περίεργος οὔτε πολυπράγμων ἐστιν* [iii. 22. 97]), for you might as fairly say that 'the general is a busybody, when he is inspecting his troops, examining them, keeping watch over them, and punishing the insubordinate.' Such allusions are scattered over his talk. The most sustained is the well-known paragraph in iii. 24. 31–34, which reiterates the conception of life as a warfare (cf. Job 7^1 14^{14}, Is 40^2): 'Don't you know that life is a campaign (*στρατεία τὸ χρῆμα ἐστι*)? One man has to stand sentry, another has to go out as a spy, another has to fight. It is impossible, it is undesirable, that all should be in exactly the same position. And here are you, neglecting the commands of the general, and grumbling when any rather severe duty is imposed upon you. You don't understand what you would have the army become, if it depended on you; if everybody copied you, no one would dig a trench, no one would put up a rampart, no one would keep on the alert, no one would take any risks, everybody would prove useless for campaigning. . . . Every man's life is a sort of campaign, and it is long and varied: you must follow the rôle of a soldier, and do everything at the nod of your general, divining what he wishes done, if possible—for there is no comparison in strength or superiority of character between this general and any other.' Finally, it is possible that a passage in iv. 13. 5 illustrates the misconduct censured by John the Baptist (Lk 3^{14}). Epictetus is warning men against loose talk about themselves, and he clinches his advice by this reference to contemporary life: 'A soldier in private dress sits down beside you and starts to abuse the Cæsar. Then you join in, assuming that you can trust his fidelity because he began the talk. You say what you think—and then you are arrested and taken to prison.' Even in the later pages of Marcus Aurelius military figures recur, although they are by no means so numerous and distinctive as we might expect, considering that this melancholy and self-conscious philosopher had been for years in command of troops. Once we do get a saying like this: 'Be not ashamed to receive help; you are bound to do the duty that falls to you like a soldier when a wall is being stormed; if owing to lameness you cannot scale the battlements alone, cannot this be managed with the help of another?' (vii. 7). But in his metaphors and similes the emperor talks more of doctors and sailors and bees than of soldiers. His pages are a warning against the common idea that a man's vocation may be deduced from his metaphors, or that a man invariably tends to colour his language by the associations of his calling. The really noticeable thing in this military emperor's little book is a couple of disparaging allusions to war; it is ranked (x. 9) with slavery and the mimes as a deteriorating influence, and (x. 10) military conquerors are frankly described as robbers: 'The spider is proud of catching a fly, one man is proud of catching a hare, another of netting a fish, another of capturing wild boars, another of seizing Sarmatians,' as the writer had done himself or was doing when he wrote this sentence. 'Are they not robbers, if you look into their principles of action?' A century earlier another Stoic philosopher, the Roman knight Musonius Rufus, had done more than write resigned commonplaces about the iniquity of war. With the officiousness for which the Stoics were sometimes blamed (see above), this eminent teacher of Epictetus had contrived to push himself in among the troops of Vitellius and Vespasian during the strained situation of A.D. 69. Tacitus tells us how he then 'began to lecture the men-at-arms upon the blessings of peace and the hazards of war. Many jeered at him, the majority were impatient with him; some would have hustled him and trampled on him, had he not given over his ill-timed philosophizing at the warning of the better sort and under threats from others' (*Hist.* iii. 81). Tacitus, of course, had no sympathy with such a move, and we should perhaps allow for his military sympathies in judging the philosopher. Still, a manlier tone breathes through the sentences of Demetrius of Phalerum (Stobæus, *Anthol.* viii. 20), describing how differently Courage and Cowardice speak to a soldier in battle-order. 'Would not Courage bid him stay where he was and keep his place in the ranks? "But I'll be wounded!" "Endure." "But I'll be killed!" "Die rather than leave your place."' The diatribê-harangues are often marked by such military figures, but it is needless to quote further from this field.

---

[*] The figurative element in the 2nd cent. *Odes of Solomon* (cf. E. A. Abbott, *Light on the Gospel from an Ancient Poet*, Cambridge, 1912, p. 3819 f.), so far as it is really figurative, is for the most part messianic and moulded upon OT patterns. It should not be forgotten that *militia* had been already used metaphorically of sports and exercises which involved exposure and hard work, as in Hor. *Sat.* ii. 2. 10. But even here it retained its military associations of severity and discipline; it was the antithesis of all that was soft and effeminate. Later on, the term lost even this connotation and was applied generally to the imperial service, civil as well as military. Hence the metaphorical use of 'secular *militia*' (Vincent of Lerins, *Common.* i.; Jer. *Ep.* lii. 1).

The prevalence of these military symbols and images was so widespread in the period under survey that it is gratuitous to refer their popularity and spread to any single origin. The allusions in the Stoic philosophers were probably derived in the main from the contemporary vocabulary of the cults. But the use of such militant expressions is spontaneous, especially in a military age and empire. As for primitive Christianity, during the apostolic period at any rate, the Jewish devotional literature might be thought more likely to have suggested many of the details into which, as we have seen, the Christians worked their parallel of religion and military service. With the OT and the later Jewish literature at hand, we might imagine that the early church would scarcely require to go far afield for suggestions of this kind. But their Jewish environment and their use of the OT are not upon the whole sufficient to account for the majority of the military turns of expression which are to be found in the earliest strata of their devotional literature from the end of the 1st cent. onwards. Occasionally an OT passage is employed in this connexion, as we have already noted. The homiletic use of the historical books also enriched the spiritual vocabulary with martial terms. Bunyan owed more to this source than to his brief service in the army, when he wrote his military allegories, and we might expect it to have been so with most of the primitive Christians. Yet a glance at the devotional sections of the OT—*e.g.* at the Psalter—reveals the comparatively limited use of military metaphors. It is always difficult to determine whether an allusion to war is literal or metaphorical, for some of the psalms were battle-songs,* but, even when we set aside those which are probably literal, and which reflect the ordinary horrors of war, its havoc, its atrocities, the provocation of reprisals (125^3), the passions of revenge and moral indignation, the perplexities of 'captive good and captain ill,' and so forth, the remainder of the psalms' allusions fall generally under the heading of God's aid for men—God as a shield or fortress, God shooting His arrows against the foes of the good man, God starting up out of sleep to champion the defenceless, God's mighty army of stars, angels, and the elements, God the conqueror riding home into the city after a victory, and so on. Such is the scope of the Psalter's war-metaphors. The armour is almost altogether God's, not man's.

This is not unnatural, for the psalms are mainly the cry of an oppressed little community, struggling against outside pagan foes and godless enemies of religion within their own nation. They are on the defensive. Faith is besieged (Ps 31^{21}), or harried. Now and then, as in a psalm like the 18th or the 44th, a more vigorous note is struck; the plaintive appeal for divine succour is exchanged for a resolute confidence that the army of the pious cannot triumph except by God's help. But this is probably a literal expectation, in some period of revolt, a return to the traditional ideal of Dt 33^{29}:

> 'Happy art thou, O Israel!
> Who is like thee?—
> A people victorious by Yahweh,
> Who is thy shield to help, thy sword to maintain thy power.
> So shall thy enemies come cringing to thee,
> And thou shalt march over their heights.'

Books like Proverbs and Ecclesiastes show a certain fondness for military phraseology and illustration—*e.g.* Ec 3^8 8^8 ('there is no discharge † in war') 9^{11} 9^{14-15} (siege) and Pr 18^{19} (an instance of the difficulty of love 'winning its way with extreme gentleness | Through all the outworks of suspicious pride'), 20^{18} and 24^{5-6} (statesmanship and war) 21^{31} (the horse) 24^{34} 25^{18} (cf. La 3^{12}) $30^{5.\ 27}$—but this is not characteristic of them or even of the pacific Philo. He is not always pacific indeed. He extols the bloody punishment inflicted by the Levites on Israel (Ex $32^{26f.}$) as an 'immaculate slaughter, which ought to be regarded as the most brilliant and important of all gallant deeds' (*de Spec. Leg.* iii. 22); it was a holy war, 'voluntarily undertaken for God's honour' (*Vita*

---

* The same difficulty emerges in connexion with the 2nd cent. Christian hymn-book called *The Odes of Solomon*, several of which are drenched in a martial messianism. See p. 657.

† *I.e.* no furlough. Man cannot control the wind, or stave off death, or get leave of absence during a campaign.

Mos. iii. 20). And in *de Plant.* i. 33 f., his exposition of Dt 20^5 is a realistic, sympathetic sketch of military methods. But the Jewish philosopher also indulges in martial images (see above, p. 654). Thus, in order to illustrate the truth that compulsion to help other people is not necessarily a mark of slavery, he appeals to the business of an army (*Quod omnis probus*, 6), in which the soldiers have to wear heavy armour and carry loads, besides cutting trenches and so forth, all for the sake of the common good; they are under strict orders, but that does not make them slaves. Other warlike figures recur in his comments on Gn 42^{11} and Jer 15^{10} (*de Confus. Ling.* 11 f.) and in *de Gigantibus* (11). Still, this line of illustration is not Philo's *forte*. Now and then quite original touches occur in the OT literature—*e.g.* in the magnificent picture of the war-horse (Job 39^{19-25}; cf. Jer 8^6), or in the comparison (cf. Job 10^{17}) of overwhelming troubles to 'a king ready for battle' (15^{24}), or in the account of Job's popularity and honour, when he occupied a position of dignity among his fellows, 'and dwelt as a king in the army, as one that comforteth mourners' (29^{25}).[*] Similar allusions are present in Sirach (*e.g.* spies, 11^{30} 14^{22}; the blare of trumpets, 26^{27}; the beacon or fire-signal, 43^8);[†] they are not infrequent in the prophets, who lived in periods of war and occasionally were stirred by the militant eschatology even to depict Jahweh as a redoubtable warrior, blood-stained (Is $63^{1f.}$) and exultant, sometimes whirling a monarch like Cyrus (? Jer $51^{20f.}$) as his battle-axe against the nations. Now and then the gnomic wisdom was couched in military figures (*e.g.* 1 K 20^{11}, Ps 127^4) like the erotic passion (Ca $6^{4.13}$). The 'bow,' *e.g.*, denoted the manly vigour which could protect itself and champion the interests of the oppressed (Job 29^{20}). Nevertheless, a survey of the military metaphors and illustrations in the Jewish literature before the Christian era or contemporary with the primitive Church shows that this source does not account for the range and detail in which the Christians of the first three centuries worked, when they drew upon war to body forth their religious convictions. Their environment in the Roman world, where the legions were constantly in evidence, the spontaneous instinct which prompts ardent religious feeling to clothe itself in such terms, and possibly—in the later stages probably—the lead given by the mystery-religions need also to be taken into account in this connexion.

For military service, as a symbol of devotion and an emblem of unflinching loyalty, did influence the mystery-religions and cults of the period[‡] as well as Christianity. It is natural to expect this in the case of a cult like Mithraism, which was so popular in the army itself; probably one of its attractions for soldiers lay in the fact that the Mithra initiates were enrolled in a 'sacred army,' swearing an oath (*sacramentum*) when they enlisted in the cult, and devoting themselves to a campaign against immorality and mortality. The unconquerable god of the cult marshalled his devotees against the powers of darkness. The organization of the cult was partly modelled on military lines; the third grade in the hierarchy was that of *miles*, according to Jerome (*Ep.* 107, in A.D. 403), who reminds the Roman lady Laeta that her kinsman Gracchus had only a few years ago destroyed the Mithræum at Rome with all the images, before which (cf. *ERE* viii. 756) the initiates were ranked as Raven, Gryphus, Soldier, Lion, Persian, Heliodromus, and Father.[*] One of the ceremonies of initiation consisted in the solemn abjuring of a crown; the votary had a crown placed on his head, which he formally removed, saying that Mithra was his crown. This, according to Tertullian (*de Corona*, 15), stamped him as a *Mithræ miles*.

In the cult of Isis also the votaries of the goddess were considered to be her sacred troops; the initiate, as we learn from Apuleius (*Met.* xi. 14–15), took a solemn oath on entering the *sancta militia*, and thenceforth belonged to the cohort of the goddess. It was a conception of the religious life which was familiar in connexion with the cults, long before Christianity; Livy (xxxix. 15. 13), *e.g.*, witnesses to the use of *sacramentum* as a term for the oath taken by those who had been initiated into the mysteries of Bacchus, and he chronicles a similar practice among the Samnites (x. 38: 'Et deorum etiam adhibuerant opes ritu quodam sacramenti vetusto velut initiatis militibus . . . iurare cogebatur diro quodam carmine in execrationem capitis familiaeque et stirpis composito, nisi isset in proelium quo imperatores duxissent'). One factor which developed its usage in the religious world was probably the oath of allegiance taken by the subjects of Oriental monarchs who were regarded as semi-divine on earth. Thus loyalism blended with piety, and military allegiance acquired a religious sanction, so that, *per contra*, the religion of the cults, Syrian, Egyptian, and Persian, became more than ever adapted to the ideas of an absolute devotion on the part of members to their sovereign deity. 'The sacred *militia* of the mysteries,' says Cumont (*Les Relig. orientales*, p. xvi), 'is simply this civic morality viewed from the standpoint of religion.' With regard to the Isis cult, in particular, early in the 2nd cent.[†] we come upon an invocation of Isis *Myrionyma*, a rigmarole of her various titles and excellences, which shows how even a female deity inspired this sense of adoring confidence in her votaries. The military aspect is repeatedly visible; *e.g.* she is hailed as 'victorious,' 'saviour of men,' 'swiftly victorious,' 'warlike,' 'warding off attacks,' 'the queen of war and rule, who easily destroyest tyrants by trusty counsels.' Her Egyptian initiate adores her for satisfying the manifold needs of men and women; he has a religious and naive assurance that she will never disappoint her loyal followers. Later on, the pious emotions of an Isis-worshipper are described by Apuleius of Madaura in the 11th book of his *Metamorphoses*. Apuleius was an Oscar Wilde of the 2nd cent. literature; an unclean brilliance shines from his pages, and the more devoutly he writes, the more we suspect him of posing. But his delineation of what Lucius felt and said at Corinth, when he was admitted to the cult, is probably a faithful transcript, on the whole, of the better elements in Isis-worship. The convert is told to enrol himself in this holy warfare ('da nomen sanctae huic militiae' [xi. 15]), and he adores the goddess as his saviour from fate and sin, as the deity who can shut and open the lower and the upper worlds.

---

[*] This blending of a martial and a pacific metaphor is not unparalleled; cf., *e.g.*, Ps 91^4 ('He shall cover thee with his feathers . . . his truth shall be thy shield and buckler') and Is 9^3 ('They joy before thee according to the joy in harvest, as men rejoice when they divide the spoil').

[†] If the reading is correct, the 'absent-minded beggar' appears as early as Sir 26^{28} ('For two things my heart is grieved, and for three things wrath comes on me: a soldier [πολεμιστής] suffering from poverty, wise men suffering contempt, and one who turns from righteousness to sin—the Lord prepare the sword for him!'). But the Syriac version makes a rich man out of the Greek πολεμιστής.

[‡] The relevant texts are collected by F. Cumont in his *Monum. Myst. Mithra*, Brussels, 1894, i. 317, n. 1; see, further, his *Les Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, Paris, 1907, p. xiii f. (Eng. tr., Chicago, 1911, p. xx f.), and R. Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, Leipzig, 1910, p. 66 f.

[*] 'Did he not,' Jerome adds—and this should be quoted as a fresh proof of the military language of the early Church—'did he not send them before him like hostages and so win for himself Christian baptism? Paganism even in Rome is left desolate. . . . The standards of the soldiers have the ensign of the cross. . . . The ruddy, yellow-haired hosts of the Getae carry with them tents for churches, and perhaps they hold their own against us because they rely on the same religion as we do.'

[†] Cf. Grenfell and Hunt, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, xi. [1915] 190–220.

The moral aspirations and hopes which were expressed in this *sancta militia* of the cults, and for which the military organization was felt to be an extremely suitable image, were three-fold.

(*a*) In the first place, a confidence in the deity, an unshaken faith that the divine being who presided over the cult was able to ensure his devotees' triumph over the 'slings and arrows of outrageous fortune,' over the powers of darkness and immorality in this world and the terrible, mysterious dangers which beset the soul as it passed at death into the circles of the upper air or the lower world. As the Roman legions held sway over the world, so these initiates believed that their respective cults represented the dominant powers, from a religious point of view. The victories of the army, which were assumed to be due to the emperor, and which were often won by his personal generalship,* symbolized the triumph of a cult-deity like Mithra, the 'Sol invictus,' or like Isis, the 'orbis totius domina,' 'victrix,' 'invicta.' For these deities were cosmopolitan in their sway. They claimed to control the universe. The cults breathed into their adherents the sense of participating in the triumph of a sovereign power, not of a mere local and provincial sect, and this is not invalidated by the fact that such a belief was more pious than well-based. The early Christians also put this faith into their martial imagery, to express their absolute confidence in the Lord, who would enable them to master demons with their onset of persecutions and heresies, and to overcome the fear and power of death itself. The term 'Lord' included this; the terms 'king of kings' and 'imperator' brought it out.

(*b*) This supremacy of redeeming power, guaranteed by the deity, required from men a devotion and loyalty like that accorded by soldiers to their generals. It was a confidence which implied moral surrender and absolute dedication. The mystery-religions gave the individual a new sense of his value, but his personality was realized through service and self-sacrifice. This was the second note in the military conception which pervaded the cults. To a modern the methods and aims do not always seem particularly moral, and they are tinged by superstitious elements which eventually proved their weakness. But as a rule the relation of the individual to the deity was characterized by a thoroughgoing allegiance, which made stringent demands upon him—demands so stringent that their nearest analogy was felt to be the binding tie of the soldier to his military superiors. In the case of Mithraism, especially, this tie involved a moral earnestness. It was attained through ritual, but 'one of the conditions indispensable to the final victory of good was purity,'† and few contemporary cults, if any, pressed this requirement so stringently and sharply on their votaries. Here, also, the martial symbolism served Christianity (see above, p. 659). It was accentuated by the fact that the *sacramentum*, or oath of allegiance, was supposed to be taken to the commander in person, and was renewed by all the troops on the emperor's birthday and on the 1st of January every year. Eventually it was extended to civilians as an oath of allegiance, but technically and originally it denoted the army's loyalty to its leader; the *sacramentum* was for the campaign, and was renewed for a fresh term of active service under new leaders. Personal devotion to one's leader, in fact, became more and more characteristic of military service. The general or officer could inspire and exact obedience; the soldier followed and fought, without asking questions. A modern writer puts it thus: 'Alan was in the right trade as a soldier; this is the officer's part to make men continue to do things, they know not wherefore, and when, if the choice was offered, they would lie down where they were and be killed. And I daresay I would have been a good enough private; for in these last hours it never occurred to me that I had any choice but just to obey as long as I was able, and to die obeying' (R. L. Stevenson, *Kidnapped*, ch. xxii.). This absolute and unqualified devotion corresponds to the Roman ideal in the early centuries of the church (cf., *e.g.*, Seneca, *Ep. Mor.* xcv.: 'Quemadmodum primum militiae vinculum est religio et signorum amor, et deserendi nefas, tunc deinde facile cetera exiguntur mandanturque jusjurandum adactis, ita in his quos velis ad beatam vitam perducere, prima fundamenta jacienda sunt, et insinuanda virtus'), and it readily suggested the devotion of the Christian to his Lord and Leader, the unqualified demands made upon him for self-sacrifice and detachment from other ties, and at the same time the satisfaction of abandoning himself without reserve to One who would reward all service, who would take all responsibilities for His soldiers, and who was personally interested in them. The issue and strategy of the campaign were His; theirs only to follow where He led and do their best, unhampered by any suspicion or doubt* of their lives being thrown away. When Christianity was to be put as a religion of loyalty, in which the oath of duty ruled out any personal choice or preference, the army furnished a telling set of ideas and words.

(*c*) A third element was probably the cohesion and new sense of brotherhood provided by the cults at their best, though this was by no means so prominent as the thought of renunciation. The initiates were taught to regard each other as comrades, fighting side by side in the ranks of their faith. A common religious hope bound them together. This is known to have been a feature of Mithraism, in theory if not in practice, and we might have expected it to flourish in the church. But it was not so. Early Christianity on the whole preferred other expressions for the solidarity and cohesion of the faithful; it went to the family, to architecture, or to the physical organism, rather than to the army, when it needed metaphors for unity; 'brothers,' 'stones' in a building, or 'limbs' in the body were much more common than 'fellow-soldiers,' though the cults also used the first of these terms quite freely.

4. Attitude of the early church towards war.—We now turn to sketch the attitude of the primitive Christians to war and the army as realities instead of analogies (cf. A. Harnack, *Mission and Expansion of Early Christianity*^{2}, London, 1908, i. 308 f., ii. 52 f.). Down to the reign of Marcus Aurelius (A.D. 161–180) military service does not seem to have presented itself as a problem at all to the conscience of the Church; it is only during this emperor's reign that indications of a difficulty are to be noted for the first time. But, in order to appreciate the situation which was now rising, we must glance at the preceding period, when the political and social conditions of the life of Jesus were passing or had passed away, and when Christians were no longer in the environment of those to whom the words of Jesus had been spoken. A wider situation was emerging than that of Jews in a small subject province of the empire.

During the Apostolic Age the first non-Jew to enter the Christian Church was a Roman officer. The Ethiopian treasurer of queen Candace had indeed been baptized previously by Philip, but he disappears in the south, far from any fellowship of the Church. On the other hand, Cornelius (cf. *DAC* i. 259), the captain of the Italian regiment stationed at Cæsarea, comes before us definitely in St. Luke's history as a convert whose case led to a new development of the Church's policy. Nothing is said about his profession being inconsistent with the faith. It was the fact that he was uncircumcised, not that he was in the army, that raised suspicion and opposition in the conservative party of the Church at Jerusalem. This forms a fresh proof, if proof were needed, that, if the gospel did not start by encouraging war, it certainly did not prohibit from the outset any connexion with the army as absolutely inconsistent with the faith. No one dreamt of any problem here, any more than in the case of marriage or of slavery.

The first war undertaken by a man of God in the Bible was Abraham's campaign against Chedorlaomer for the liberation of Lot (Gn $14^{14f.}$), in which he proved himself effective, loyal, and generous, both as a general and as an ally; but this daring exploit is not selected by the author† of Hebrews (cf. 11^{8-19}) as an instance of his faith. He did not pass it over, however, from any sense of embarrassment, for he goes on to recount other military events in the story of Israel with unhesitating enthusiasm, from the downfall of Jericho to the Maccabæan struggle ($11^{30f.}$, 'men who by faith conquered kingdoms, administered justice, . . . escaped the edge of the sword, from weakness won to strength, proved valiant in warfare, and routed hosts of foreigners'). This frank recognition of the historical connexion between war and religion deserves to be contrasted with one of the most nauseous pieces of sophistry in Josephus, *i.e.* the appeal which he says that he made to his fellow-countrymen at the siege of Jerusalem to surrender to the Romans. He actually advised them not to fight, on the ground that Israel had never succeeded in war, and that all she needed to do was to trust in God, if her cause was just—which this renegade Jew, from the shelter of the legions, coolly denied. In the old days, said Josephus to his indignant countrymen, 'God carried on these campaigns for our fathers, because they dispensed with active service and arms and committed their case to Him to vindicate. . . . In short, our fathers won no success by war and never failed to succeed when they abjured war and committed all to God' (*BJ* v. 386, 390). Pacifist special pleading like this was untrue alike to history and to the OT. The author of Hebrews took a more sane view of Israel's record, and included martial exploits in his list of honour. These achievements [*] are ranked in the same class as the martyrdom of Abel and the passive glories of Isaac and Joseph. It is true that the writer 'seems with a tender instinct to avoid anything like stress on the exploits of warriors. Of the twelve persons having a share in the detailed expositions, David is the only warrior, and his character as a man of war is eclipsed by his greater attributes as a prophet, or declarer of the Divine counsels. It is yet more noteworthy that Joshua, who had so fair a fame, but who was only a warrior, is never named in the chapter, and we are simply told that "by faith the walls of Jericho fell down, after they had been compassed about seven times." But the series of four names, which are given without any specification of their title to appear in the list, are all names of distinguished warriors. They had all done great acts of faith and patriotism against the enemies of Israel—Gideon against the Midianites, Barak against the hosts of Syria, Samson against the Philistines, and Jephthah against the children of Ammon. Their title to appear in the list at all is in their acts of war.' [†] At the same time there is not the slightest hint that in the people of God who live under the spirit and hope of Jesus any successors of these martial saints were expected to arise. The promise of Dt 31^6 and Jos 1^5 is taken out of its very militant setting and transformed into a word of encouragement for those who needed to be freed from worldly anxiety about their possessions (He 13^5: 'I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee'). The situation of the community to which the writer addresses himself was too remote from public affairs to suggest any difficulties about such matters as the relation of Christians to the army or to any other function of the Empire. At this stage, indeed, no difficulties were felt at all.

---

* As far back as the 1st cent. B.C. the military reforms are said to have produced a concentration of the soldier's devotion to his general; he was detached more than ever from the ties of civilian life. 'The soldier learnt to owe allegiance to the man who led and fed him, his affections were centred on the only home which he knew—the camp' (E. H. Alton, in *A Companion to Latin Studies*^{2}, Cambridge, 1913, p. 463).

† J. Toutain, *Les Cultes païens dans l'empire romain*, ii. [1911] 131.

* 'Il y a, sous les armes, une grande dignité de vie. . . . Il faut être prêtre ou soldat pour ne pas connaître les angoisses du doute' (Anatole France, *Le Livre de mon ami*^{16}, Paris, 1896, p. 69).

† In Sirach's hymn of praise ($44^{19f.}$) the same omission is made, though the martial note is frequently struck farther on ($45^{23f.}$ $46^{1f.}$ $47^{4f.}$).

When we read of conflicts and wrangles in Ja $4^{1f.}$, the writer [‡] is referring to the private animosities of Christians; he is not laying down any philosophy of war and its causes in the outside world, but simply denouncing (cf. Ps 120^7, Mic 3^5) the passions of greed, envy, and selfishness which stir up feuds in small religious communities. His words have not the scope of the similar passage in Cicero's *de Fin.* i. 13 ('the passions are insatiable; they ruin not merely individuals but entire families, and often actually undermine the fabric of the State; from them come hatred, discord, quarrels, seditions, wars.'); they belong rather to the diatribê class of sayings about so-called 'peace' being really a state of bitter warfare, thanks to the strife and aggressiveness of men (cf. the quotations in P. Wendland, *Philo und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe*, Berlin, 1895, p. 39 f.). On the whole, we are justified in regarding Justin Martyr's allusions in *Apol.* i. 39 and *Dial.* 110 as no more than an expression of Christian antipathy to such aggressiveness in public and private.

The former passage runs: 'When the prophetic Spirit is prophesying what is to happen, it speaks thus: "*For out of Sion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem, and he shall judge among the nations and rebuke many people; and they shall beat their swords into ploughs and their spears into sickles, and nation shall not lift the sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any longer.*" You can be convinced that it happened thus. For men, to the number of twelve, did go forth from Jerusalem into the world, and, although they were untrained and unable to make speeches, by the power of God they made it known to every race of mankind that they were sent by Christ to teach all men the Word of God; and we, who formerly murdered each other, not only do not make war on our enemies but die confessing Christ gladly, so as not to lie or to deceive those who examine us—though we might indeed have practised the saying,

"My tongue has sworn, my mind has sworn no oath."

It would be absurd if the soldiers you muster and enlist were to put life itself, their parents, fatherland, and all their kindred second to their confession of loyalty to you, to people who cannot give them any incorruptible reward, while we, who long for incorruption, could not endure all things in order to gain our heart's desire from Him who is able to bestow it.'

Here we are in the middle of the 2nd cent., with an author who had mingled in the great world, a man who had grown up in the age when Trajan had extended the Roman Empire to its limits, and when Tacitus had regretfully compared his period with the older military opportunities which his predecessors enjoyed (*Ann.* IV. xxxii. 2 f.). Historians and politicians alike saw that a military imperialism was the policy of Rome. But Justin's holy empire is not Roman. The issue of martyrdom has been also raised sharply; there is to be no holy war even of a defensive character, and Christians are to die cheerfully rather than retaliate on their persecutors or abandon their convictions. [*] But there is no more than this, even when Christians are thus described in the *Dialogue* (110): 'We who were filled with war and mutual slaughter and every wickedness have each of us throughout all the world altered our weapons of war, turning our swords into ploughs and our spears into agricultural instruments, and cultivating piety, righteousness, human kindness, faith, and hope, which we have from the Father Himself through the Crucified.' The spirit of Jesus still controlled the church in which and for which words like these were written. The ideal was that of the Beatitudes, and Justin sought to have that ideal realized. Rome was at war with Parthia when he wrote, and fighting her way up into Scotland; the disaffection in Palestine was to blaze up in the revolution of A.D. 161; on almost every frontier the empire had to hold its own by force of arms. But Justin steadily set his eyes upon the peaceful advance of Christianity, unarmed and non-resisting. Even yet, however, the question of the Christian as citizen had not fully presented itself to the Christian consciousness. The political horizon had altered and broadened since the days of Jesus, but the Church was still unconscious that its very development must, in the providence of God, bring it face to face with the problem of its relation to the Empire in more than a merely antagonistic or aloof spirit.

---

[*] Clement of Alexandria has an admiring account (*Strom.* i. 24) of the strategy of Moses as a military commander. Yet Clement is no panegyrist of war. One of his sumptuary rules is that Christians must not wear seals which have a sword or a bow engraved upon them, since these emblems are unsuitable to lovers of peace (*Pæd.* iii. 11. 59).

[†] W. E. Gladstone, *Later Gleanings*, London, 1897, viii. 126 f.

[‡] In the epistle of James the brevity and uncertainty of life (4^{14}) are not compared, as in Wis 5^{12}, to the flight of an arrow ('as when an arrow is shot at a mark, the air is parted and closes up again at once, so that men know not where it passed through; so, as soon as we were born, we ceased to be, we had no sign of virtue to exhibit').

[*] Contrast a passage like Sir $35^{18f.}$ (39^{30}), where God is expected to intervene with a militant stroke.

A quarter of a century later Irenæus echoed Justin's faith and hope from far-off Gaul. The bishop agreed with the apologist. He quotes the Isaianic prediction (iv. 34. 4) to the same effect, as a direct prophecy of Jesus Christ, since these pacific results were produced by the preaching of the gospel, 'which made such a change that swords and spears were converted into ploughs, and altered into sickles for reaping grain—that is, into tools of peace—so that people are now ignorant how to fight, but when struck offer also the other cheek.' Seneca had longed for the time when only farmers' tools would be made out of iron (*Thyestes*, 930: 'Ferrum omne teneat ruris innocui labor'). Irenæus claims that Christians were already devoting themselves entirely to peaceful agriculture. He proceeds, however, to allegorize the Isaianic prediction, and this is his main interest; *e.g.* the plough signifies the creation or first sowing of humanity, and the sickle denotes the ingathering of the elect by Christ. There is nothing in his pages any more than in Justin's to betray the least consciousness that war as a function of the State seriously presented a problem to the conscience of the church. Neither of them speaks so clearly and sharply as their predecessor Tatian, the bitter, earnest Syrian apologist, about the middle of the 2nd century. Tatian loathes war. But his antipathy is not based on any positive statement of the Christian faith so much as on the associations of warfare with the pagan Greeks. The wars of the Greeks, from Homer downwards, and their connexion with the pantheon of Olympus, furnish him with shafts to wing against polytheism, and this is practically all that we find in the allusions scattered through the *Oratio ad Græcos*. Thus, he upbraids the Greeks for using poetry to describe the battles and amours of the gods (1), sneers at Athena as a homicide (Schwartz omits *ἡ πολεμοποιός* in 8), derides the delight of Ares in war, and tells his pagan readers bluntly, 'divination is an aid of your worldly lusts: you want to make war, and you take Apollo to advise you about slaughter: he who makes you fond of wealth is he who reveals to you the secret of money-making; he who stirs up strife and war predicts victory as well' (19). This is the standpoint of the martyr Carpus (*Acta Carpi*, etc., in *TU* IV. iv. [1888] 446), who tells the magistrate that the devil sets wars afoot and also pretends to reveal the future.

Twenty years later, *c.* A.D. 170, when the legions had conquered the Parthians and were now, under Marcus Aurelius, fighting among the Balkans, in the long campaign against the Marcomanni, the apologist Athenagoras happened to touch the subject of war. Athenagoras was a sensitive soul. He could not bear bloodshed, and he recoiled in horror from armed conflict, but his pages contain no direct repudiation of war or of the military profession. It is impossible to interpret his language as conveying a direct censure of military service. The relevant passage occurs in his *Legatio pro Christianis* (35), where he has occasion to refute the widespread calumny that Christians were cannibals. To eat human flesh, he declares sarcastically and indignantly, you must first of all kill a human being. Now, who can prove that against us? 'Who can accuse us of homicide or of cannibalism, when they are well aware that we cannot bear to see a man put to death even justly?' We decline to watch the gladiators in the theatre, he adds, since 'our opinion is that to watch a man being put to death is much the same thing as actually putting him to death.' This is repeated later by Lactantius (A.D. 260–340). It would have been indeed strange if the early Christians had not lifted up their testimony against war, as distinguished pagans had done before them, from the peripatetic philosopher Dikæarchus of Messana, who in the 4th cent. B.C. calculated that war had killed more people than all other causes of destruction put together (Cicero, *de Offic.* ii. 5), down to Plutarch in the beginning of the 2nd cent. A.D.

Lactantius is one of those who endeavoured to set public opinion in the Church against the war spirit, but he (*Div. Inst.* vi. 20) carries his protest forward into a philosophic repudiation of war as inconsistent with the character of the just man. He protests that the spectators of the games, at which condemned criminals had to fight, were exposing themselves to a corrupting influence. 'He who thinks it a pleasure to watch the slaying of a man, even though he has been justly condemned, pollutes his conscience as much as if he watched and shared a secret murder. And yet people call them "sports," at which human blood is shed.' He objects to all capital punishment, inflicted in the gladiatorial games, and concludes: 'When God forbids us to kill, he does not merely prohibit violent attacks (*latrocinari*), which even the public laws condemn, but warns us against doing what men consider lawful. Thus it will not be lawful for the just man to fight in the army, for his real warfare is justice itself; nor to accuse any one of a capital crime, for there is no difference between putting a man to death by the sword or by a word; what is forbidden is to put to death at all. Consequently, there ought to be no exception to this order of God; it ought always to be wrong to kill man, man whom God willed to be a sacred creature (*sacrosanctum animal*).' This humanitarian objection to war is a favourite thought of Lactantius. He protests against the deification and glorification of great generals (i. 18), as if the path to immortality lay through indiscriminate bloodshed and slaughter. The successful military conqueror, he sneers, is just a multiple murderer. He bewails and ridicules the insane delusion that immortal fame and glory are to be gained by making war on one's fellow-creatures. And in another passage (v. 17 f.) he avows that Horace's 'Integer vitæ' ode is the ideal and pattern of the just man, who would rather die than owe his life to the death of another human being. Cicero had pointed to the fact that Rome's high spirit and passion for martial fame were shown by the statues in the capital, which were generally in soldiers' uniform (*de Offic.* i. 18), but Lactantius was Ciceronian only in style. He shrank from war and force. The man who could write the *pro Murena* was no model for him in political philosophy. No early Christian is so Tolstoyan in his ethics as Lactantius. He refuses to allow any retaliation whatsoever, and he does so on philosophic grounds rather than upon definitely Christian principles; his proofs are drawn from his humanitarian considerations rather than, as in the case of his predecessor Tertullian, from appeals to the NT.

5. Christians in the army.—The extant literature of the Church down to the close of the 2nd cent. betrays no sense of military service as incompatible with Christianity; it is discouraged rather than disparaged, when it is noticed at all. Neither then nor afterwards did the Church ever decline to baptize a soldier, or to allow him to remain in the army. Tertullian, writing about A.D. 197, proudly claims that Christians are so numerous that they have swarmed into every department of Roman life, into the army as well as into civil employments (*Apol.* 37). How can you taunt us, he asks the Romans (*ib.* 42), with being parasites and useless members of the State, when we fight at your side, trade along with you, and prove every day of our lives that we are no recluses? The language is hyperbolical, especially when he warns the Romans that Christians, by their sheer force of numbers, could wreck the State if they were to withdraw or to rebel. But, although the rhetorical bent of Tertullian always made him care more for emphasis than for accuracy, the significant point is that a Christian apologist was able to make this claim about Christians in the army, conscious that the fact could not be denied by his opponents, and sensible of no objection to it on the part of the Church. As we shall see, Tertullian had other private views on the advisability of Christians serving in the army, and later on he developed these into a rigid repudiation of military service as a sphere for genuine Christians; but as an apologist he makes no scruple whatsoever about using the existence of Christian soldiers as an argument in favour of the Church's claim to consideration at the hands of the empire. Even later, in his vehement protest *ad Scapulam* (4), he witnesses to the presence of Christian soldiers in the legions, mentioning again, as he had already done in the *Apology* (5), the case of the 12th legion in A.D. 174, which, by its prayers, was believed to have rescued the army of Marcus Aurelius from a desperate plight.

> The Roman troops were in straits for lack of water; these Christian soldiers knelt down, and in response to their prayers God sent rain for themselves and their fellows, while thunder and lightning scared their enemies, the Germans and Sarmatians. So the story ran. The legion was called after its headquarters at Melitene in S. Armenia, in the neighbourhood of which it was recruited; it supplied more than one martyr subsequently, and, as both S. Armenia and Edessa, which also supplied soldiers to it, are known to have been penetrated by Christianity, at least as early as the beginning of the 3rd cent., there is no reason to doubt that Christians did serve in its ranks.

Whatever be the historical truth of the tale,* it was firmly believed by the early Church from the end of the 2nd cent. onwards (see Eus. *HE* v. 5), and for our purpose this is sufficient; the acceptance of the story proves not only that Christians must have been in the army but that their presence there did not raise the slightest sense of embarrassment or disapproval in the Church. The *Pax Romana*, within which Christianity itself was growing, would not have been maintained unless there had been plain, duty-loving men at arms, Christians as well as pagans, who were content to serve in the legions with the same kind of healthy spirit as that which Marius expressed (Sallust, *Jug.* lxxxiii.: 'Illa multo optuma rei publicae doctus sum—hostem ferire, praesidium agitare, nihil metuere nisi turpem famam, hiemem et aestatem juxta pati, humi requiescere, eodem tempore inopiam et laborem tolerare').

No reliable clue either to the relative number of Christians in the legions or to any deduction from that number as to the general feeling of the Church about military service can be found in the many allusions scattered throughout the Christian inscriptions. Soldiers are not often mentioned in the extant Christian epitaphs. But this is not so significant, perhaps, as it might seem to be. It must be recollected that soldiers fell in battle all over the empire, and usually on the far frontiers. Of all professions, the military was the least likely to furnish material for epitaphs in Christian cemeteries at Rome or in any of the leading cities of the empire. Death abroad, perhaps with no Christian comrade at hand, perhaps with no epitaph beyond the 'sed miles, sed pro patria' muttered in pride and regret, was a frequent end to the Christian soldier's career. This must be taken into account in estimating the comparatively infrequent notice of the military profession in the catacombs and elsewhere. Besides, the worldly calling of a Christian is by no means universally inserted in his epitaph. Many a soldier may have been buried without a word being set up to preserve his profession. And this omission need not have been due to a sense of disapprobation or shame. In the presence of God social distinctions were often regarded as beneath notice; a modesty or reverence in the survivors forbade such secular positions being perpetuated in the memory of men. The grave of a slave was not always marked by the addition of 'slave' to the name of the departed, and the same would apply to soldiers.

Another technical regulation must have restricted for a time the number of Christians in the legions. Although the ancient practice of admitting only Roman citizens to the army had been relaxed, no slaves were allowed into the ranks; the penalty of death was inflicted upon any who managed to make their way into the coveted service. Military service was still, in one sense, a privilege; there were obvious reasons, as Juvenal's sixteenth satire shows, why not only officers but men were glad to embrace the army as a profession, for it held out to some a life of adventure and economic independence and it opened up to others an avenue leading to considerable social and political influence. The exclusion of the slave,* except in dire cases of emergency, and even of the freedman, naturally ruled out a considerable percentage of Christians. This ought not to be forgotten in any attempt to estimate the possible numbers of Christians in the legions. The majority of Christians were by no means all Roman citizens; that is, they were not qualified to serve. Besides, the recruiting system did not sweep in even the non-slave classes of Christians automatically. The conscription only required a certain number, as a rule, in order to keep the legions up to their full strength; the legions were not large, in proportion to the population of the empire,† and any one whose name was drawn could (from Trajan's reign onwards) provide a substitute, if he chose and could afford it. The voluntary principle was in force under the empire ('plerumque voluntario milite numeri supplentur,' *Dig.* XLIX. xvi. 5). It is only in a modified sense that we can speak of conscription being the means of recruiting for the Roman army. Consequently, if a Christian was in the army, he was usually there of his own free choice—unless, of course, he had been in the service before he became a Christian at all. Even under the empire the Romans were not a nation under arms. Military service still retained its associations of privilege; no doubt, the possession of a certain income involved liability to serve in the legions, and this was irksome to a certain number, but they could sometimes gain exemption—indeed they were eventually allowed to buy exemption; and on the other hand there were many freedmen and others whose anxiety to join the army enabled the State to enrol them even although, on the strict principles of the older law, they were disqualified. Furthermore, the sons of legionaries tended to adopt their father's profession, and this was particularly true of the period after Septimius Severus, when regular marriage was permitted in the army.

This two-fold fact, that no Christian slaves could enter an army which was primarily reserved for Roman citizens (cf. *DAC* i. 93), and that even other Christians were not regularly pressed into the service, helps partly to explain why, during the first century and a half of the Church, the problem of war never became a serious matter for Christians. But, when their number increased, when converts were made in practically all ranks and vocations of life throughout the Roman world, the difficulties of military service began at last to be realized. Primarily, they met men who were in the army when they became Christians. A private or officer had then to consider his position, once the scruple had been voiced. Ought he to remain? Should he not withdraw from so compromising a profession? The rigorist party in the Church seems to have considered it his duty to leave the legions without any hesitation. But the conditions of military service prevented any Church-discipline from being enforced as easily as on civilians at home; not all the Christian soldiers were rigorists, and for various reasons it was difficult to agree with this cut-and-dry principle. Had not St. Paul told Christians to remain in the calling and position in which they were converted (1 Co 7^{20})? Did not that apply to soldiers as well as to slaves? The question might be asked sophistically, but it was also asked quite seriously. Clement of Alexandria, *e.g.*, assumes this position without the least hesitation. His argument is (*Protrept.* x. 100): 'Practise farming, we say, if you are a farmer, but know God as you till your fields; sail away, if you are fond of sea-faring, but call upon the heavenly Pilot; if the knowledge [*i.e.* of the gospel] has come upon you in the army, listen to the General who gives orders that are righteous.' The implication is that the soldier is to be pious where he is, like the sailor and the farmer. What makes this remark all the more significant is that Clement feels no need of arguing the point; he was stating the normal Christian principle. Besides, what were Christian soldiers to do if they left the ranks, perhaps after years of service, when they were more or less incapable of taking up a new profession? Were they to forgo the valuable retiring allowances which they would earn at their discharge? And, even if they wished to leave the army, was that feasible? The law recognized only two exits—disease which incapacitated a man from active duty, and an honourable discharge at the end of his sixteen, twenty, or twenty-five years of service. Desertion was the ugly and ominous name for the conduct of those who forsook the eagles upon any other plea.

---

* Probably, as A. C. McGiffert observes (on Eus. *HE* v. 5. 1), 'the whole legion prayed for deliverance to their respective deities, and thus quite naturally each party claimed the victory for its particular gods.' *E.g.* an Egyptian soothsayer was supposed to have brought about the miracle by his incantations to Hermes. Cf. Renan, *Marc-Aurèle*, Paris, 1882, p. 273 f.

* *Digesta*, XLIX. xvi. 11: 'ab omni militia servi prohibentur.' There is an interesting illustration of the strictness with which the authorities excluded slaves, in Trajan's letter to Pliny (*Ep.* x. 32).

† Hardly more than about 320,000 men, as a rule (cf. W. T. Arnold, *The Roman System of Provincial Administration*^{3}, Oxford, 1914, p. 113). Eventually barbarian serfs were allowed as *vicarii*, or substitutes.

It is premature to speak of a 'rigorist party' even in the days of Marcus Aurelius, when Christian soldiers were serving freely in the legions, but from the remonstrances and taunts of the pagan patriot Celsus (170–185), which we overhear in the pages of Origen (*c. Cels.* viii. 73 f.), it is fairly obvious that he had met Christians who were already holding back from military service. He gives no hint as to their reasons. All that concerns him is the fact, and he deplores it as a lover of the Empire. He cannot understand these conscientious objectors. Their attitude is all the worse because it professes to be religious. To him it is part and parcel of the pusillanimity which characterizes these skulking, contemptible, superstitious sectarians. Celsus was an earnest Epicurean, as Lucretius had been before him, but he is as devoted to the Empire as the poet had been indifferent, and he endeavours to overcome the apathy of Christians. He quotes from Homer's *Iliad* (ii. 205) to base a sound principle of government and order; there must be one strong royal hand. Then he turns to Christians and tells them, 'if everybody were to do as you do [*i.e.* abstain from military service and loyal, patriotic self-sacrifice], there would be nothing to prevent the king from being left quite alone and forlorn, and the affairs of this earth would fall into the hands of the wildest and most lawless barbarians.' At the same time this antipathy to the army was by no means universal among Christians, for, as we learn from the stories of the 12th legion (see above, p. 663) and of the *Acta Pauli*, which probably were put into shape during the reign of Marcus Aurelius, soldiers belonging to the Church not only served in the legions but were occasionally persecuted.

6. The problem first raised.—The next half-century, however, *i.e.* from the end of the 2nd cent. to the middle of the 3rd, was to witness a slight change, or rather an oscillation of feeling, and the first to voice it was the very Tertullian who had formerly appealed to the army as proving the existence and spread of Christianity within the Empire. Both he and Origen after him are the protagonists of the extreme section in the Church which now frankly disavowed the military profession. Froude declares that he and Hurrell were told by their oldest brother that they might begin to think for themselves, if they saw Newman and Keble disagreeing. Did the divergence of opinion between contemporary leaders like Tertullian and Clement set the rank and file thinking for themselves on the question of war? Perhaps it did. At any rate, scattered cases occur of Christians either refusing to join the army or throwing down their arms for conscientious reasons. Whether these incidents were due to the literary propaganda of the two pacifist writers, and if so how far, we cannot tell; in one case, at least, the recalcitrant recruit declares that no one had instigated him.[*] The point is that a certain feeling of dislike to the army was in the air, among some circles of Christians, and it is important to notice the reasons put forward by this serious fraction of the early Church.

Lord Acton said that he would never write in the *Rambler* upon unworthy conciliation or virulent controversy. Tertullian in his day wrote of both, especially of what he considered the former. He came to regard all the State service, military and civil, as an unworthy combination of faith and idolatry; public work was too equivocal; neither an official nor an officer could keep his position without compromising his Christian religion, and Tertullian had no patience with any one, clerical or lay, who asserted that these professions were compatible with a true faith. It is significant that several of the 'pacifist' writers, from Tatian onwards, were or became eccentric and heretical. So it was in Tertullian's case. After writing his *Apology*, he had gradually identified himself with an extreme position on various points, which finally drew him over to sympathy with the Montanists. Theologically, the change did not make him much less orthodox; in fact, his great contributions to the doctrines of Christology and the Trinity, which date from this later period, are unspoiled by Montanist aberrations. It was not so, however, in the field of ethics. His opposition to what he considered the laxity of the Catholic Church made him an ultra-puritan, and the idea of a Christian serving in the army now became anathema to him.

He gave sweeping and brilliant expression to this view in two tracts, *de Corona*[†] and *de Idololatria*. They are specimens of his special pleading at its best—or at its worst. A noble spirit of devotion to Christ is blended with a fanatically anti-social bias, and a number of the arguments are not only scornful but quite fantastic. The *de Corona* was written after news had reached Carthage of an incident involving a Christian soldier. When Septimius Severus died at York in 211, during his campaign in Britain, the emperors Caracalla and Geta signalized the new reign by presenting the troops at Lambesa in N. Africa with a largesse, or *donativum*. Each legionary received this, coming forward for the money with the usual crown of laurel on his head, a ceremonial badge of respect for the State deities of the army and the empire. One soldier, however, violated the etiquette of the proceedings. He carried the crown in his hand, and was promptly arrested for this breach of discipline. He explained that as a Christian he could not wear a crown, and, abjuring military service, was imprisoned before being executed. Apparently this was quite an exceptional case. His action was blamed as rash and idle by his fellow-Christians, within and without the army. But

---

[*] Maximilianus (see below, p. 669). When the proconsul asks, 'Quis tibi hoc persuasit?' he replies, 'Animus meus, et is qui me vocavit.'

[†] Gibbon (*Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. xv.) holds that 'by the mention of the *emperors* (Severus and Caracalla) it is evident that Tertullian composed his treatise de Coronâ long before he was engaged in the errors of the Montanists.' Recent research has proved that this is not evident; the earlier date, prior to A.D. 198, is no longer tenable. At the same time, if the *de Pallio* (ch. 5) is an early composition, Tertullian even when he wrote his *Apology* must have had some private views about military service which did not agree with the normal church view of which he was at that time, for apologetic reasons, the trenchant spokesman. There is a full discussion of his attitude to war in C. Guignebert, *Tertullien*, Paris, 1901, p. 189 ff.

Tertullian, on hearing of it, heartily approved. Here is a true *miles gloriosus*,* he cried—a soldier whose glory is in God! Here is a man who will not sell his Lord for money! To the objection that there was nothing in the Bible to prohibit a Christian from wearing a chaplet of flowers, Tertullian can only answer sophistically that this prohibition is one of the excellent customs which have grown up in the Church, excellent because flowers are meant to be admired or smelt or carried in the hand but not worn on the head, which would be unnatural! You never read of bishops or saints being crowned with flowers! Only pagans wear such crowns, pagan deities like Isis, and pagans who seek thus to honour their idols. The laurel is sacred to Bacchus and Apollo. Besides, Christ is the head of the man (1 Co $11^{3f.}$), and He was only crowned with thorns! The head should be kept sacred to Him, who will crown it one day with the crown of life eternal (15). Such is the kind of pleas which, in all seriousness, Tertullian advances in defence of this soldier's refusal to wear a laurel crown. But he goes further. Not only is such a crown inconsistent with Christianity, for a Christian must not touch the symbols of idolatry, but the military profession (11) itself is tabued, because (i.) the *sacramentum*, or oath of loyalty, which a Christian takes to his Lord, supersedes and invalidates any other *sacramentum*; (ii.) when Jesus said, 'He who uses the sword shall perish by the sword' (Mt 26^{52}), He made it unlawful for a disciple to use the sword at all; (iii.) if a Christian cannot go to law (1 Co 6^{7}), much less can he, as a son of peace, go to battle; (iv.) if he is not allowed to avenge injuries done to himself (Ro 12^{19}), he cannot consistently take part in imprisoning or torturing or punishing his fellow-creatures; (v.) the military calling interferes with the regular practice of his religion—*e.g.* he may have to do sentry-duty on the Lord's Day,† or to stand sentry over pagan temples. The mixture of real and fantastic objections becomes bewildering at this point. Tertullian, *e.g.*, asks how a soldier can hold a spear, when Christ's side was pierced by a spear, or allow himself to be raised from sleep by a trumpet, when he hopes to be raised from death by the last trumpet! But there are deeper notes in the appeal for severing all connexion with so compromising a place as the camp. He admits that the case of men converted when they are already in the army is a special case, like that of the soldiers who came to John the Baptist or of the centurions in the gospels and Acts of the Apostles; still, once soldiers have accepted the faith, 'a man must either quit the service, as many have done, or absolutely refuse to do anything contrary to God (and yet neither course is permissible, according to military law), or finally he must suffer death for his God, as a civilian Christian has also to do ‡ in terms of his loyalty. Military service will not hold out to him any prospect of impunity in the matter of sin, or immunity from martyrdom. A Christian is never anything but a Christian, no matter where he is. The gospel is one and Jesus is the same Jesus, who will deny every one who denies God and confess every one who confesses Him, who will save the life that has been lost for His sake and on the other hand destroy the life which has been valued over against His name. In His eyes the civilian (*paganus*) believer is just as much a soldier [*i.e.* of Christ] as the pagan [*paganus*—a play on the double meaning of the term] soldier is no soldier [*i.e.* of Christ]. There can be no plea of necessity, in the region of faith; those for whom the one thing needful is to avoid sin have no plea of necessity for sinning.' And so on. It is a radical assertion that Christians have no right to enter the army, and that Christians within the army must risk death itself in order to maintain their faith against the most trivial association with pagan religion.§ In fact, Tertullian shuts out the profession of arms as well as philosophy from the Christian religion. The vexed question of military service primarily turns, for him, upon the polytheistic and idolatrous practices which were bound up, more or less directly, with the entire fabric of Roman civilization. They met the Christian in almost every branch of trade as well as in a profession like education and in the pleasures and intercourse of social life; as we might expect, therefore, Tertullian takes up this problem again in the *de Idololatria*, where he handles it with an equally paradoxical and uncompromising vigour, refuses to hear of any bowing in the house of Rimmon, reiterates that Christianity is a holy war against idolatry, in which the catechumen at baptism takes the *sacramentum*, or oath of fealty, to his divine *Imperator*, and (19) rules out the army even more drastically than in the *de Corona*. 'The question is, whether a believer can take to military service, and whether one can be admitted into the Christian faith who belongs to the army either as a private * or as a menial servant who is not obliged to take part in sacrifices or capital punishment. The divine oath of loyalty (*sacramentum*) and the human have not a thing in common, there is no affinity between the standard of Christ and the standard of the devil, between the camp of light and the camp of darkness; one soul cannot serve two masters, God and Cæsar. "Moses carried a rod [like the centurion's *vitis* or wand]? Aaron wore a clasp [like the soldiers on their shoes]? John was belted with a leather girdle? Joshua the son of Nun led an army? The people [of God] made war?" To talk thus is to trifle! How can people make war, how can they even do military duty in times of peace, when God has deprived them of their swords? For, although soldiers did come to John and receive instructions on their duty, though a centurion did have faith (Mt 8^{10}),† the Lord subsequently disbanded every soldier when He disarmed Peter (Jn 18^{11}).'

In this last sentence Tertullian argues that John the Baptist's regulations were not final. John the Baptist met soldiers at the opening of his mission, and he died by the hand of a soldier—a *σπεκουλάτωρ*, as Mark notes (Mk 6^{27}), *i.e.* a *gendarme*, one of the non-commissioned officers called by that name, who were sometimes employed as executioners (cf. Seneca, *de Ira*, i. 16) as well as in the capacity of couriers. Their domineering and tyrannical conduct to provincials, when they were employed on police-duty, was the fault that John had rebuked (cf. W. M. Ramsay, *Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the NT*, London, 1915, p. 316 f.). But, according to Tertullian, John's mere prohibition of this was not the last word; Jesus had excluded a Christian even from being a just *σπεκουλάτωρ*. This is a fairer view than the disparagement or even the sweeping rejection of John which many other extremists within and without the Church advocated — *e.g.* the Manichæans of a later day ('Manichaei Johannem aperte blasphemare consuerunt,' Aug. *c. Faustum*, xxii. 74). But it was far from general in the Church. Tertullian's contemporary, Clement of Alexandria (*Pæd.* iii. 12. 91), denied that it was John, and only John, who spoke: 'The Lord gives by John to soldiers the command, "Be content with your pay."' ‡ The belief in inspiration must have told seriously against any exegesis which, for however high an end, depreciated even a word like that of Lk 3^{14}.

The Isaianic prediction, for which there are striking parallels in Plutarch's *Vita Numæ* (20) and in the discussion of the relative merits of agriculture and the army by Maximus of Tyre (*Diss.* xiii. f.), lent itself so naturally to allegorizing that we are not surprised to find it elaborated by Origen (*c. Cels.* v. 33), in the same sense as Irenæus, a century earlier. He does insert *λογικάς* before *μαχαίρας* and *ὑβριστικάς* afterwards, as though he allegorized the weapons of war into rhetorical devices and sophistical harangues. But the context indicates that the literal sense of the prediction was not forgotten by him. Later on, in vii. 26, he makes his point clearer. There is this difference, he says, between the Mosaic polity and the Christian, that the Jews could not maintain the former if they accepted the gospel; 'for Christians could not follow the Mosaic law in destroying their enemies or those who were condemned to be burned or stoned for having transgressed the law; the very Jews are unable, much as they desire to do so, to carry out the punishments ordered and enjoined by the law.' Origen sees a providential purpose in the removal of the Jewish state; it removes from the Jews the need and opportunity, which had been essential to them in

---

* Cyprian borrowed this epithet and applied it to the martyrs (*Ep.* xlvi. 2: 'Magis militibus gloriosis et bonis congruit intra domestica castra consistere').

† This had been an old difficulty for the Jews, under the Hasmonæans (cf. 1 Mac 2^{29-41}), for, as nothing could be carried on the Sabbath, to carry arms was held by some to violate the strict law of the Sabbath. At the request of Hyrcanus, Dolabella and Mark Antony exempted Asiatic Jews on this very ground (Jos. *Ant.* xiv. 223–230) in 49–42 B.C. Cf. *JE* ii. 123.

‡ 'Quod aeque fides pagana condixit'—*paganus* being equivalent to non-military or civilian. In the Christian vocabulary of the 4th cent. *paganus* thus came to mean all who did not belong to the real 'army,' *i.e.* to the Church.

§ His language (see above, p. 659) seems to imply that the votaries of Mithra in the Roman army were exempted from wearing crowns, and that the similar religious scruple of Christians ought to be recognized—or at least that Christians should maintain it.

* The *militia caligata* really included not only privates but soldiers up to the rank of centurions.

† The first time that *πίστις* is mentioned in Mt.

‡ There is a striking parallel in the instructions given by Josephus to his armed force of Galilæans, to avoid quarrelsomeness and to be satisfied with their rations (*συνεβούλευον πρὸς μηδένα μήτε πολεμεῖν μήθ' ἁρπαγῇ μολύνειν τὰς χεῖρας, ἀλλὰ σκηνοῦν κατὰ τὸ πεδίον ἀρκουμένους τοῖς ἑαυτῶν ἐφοδίοις* [*Vita*, 244]).

OT ages, of maintaining their national existence by force of arms. 'To have deprived them of the right of making war on their enemies and of fighting for their country and of executing or in some way punishing adulterers, murderers, or persons guilty of similar crimes, would have been to expose them to sudden and utter destruction, whenever their enemies attacked them ; for in that case their very law would have crippled them and prevented them from resisting their enemies.' Origen admits that war is vital to nationality, and so he rejoices that nationality no longer exists for the Jews. He cannot of course imagine that it could exist for Christians either.* Tertullian had no positive notion of the state in his Christian ethic. Origen betrays a slight consciousness of this problem, but as yet, while the political conditions had begun to alter the focus assumed in the NT, they had not developed sufficiently to enable any satisfactory view to be propounded. Christians do not spread the gospel by force of arms, and they do not form a nation in the ancient sense of the term. This is all that Origen can say. But the further question arises, Have Christians, as citizens of the Roman empire, any duty of loyalty which obliges them to fight in the legions on behalf of their empire? Are they to enlist voluntarily or to obey the orders of the recruiting-sergeant, when their names are called? It is clear that some hesitation had been felt on this point. As we have already seen, Celsus had urged Christians to rally to the help of the emperor, for the maintenance of justice and order against the barbarians, and in viii. 73 f. Origen meets this tacit criticism of political indifference among members of the Church.

We Christians, he argues, help the State by being good men, by putting on the panoply of God (Eph 6^{11}), and also by offering prayers for kings and authorities, as the apostle enjoined (1 Ti 2^{1-2}).† 'The more pious any one is, the more serviceable he is in support of those who reign, more serviceable than soldiers who sally forth to fight and slay as many of the enemy as they can. Besides, when the opponents of the Faith bid us do battle for the common weal and slay men, our answer is this: "Among yourselves the priests at certain shrines and the attendants of your gods keep their hands free from bloodshed for the sake of the sacrifices, so that they may have unstained and pure hands to offer the appointed sacrifices to those whom you consider gods. Even when war comes, you do not make the priests serve in the ranks. Well, if that is a reasonable and laudable custom, how much more so, that while the rest of men are fighting, these persons [*i.e.* Christians] should serve as priests and ministers of God, keeping their hands pure and wrestling in prayer to God for those who are fighting in a righteous cause and for a righteous king, that all opposition to righteous agents may be crushed."‡ Also, as we vanquish by our prayers all the demons who stir up war and the violation of oaths and disturbances of the peace, we thus prove of more help to kings than those who take up arms. Besides, we do take part in public affairs, for from a righteous life we offer up prayers, conjoined with ascetic discipline and meditations which instruct us to scorn delights instead of being carried away by them. We fight for the king better than any one else. We do not take up arms along with him, even though he presses us, but we take arms on his behalf, raising a special regiment of religion (*ἴδιον στρατόπεδον εὐσεβείας*) by means of our supplications to God. If Celsus wants us to fight on behalf of our country as well, let him know that we do so fight. And our fighting is not for the purpose of being noticed by men or of winning vain glory, for our prayers are in secret, in the inner life, ascending as from priests on behalf of our fellow-citizens. Besides, Christians render more help to their countries than other men, for they train citizens and teach piety towards the supreme Deity.' This course of reasoning would naturally have seemed evasive to Celsus, and he would have been still more disappointed with the plea (viii. 68 f.) that the wild barbarians would not bring Roman civilization to ruin, because, if they were converted to Christianity, they would make excellent citizens, law-abiding and humane. Origen recalls the prediction of Zeph 3^{7-13}, but he is not very certain about its meaning, though he actually brings it forward in all seriousness against the remark of Celsus that any wholesome agreement between the barbarians and the Romans was in the last degree unlikely.

Origen, in fact, falls back upon fatalism. He propounds a holy experiment, which had no relation to the moral order or to the actual situation of the empire. He declares that, if the Romans would all accept Christianity, their prayers would enable them to overcome their foes—or rather, he adds, they would not require to fight at all, since the divine power which promised to save five cities for the sake of fifty just men would be their safeguard. One can imagine how chilling and unreal these airy excuses would sound to Roman patriots who were celebrating with a glow of enthusiasm in A.D. 248 the thousandth anniversary of the founding of Rome.* Besides, to suggest disarmament as the only alternative to militarism was worse than folly to any serious citizen of the Empire in the 3rd cent.; it suggested an unhealthy conscience. But the plea of Celsus was as much beside the point as Origen's answer. Neither dealt with realities. When Celsus asked Christians to serve in the army, he did not realize that the religious rites associated with military and civil service were a genuine stumbling-block to Christians. He forgot, as Renan (*Marc-Aurèle*, p. 370 f.) says, that in upholding the established religion he was asking Christians to agree to absurdities greater than those which he attacked in Christians themselves. Celsus had an Epicurean's healthy scorn for superstition and a Roman's inability to see how any religion could be real or reasonable apart from nationality. Both of these traits prevented him from doing justice to Christianity. Origen's main position is sound, but then he weakens it by letting himself be drawn off into doctrinaire opinions and speculations about politics. It is true that in one passage he incidentally (*c. Cels.* iv. 82, *Philocalia*, xx. 9) appears again to admit that war in certain circumstances might be justified for non-Christians. He has been speaking of bees, which obey a sovereign and engage in wars. 'Perhaps,' he adds, 'the so-called wars of the bees suggest how just and regular wars (if such must be—*εἴ ποτε δέοι*) should be prosecuted by men.' But this is an *obiter dictum*, although, as we have just seen, he contemplates Christians praying for a righteous cause and army.

So far as the straight issue went, Origen answers Celsus on this point with a blunt 'Non possumus'; he is not so defiant as Tertullian, but he is equally decided. The reasons added to his decision are less convincing; they remind us too vividly of the ingenuous philosophy of war which his fellow-Alexandrian had propounded two centuries earlier. Philo's simple scheme of things (*de Præm. et Pœn.* 15–16) divides the enemies of man into two classes, animals and human beings. Wild beasts are our natural enemies (*τοὺς φύσει πολεμίους*); war against them has no ending, for their nature is alien to ours. The only prospect which Philo sees of any improvement in man's relations to the beasts—and it is a dim prospect—lies in the taming of the human passions; 'is it not silly to imagine that we can avoid injury from wild beasts external to us, when all the while we are training the wild beasts within to awful savagery? Hence, we must not give up hope that, once our wild passions of the soul are subdued, animals also will be broken in.'

---

* When Ulfilas came to translate the OT for the warlike Goths in the latter half of the 4th cent., he is said by Philostorgius (*HE* ii. 5) to have left out the books of the Kings, 'since they are merely a story of military deeds, and since the Gothic tribes, who were particularly fond of fighting, required to have their militant passions checked rather than spurred on to warlike exploits.'

† Including, as we learn from Arnobius (*adv. Gent.* iv. 36), prayers for the army.

‡ If a Roman had taken this seriously, he might have allowed the exemption of the Christian clergy, for the same reason as not only pagan priests but rhetoricians, philosophers, and physicians were not obliged to serve against their will. The notion of all Christians being priests would not have been intelligible to him.

* For this dating of Origen's treatise see K. J. Neumann, *Der römische Staat und die allgemeine Kirche bis auf Diocletian*, Leipzig, 1890, pp. 265–273.

In this way Philo hopes further that the wars of man against man will be ended; once the wild beasts are overcome by human gentleness and self-command, men will feel ashamed to pursue wars of aggression which make them lower than the brutes.* 'It will seem most disgraceful if venomous, carnivorous, unsociable, and ferocious animals have become on good terms with man, and if man himself, who is naturally gentle, and endowed with a sociable and harmonious disposition, is truculent and bent on destroying his fellow-creatures.' For an idealist like Philo to write in such terms was harmless, if it was useless. His dream compromised nobody. But, when Origen talked about the possibility of the barbarians becoming Christians, at a time when Rome was face to face with the wild Goths on the northern frontiers, he forgot that there is a time and a season for everything, even for dreaming dreams. To suggest, as he did, that the barbarians were not really so dangerous as Celsus had made out was to run the risk of giving Roman citizens a false and poor impression of Christian sagacity, to say nothing of Christian loyalty. Tertullian's outburst was less likely to do harm; it was meant for Christians. But Origen's utterances would reach the outside public more readily than his predecessor's.

The second of the great African fathers admired Tertullian and on this point agreed with him. Cyprian, in A.D. 246, invites his friend and fellow-rhetorician Donatus (*Ep.* i. 'ad Donatum,' 6)† to look at the state of the world: 'roads rendered impassable by brigands, seas infested with pirates, wars waged on every side with the bloody horror of camps, the world drenched with internecine bloodshed (*mutuo sanguine*), and murder—a crime, when committed by an individual—a virtue when committed wholesale. Impunity is claimed for crimes not because they are free from guilt but because of the large scale of their cruelty.' There is a tinge of sentimental melancholy and weariness of the world in these words penned amid the charming ease and quiet of his gardens at Carthage. But Cyprian's position amounts to a discouragement of war in general. He has no room for it in his scheme of things. Half a century later the trenchant African objection to war was repeated by Arnobius of Sicca (i. 6), from whom Lactantius may have learned his pacifism as well as his rhetoric. Arnobius claims, however, that wars have abated in the Empire since the coming of Christ, though he insists that Christians 'would rather shed their own blood than stain their hands and conscience with the blood of other people.' One of the points which he makes later (vii. 12) is the absurd situation created by two nations at war sacrificing to the same gods for victory. What are the poor gods to do? To side with each, time about, or with neither? But he uses this illustration to bring out the futility of imagining that the divine favour can be influenced by human offerings, not to emphasize the incongruities of war and religion. Neither Cyprian nor Arnobius nor even Lactantius and Athanasius,‡ however, dinted Christian opinion like Tertullian and Origen.

7. The pressure of the problem.—Yet the dint was neither deep nor permanent. Fortunately for the early Church, the views of Tertullian, Origen, and Cyprian did not alter the situation. Tertullian and Origen, like Tatian, happened to be suspected by the orthodox on other grounds. Cyprian's influence might have been expected to exercise far more influence; apparently it did not. Of the four great African fathers, only the last, Augustine, recognized the sad, stern necessity of war as a sphere for Christian civic loyalty; Tertullian, Cyprian, and Lactantius take the opposite position. Yet Christians still continued to serve in the army. Had the extremists succeeded in their policy of tabuing military service, it is very doubtful if the victory of Christianity in the next century would have been possible; had the Church committed herself to an open line of disloyalty, by forbidding her members to join or to remain in the legions, the perils of the new religion would have been seriously increased, and Constantine would hardly have felt justified in raising it to the position of the State-religion. One of the factors of the Church's triumph in the 4th cent. was that the Christians had made themselves necessary to the well-being of the Empire and proved themselves in deed as well as in word loyal citizens. A saving instinct kept the Church from yielding to the Gnostic and Manichæan tendency which was implicit in the fanatical anti-civic repudiation of force voiced by Tertullian and Origen. By the end of the 3rd cent. Christian soldiers were so considerable an element that one of the aims of Diocletian, in his ruthless policy, was to purge the army of their presence. The fact speaks for itself.

To it we may add, more for the sake of interest than of importance, that in the first half of the third cent. a Christian actually wrote on military tactics. (An incidental parallel occurs in the advice of *Ep. Aristeas*, pp. 193 f., 281, where a Jew gives Ptolemy Philadelphus some good counsel on military matters.) This was Sextus Julius Africanus, the versatile and indefatigable friend of Origen, who not only travelled widely in the East and studied science, but composed pages on subjects as diverse as chronology and agriculture. The recent discovery (cf. Grenfell and Hunt, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, iii. 36 f.) of a papyrus containing the end of the 18th book of his Κεστοί ἢ παράδοξα removes any reason for scepticism as to his authorship of the latter work. The Κεστοί were, like the *Stromata* of Clement, a miscellany or encyclopædia, but of a more secular character; they discussed all manner of topics from charms and medicines to strategy, from literary criticism to methods of warfare. Africanus seems to have been on intimate terms with the emperor, Alexander Severus; he arranged a library for him at the Pantheon, and his interests, theoretical as well as practical, were by no means confined to ecclesiastical affairs. He stood in the front rank of contemporary culture, and was a man of affairs as well as a scholar. Whether or not he had served in the army, it is significant that he could transcribe from his note-books information about matters of military science such as poisoning wells and provisions or the best methods of attack.

But the 3rd cent. witnessed the rise of difficulties for Christian soldiers on a serious scale, which produced a certain reaction against the service. Some part of the repugnance obviously felt by Christians for military service may have been due to the fact that Mithraism was one of the favourite religions among the troops. From Memphis to the south of Scotland, from Armenia and the Balkans to Spain, the presence of the legions has left more or less distinct traces of this cult; from the reign of Commodus onwards, it was patronized by various emperors as the *fautor imperii sui*; sometimes, as under the reactionary policy of Julian, it was favoured actually as a counter-weight to

---

* Seneca (*Ep. Mor.* xcv.) also holds up animals in order to shame men out of their pugnacity and militarism. 'We forbid homicide and individual slaughter. What of wars and the "glorious" crime of slaying nations? . . . Man, the mildest of beings, is not ashamed of rejoicing in a fellow-man's blood, or of waging wars and handing them on to posterity to wage, when even dumb, wild beasts are at peace among themselves. . . . Man, a sacred thing to man, is now killed in sport and jest.' The entire passage agrees with the pleas of Lactantius (see above, p. 662).

† He addresses Donatus in military terms: 'Tu tantum quem iam spiritalibus castris militia coelestis signavit' (15).

‡ In the *de Incarn. Verbi Dei* (50–53) he attributes war to the machinations of demons, and, as these are being routed by 'the faith of Christ and the sign of the Cross,' the prediction of Is 2^4 is being visibly fulfilled. Formerly the entire life of barbarians 'used to be spent under arms; their staff was a sword, and it was their stay in all emergencies . . . but when they hear the teaching of Christ, they at once turn from war to agriculture . . . and, instead of fighting among themselves, take arms against the devil and evil spirits, subduing them by self-control and by the soul's virtue.' It was in fear of war turning against themselves that the demons incited men to war against men!

Christianity, and all this may have sharpened the distaste of the Church for a branch of the public service which was so closely identified with the rival and belligerent cult of Mithra. But the reasons for the Christian hesitation lay deeper. Some Christians felt (see above, p. 662) that the sixth commandment forbade the taking of human life at all, and that the soldier's trade was no better than murder. This had never been the aim of the OT command, of course, and a man like Athanasius (*Ep.* xlviii.) frankly recognized the difference between murder as prohibited by the sixth commandment and the duty of the soldier to kill his enemies. Still, under a Christian regime which discouraged and had to discourage murder, it was inevitable that such a conclusion should occasionally be drawn. Far more serious was the difficulty raised by the compromising association of the Roman army with polytheism and the State-religion. These offered a real obstacle to some early Christians, and it was on this score that the issue was sharply raised. The allegiance of the army was bound up with a statutory recognition of the Emperor as the semi-divine head of the State; the military standards, decorated with gold and silver images of gods and emperors, were set up periodically as *sacra* to be venerated; and altars were erected, from the reign of Gallienus onwards, to the genius of the Emperor and subsequently to the genius of the Roman people. Camp religion, said Tertullian, is nothing but a veneration of the standards; the whole camp swears by them, and sets them up above all other gods (*Apol.* 16).* The 'genii of the legion,' the 'genii of the cohort,' and so forth, made up a military religion of their own, alongside of the Capitoline deities. On the other hand, all this 'religious' side of the army could be, and evidently was, regarded by many Christians as a purely formal and official business; it was an unpleasant and distasteful item in the organization, but it could be judged from the point of view of patriotism, and many who were not Christians at all showed that they did not take it seriously. Church-parades were even then what they are often now. Besides, the offering up of the prescribed sacrifices was the duty of the officers; the rank and file had no direct personal share in the ceremony, although they tacitly assented by their presence on parade. And Christian officers cannot have been very numerous, at any rate in the 2nd century. At the same time, the army obviously was a place of special danger to the Christian who wished to be perfectly consistent. The situation was undoubtedly equivocal. The pagan Cæcilius, in the dialogue of Minucius Felix (6), proudly claims that the Roman service had a distinctly religious accompaniment: 'Exercent in armis virtutem religiosam . . . cultu religionis armati.' Trouble was almost inevitable before long for members of the Church who had to face the religious rites of the camp in the light of what some Christian authorities were saying about idolatry. For example, a Christian soldier was put to death at Cæsarea under Gallienus (Eus. *HE* vii. 15) for refusing to offer the usual sacrifice to the emperors, which was required of all officers. Marinus had been elected to the position of centurion, but his election was challenged by a rival, who objected that Marinus could not take the honour as he was a Christian and therefore unable to perform the due sacrifice. On examination this was found to be correct, and the Christian forfeited his life. The local bishop, Theoteknus, came to him during the three hours given him for reconsidering his position, and, taking him into the church, asked him to choose between the sword at his side and the gospels which the bishop put before him. The soldier took the gospels. Once again, a case of voluntary death on the part of two Christian soldiers is chronicled in the famous inscription of Pope Damasus on the Appian Road (cf. H. Achelis, in *TU* XI. ii. [1894] 43 f., where their later Acta are discussed), which commemorates the martyrdom of Nereus and Achilleus; they were buried in the cemetery of Domitilla, the niece of Domitian. The exact date of their death is uncertain. But they certainly felt that their Christian faith was incompatible with their profession, and acted upon their feeling ('conversi fugiunt ducis impia castra, reliquunt clypeos, faleras, telaque cruenta, confessi gaudent Christi portare triumphos'). In like manner, there were isolated cases of men refusing to take part in the pagan religious rites which the army practised. One of these is known to have taken place at Tangiers, where a centurion called Marcellus, during some ceremony of sacrifice in honour of the Emperor's birthday, suddenly threw off his military belt and declared that he was a soldier of Jesus Christ the eternal King. 'From this time,' he shouted, 'I cease to be a soldier of your emperors, and as for worshipping your gods of wood and stone, I scorn to do it; they are deaf and dumb idols.' For this breach of discipline he was arrested and beheaded (cf. T. Ruinart, *Acta Primorum Martyrum*, Amsterdam, 1713, p. 343 f.). Marcellus suffered under Maximian and so did the Christian soldiers of the Thebaic legion (*i.e.* from Thebais, in Upper Egypt), which is said to have been twice decimated for refusing to participate in some pagan rite; both officers and men died for thus incurring the charge of insubordination.

Again, what were Christians in the army to do when they were ordered to take part in the arrest and even in the execution of Christian civilians during a persecution? This task often fell to soldiers. Indeed, it was one of their temptations to harshness and extortion (see above, p. 653). Christians who desired to avoid persecution could bribe soldiers, as Tertullian implies (*de Fuga*, 12: 'Tu autem pro eo pacisceris cum delatore vel milite . . . quem coram toto mundo Christus emit. . . . Quid enim dicit ille concussor? Da mihi pecuniam'). A Christian soldier would not be likely to take bribes from a cowardly Christian civilian, and it would be dangerous, if not impossible, for him to connive at the escape or exemption of his fellow-believers. What then was he to do? Military discipline left the troops no alternative but to obey such a distasteful command. And yet how could they as Christians participate in the punishment of their fellow-Christians? Eusebius describes one case, during the fierce Decian persecution of the Church at Alexandria (*HE* vi. 41. 22 f.). Four or five legionaries standing beside the tribunal attracted the attention of the court by the marks of violent disapprobation * which they made when a Christian prisoner seemed on the point of recanting. Without waiting to be arrested, 'they ran forward to the presiding magistrate and confessed proudly that they were Christians.' This encouraged the civilian Christians who were awaiting their trial. The legionaries themselves were executed; but, as Dionysius the Alexandrian bishop, from whom Eusebius quotes the story, is careful to add, their martyrdom was a triumph for their God (*θριαμβεύοντος αὐτοὺς ἐνδόξως τοῦ θεοῦ*; cf. 2 Co 2^{14}). Half a century earlier, when Perpetua and Felicitas were tortured to a horrible death at Carthage in A.D. 203, a humane soldier, Pudens, who was in charge of them was so impressed by their conduct that he became a Christian (*Passio S. Perpetuæ*, 9, 16). Whether he remained a soldier or not, we are not informed. He was by nature a kind man, like Julius the officer who had charge of St. Paul (see above, p. 653), but Pudens advanced from humane feeling to faith. He did not suffer with the two women and Saturus, however. The *Passio* closes with Saturus, on the eve of his own death, encouraging Pudens to believe with all his heart. There is no claim made that he came forward to seal his confession alongside of his prisoners. But this infectious courage sometimes caught up a soldier. When Potamiæna, the beautiful girl-martyr of Alexandria, was being led away to be burned, *e.g.* (Eus. *HE* vi. 5), the Roman officer who was in charge of the prisoner chivalrously protected her from the coarse violence of the mob. In gratitude for his kindness, she told him that she would ask her God, after she died, to reward him. Shortly afterwards Basilides, the officer, declined to take one of the usual military oaths on the ground that he was a Christian. He attributed his conversion to visions of the woman whom he had watched dying for her Lord, and was beheaded for his own confession. Another case occurred during the Decian persecution at Alexandria (Eus. *HE* vi. 41. 16), when a soldier called Besas checked the riotous mob round the martyrs and was beheaded promptly. The probability is that he was already a Christian, like his five fellow-soldiers of the Second Trajan legion (see above), but the story leaves it a fair question whether he was not suddenly converted by the bearing of the prisoners.

---

* Germanicus cheered on his troops to 'follow the Roman birds [*i.e.* the eagles], the special deities of the legions' ('propria legionum numina' [Tac. *Ann.* ii. 17]).

* Rufinus, in translating this, expands it, in order to suggest that they tried by signs to encourage the hesitating prisoner.

Another case may be selected. Writing in A.D. 250–251 (*Ep.* 39), Cyprian warmly commends Celerinus as 'the leader in the battle of our own day, the foremost of Christ's soldiers to advance (*antesignanus*),'* a man who, although racked and tortured, defeated the devil his enemy by his constancy. He had prevailed, says Lucian, one of his Carthaginian friends (Cyprian, *Ep.* 22), 'against the chief Snake, the quartermaster (*metatorem*) of antichrist'—the *metatores* (cf. Lipsius, *op. cit.*, p. 300 f.) being the advance-party who laid out the camp.

Cyprian's comment is: 'In the case of a servant of God, the glory of the wounds constitutes a victory.' Celerinus came, on both sides of his family, from a military household. Not only had his grandmother been a martyr, but 'his two uncles, on the father's and the mother's side, Laurentius and Egnatius, once fought themselves in the armies of the world, and, true, spiritual soldiers of God as they were, overthrew the devil by confessing Christ, thereby winning palms and crowns from the Lord.'

These two Christian soldiers had not renounced their profession. They suffered rather than renounce Christ, but at the time of their martyrdom they were still in the army.

The difficulty of reconciling Christianity with military service also met recruits. One case has been preserved, which occurred in 295 in Numidia, where a certain Maximilianus, the son of a veteran, declined to enlist on the ground that he was a Christian: 'I cannot fight, for I am a Christian.' *Militare* is for him the same thing as *malefacere*. 'Non milito saeculo sed milito deo meo.' In spite of all threats the youth refused to do his duty, and the recruiting authorities, who behaved with considerable patience, had no alternative except to order his execution for disloyalty (Ruinart, p. 340 f.). He is reminded that there are Christians already in the army, but that does not remove his scruples: 'Ipsi sciunt quod ipsis expediat.'

We may sum up the evidence thus. The available data for the 3rd cent. go to prove that, if some Christians left or tried to leave the army, others found it quite possible to remain; if some had conscientious objections ~~to~~ entering the legions, others enlisted of their own accord. Naturally, it is the cases which led to martyrdom that are chronicled. Instances of men who suffered in the army or for declining to join the army come repeatedly to light. But their number must not be exaggerated. It should be remembered that there was nothing to attract attention to the other class of Christian soldiers who, for one reason or another, never came up to the critical issue, who fought for their country either without raising the general question of war at all or after weighing the problem and deciding that a healthy conscience could not look at any other alternative than to serve in arms. How important a factor they were in the army by the end of the 3rd cent. may be gathered indirectly but decisively from the fact that they were more than once made the special or primary target of official persecution. Thus, Galerius, incited by his pagan mother, over-persuaded Diocletian, his colleague, to persecute Christians, and one circumstance which whetted the older man's wrath was that the presence of Christians was supposed to obstruct the pagan rites of divination; when some Christians who had to be present at the ceremony made the sign of the cross, the soothsayers at once blamed this for the failure of the rites. The persecution was specially directed against officers and the rank and file of the army (Lact. *de Mort. Persecut.* 10), who were ordered to offer sacrifice on penalty of dismissal from the service. At first, however, the attack on Christians in the army was not pushed home (cf. Eus. *HE* viii. 4); the authorities evidently found that their Christian officers and privates were too resolute and also too numerous to make a ruthless policy advisable. Only one or two cases of martyrdom occurred. But during the five years of the great persecution, from 303 onwards, the army contributed its martyrs to the roll-call of the Church, men like Dasius the private, who refused to take part in the revels of the Saturnalia (cf. F. Cumont, in *Analecta Bollandiana*, Brussels and Paris, 1897, xvi. 5 f.), Sebastian, an officer in the Prætorian Guard, who was shot to death by archers for declining to abandon his religion (cf. H. Delehaye, in *ib.* xvi. 209 f.), and Seleucus, either a veteran or one who had withdrawn from the army (Eus. *de Mart. Pal.* xi. 20–23), and who was put to death at Cæsarea (further particulars in A. J. Mason, *The Historic Martyrs of the Primitive Church*, London, 1905, p. 203 f.). The (early 4th cent.) *Acts of Callistratus* (cf. F. C. Conybeare, *Monuments of Early Christianity*^{2}, London, 1896, p. 273 f.) also assign to the great persecution under Diocletian the martyrdom of that saint and forty-nine of his fellow-soldiers, either at Rome or at Constantinople.

'Early in 303 the Great Persecution was begun with the demolition of the Church at Nicomedia: and there was a tall young officer looking on with thoughts of his own, like Napoleon watching the riot of June 1792.'* But Constantine was not to get his chance, even three years later when he became one of the Cæsars. It was only in 311 that the death of Galerius gave him the opportunity of crushing Maxentius at the Milvian Bridge in 312; even then the vision of the Cross did not definitely stamp the victorious general or the army as Christian, but the Christians and Constantine were drawing closer together, and their union was sealed by the final struggle with Licinius (A.D. 323), who suddenly committed himself to a fresh policy of repression against the Church, ordering all the Christians in his army to apostatize, on penalty of dismissal from the service. The sacrifice involved in this dismissal was serious, for, when a veteran received his honourable discharge (*honesta missio*), he not only received his bounty (see above, p. 655) but was generally made a Roman citizen, if he was not already enfranchised; he was also assigned land to settle upon as his own property. The mere prospect of the pay secured to him at the end of his service was a strong motive for adhering to the army, as Vegetius observes (ii. 20: 'Miles . . . qui sumptus suos scit apud signa depositos, de deserendo nihil cogitat, magis diligit signa, pro illis in acie fortius dimicat'). We are hardly surprised, therefore, to discover that some of those who allowed themselves to be cashiered rather than offer the pagan sacrifices, and who conscientiously gave up their military belts, reconsidered their position afterwards and by bribery regained their position in the army. It is their case that is decided by the Council of Nicæa (canon xii.), which ordered such soldiers, who had returned like dogs to their vomit (an echo of 2 P 2^{22})—*i.e.* to serve in a pagan army fighting against Constantine, who was sympathetic to the Church—to undergo a prolonged penance. But no censure was passed on military service as such. Others were apparently treated with more rigour than dismissal from the service,* if the famous story (cf. Basil's 19th *Homily*, 'in Sanctos Quadraginta Martyres') of the Forty Soldiers of Sebaste is to be referred to this period. For declining to sacrifice, they were first plunged in an ice-cold lake, and then tortured to death. These heroes belonged to the famous Melitene legion, which had already Christian traditions (see above, p. 663), and it was to this legion that Polyeuctes also belonged, although the 4th cent. *Acts* of this military martyr (cf. F. C. Conybeare, *Monuments of Early Christianity*^{2}, pp. 123–146) yield no authentic evidence for the period of his death. The martyrdom of Theodore, an officer in high command (*ib.*, p. 217 f.), is, however, definitely assigned to the period when Licinius was purging his army. Soldiers who had recanted under the terrible pressure of the Diocletian persecution formed a special item in the problem which the *lapsi* furnished to the Church (Epiph. *Hær.* lxviii. 2).

---

* The *antesignani* were the picked men who fought in the front rank, originally in front of the standards (see Livy's account, xxii. 5). Calvin uses the same metaphor in his note on 1 Ti 1^{18} ('*militiae* nomine subindicat certandum esse. Atque in universum piis id convenit: proprie tamen Christianis doctoribus, qui sunt velut antesignani aut duces').

* H. M. Gwatkin, in *Cambridge Medieval History*, i. [Cambridge, 1911] 2.

It would be unjust to infer that the Christian soldiers who were not martyred were necessarily of inferior quality to their fellows. The Romans were not a persecuting people. Except on special occasions† of popular fury, they did not as a rule force the issue even on civilian Christians, and in the army, particularly on active service in the provinces, where men held together in face of a common enemy, there would seldom be any occasion or desire to throw a legionary into difficulties by raising the question of his religious beliefs. The enforcement of even an imperial edict depended largely on the local authorities. It was not uniformly put into execution throughout the army, and this explains partly why some soldiers suffered while others seem to have been exempted. How far Christian soldiers even acted as missionaries of the faith we can only surmise. The devotees of Mithra in the legions certainly carried their worship with them, and Mithræums were erected all over the Empire where the army had their headquarters. Did Christian soldiers push the propaganda of their faith also? Was it to them, or to traders, that the early introduction of Christianity into Britain was due—the introduction of which Tertullian speaks so proudly by the end of the 2nd cent. (*adv. Jud.* 7)? In our present state of knowledge, this is a question which can only be asked. Probabilities are not evidence, and there are no reliable data to support even inferences that might serve as an answer.

8. The practical solution of the problem.—It is only upon a generous estimate of the scope of this Dictionary that the survey has been carried down even this length; but for the sake of completeness a word may be added upon the final solution of the problem, so far as it was finally settled, for the early Church. The open adhesion of Constantine to Christianity, after his defeat of Licinius, entirely altered the focus of the problem. When the head of the army had become a Christian, and especially when he used the nails which were alleged to have been used for the cross to fix his armour (Socrates, *HE* i. 17: *τοὺς ἥλους δε, οἱ ταῖς χερσὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ κατὰ τὸν σταυρὸν ἐνεπάγησαν, ὁ Κωνσταντῖνος λαβὼν . . . χαλινούς τε καὶ περικεφαλαίαν ποιήσας, ἐν τοῖς πολέμοις ἐκεχρῆτο*), a whole series of difficulties was removed; theoretically, a number of the objections urged during the pagan regime fell to the ground. The army had received a semi-consecration. Christians were no longer exposed to pagan seduction in the army. A passing wave of reaction might alter the situation under Julian,* but this was temporary, and the position after Constantine was in the main established. The only scruple which Christians could now feel about military service was with regard to bloodshed. Was war, even under the auspices of a Christian Emperor, and in defence of the State, permissible or advisable for members of the Church? The question had reduced itself to this. Yet, at the same time, it was soon to broaden out; for, when the Church and the State were allied, their common interests were sometimes bound to make war assume the position of a holy war.

As early as 314 a Council of the Church in the West seems to have been anxious to prove the loyalty of Christians to the army, in view of Constantine's sympathies. The third canon of the Council of Arles runs thus: 'De his qui arma projiciunt in pace, placuit abstineri eos a communione.' The difficulty of the phraseology was felt at an early period, as is plain from the *v.l. proelio*, which would mean that soldiers who proved cowards in face of the enemy were to be excommunicated. But would they have lived to be excommunicated? The army would surely have dealt with them before ever the Church could. The canon does not refer either to this or, as even Hefele thought, to gladiators. It appears to be a repudiation of Christian soldiers who gave way to their scruples about war; since the Church now enjoyed 'peace,'† under Constantine, there was no reason for this desertion, and all such persons were debarred from communion. The adhesion of the Church to the State is complete, on this interpretation of the canon. It is all the more likely that the declaration of Arles is to be read in this light, as the Western Church would be anxious at this period to lend its moral support to a general like Constantine.

---

* The 18th *Homily* of Basil ('in Gordium Martyrem') is on a centurion who withdrew from the army rather than soil his faith by offering sacrifice. But he was not martyred for that.

† In a general persecution, *e.g.*, like that of Decius (A.D. 250), soldiers as well as civilians are expressly said to have suffered at Alexandria (Eus. *HE* vii. 11. 20).

* 'Militiae cingulum non dari nisi immolantibus iubet' (Rufinus, Eus. *HE* x. 33). Martin of Tours left the army rather than accept a *donativum* before battle against the Gauls (Sulpicius Severus, *Vita S. Martini*, 4). He also used army discipline once to enforce the argument for celibacy. An ex-soldier who had become a monk desired to have his wife beside him, pleading that she had vowed as well as he to be a soldier of Christ, *i.e.* to abstain from sexual relations. Martin asked if he had ever seen women standing in the ranks of an army drawn up for battle. The ex-soldier blushed at the reproof, and admitted that this was unheard of. Well, said Martin, in the Christian army the soldiers must keep separate from the women too (Sulp. Severus, *Dial.* ii. 11).

† Or, 'in pace' may refer to periods when no actual war was proceeding, and when it was less dishonourable and dangerous to leave the army. A Roman army in peace built bridges and roads, and did general repairing work, besides police-duties.

Constantine himself acted afterwards upon a broad policy of toleration. He (Eus. *Vita Const.* ii. 33) left it to Christian officers to decide whether they would be reinstated in the army from which they had been ejected on religious grounds by Licinius, or would accept an honourable discharge from the service. The choice lay with themselves. He would not force any Christian to serve against his will. This made it more easy for the Church to form a conclusion, but it did not help matters. The question was still left to the individual, and we have few data for determining how far it was felt to be a question at all. Now that the scruple about idolatry had fallen, the scruple about bloodshed became vital. This had always been recognized, even in army regulations; the piacular sacrifice or lustration of the army at the close of a campaign was both Semitic (see Nu $31^{19f.}$, after a ruthless massacre of prisoners) and Roman—though W. Warde Fowler (*The Religious Experience of the Roman People*, London, 1911, p. 217) cannot find any trace of it except in 'a statement of Festus that the soldiers who followed the general's car in a triumph wore laurel wreaths "ut quasi purgati a caede humana intrarent urbem."' This scruple about the taint of bloodshed now appears in Christian ecclesiastical rules. On the one hand, there must have been a feeling abroad in certain circles which led up to the attitude adopted in the later *Canons of Hippolytus* and *Testament of our Lord*, not earlier than the end of the 4th cent., which propound a stringent ecclesiastical discouragement of the army as a sphere for earnest Christians. The *Testament* is more sympathetic to teachers than to soldiers; the latter are not only forbidden to shed blood and bidden to be content with their pay (cf. Lk 3^{14}),* but, 'if they wish to be baptized in the Lord, they must give up military service absolutely' (ii.). In the same way, the Tertullian-spirit dominates the *Canons of Hippolytus* (13, 14), which prohibit a soldier from wearing chaplet or crown, and exclude him from the sacrament till he has done severe and long penance for any blood he may have shed. But these extreme attempts did not represent the normal temper of the Church, as is plain from their later editions: in the *Canons of Hippolytus* the sentence of the 14th Canon (71–73) that 'no Christian is to go and become a soldier' is qualified (74: 'nisi sit coactus a duce'; cf. *TU* VI. iv. [1891] 82) afterwards by the insertion of the clause, 'unless he is obliged to do so'; that is, a Christian is allowed to join the army if he is called up by conscription, but he is not allowed to enlist voluntarily. The profession is discouraged for members of the Church, principally on the ground that it involves bloodshed. Similarly, in the later Coptic version of the *Testamentum Domini*, the claim that a catechumen must leave the army before he can be baptized is omitted, although Christians are still prohibited from joining the legions of their own accord.

Over against these extreme views we may set not only the distinctly loyalist tone of Eusebius, but the extreme appeal of a writer like Firmicus Maternus, in the middle of the 4th cent., who urges the sons of Constantine to root out paganism forcibly. The weeds which he has in view particularly are Eastern cults like those of Isis, Mithra, and Magna Mater, which had hitherto seemed to many Romans to possess the same origin and aim as Christianity itself. Firmicus Maternus regards them as the 16th cent. reformers regarded the Mass. He advocates, for the first time in the history of the Church, a holy war (*de Errore profanarum religionum*, 16 ff.). Paganism requires a rough surgery, 'et, si conualuerit malum, et ignis adhibetur et ferrum.' 'O Constantius and Constans,' he cries, 'most sacred emperors, only a little more action and the devil will lie prostrate, under the blow of your laws, the dreadful plague of idolatry will vanish and perish; raise the standard (*vexillum*) of the Faith, you for whom the Deity has reserved this honour: raise the banner of the Law for men to reverence . . . may weal and bliss accrue to the state, because you have laid low the enemies' armies amid heaps of slain victims. Blessed are you also, for God has made you participators in His glory and His will; and, out of kindness to the people, Christ has granted you with your own hands to destroy idolatry and demolish the shrines of the profane. He conquers evil spirits with spiritual arms, you have conquered earthly evils. Raise the trophies of victory . . . you have won the battle for man's salvation, Christ Himself fighting in the conflict' (20). Firmicus Maternus believes strongly in a Lord of hosts. When a Roman army in the old days came back from victory over foreign foes, it had to march through the Porta triumphalis, and Fowler (p. 217) suggests that this custom 'most likely had as its original meaning the separation of the host from the profane world in which it had been moving.' To Firmicus Maternus an army which had been putting down idolatry required no such purging from profane influences; its task had been high and holy. Yet his contemporary Basil, who succeeded Eusebius in the bishopric of Cæsarea, looked more askance at Christian soldiers. In the first of his 'canonical letters' to Amphilochius, the bishop of Iconium, he would exclude from communion for three full years all soldiers who retire when their term of service is over: 'Our fathers did not consider homicide in war to be homicide, presumably because they wished to make allowance for men who fought on behalf of chastity and true religion. Perhaps it is well, however, to counsel that those whose hands are not clean should only* abstain from communion for three years' (*Ep.* clxxxviii. 13). He had already (*ib.* 8) discussed the difference between intentional and unintentional homicide, and argued that all attacks on other people in battle are intentional, since soldiers fight to kill their enemies; such acts are ranked by Basil as murders, on the same plane of guilt as deaths caused by robbers and poisoners. This is the plea against war which we have already noticed (p. 662 f.). Basil seems to have considered it possible for soldiers to avoid bloodshed, but this cannot have been a common experience, for most of the legionaries must have seen active service in his day. He himself had correspondents in the army. One of his short letters (cvi.) is to a soldier-friend, evidently high up in the service. 'I have learned,' says the bishop, 'to know one who proves that even in military service it is possible to maintain absolute love to God, and that one should distinguish a Christian not by his style of dress but by his temper of soul. It was a great delight to meet you, and I am now extremely glad whenever I recollect you.' Basil's ecclesiastical opinion on war is coloured by his strict asceticism, like his objection to lending money on interest, and his restriction of the ordinary practice of discipline for the sacrament was never acted upon by the Church. It is significant that even he, however, does not venture to brand military service as unchristian. Asceticism led then and afterwards to extravagant and heretical developments, but Basil had enough good sense to prevent him from declining to bracket 'Christian' and 'soldier' together.

---

* This precedent of John the Baptist has come up so repeatedly in the course of our survey that we may recall one of the ironies and grim coincidences of history, viz. the fact that, when the turbulent citizens of Florence turned to Christianity, they converted the temple of Mars into the Baptistery of John!

* 'Only'—because intentional homicides were to be kept from communion for twenty years (*Ep.* ccxvii. 56). The soldier gets off with three.

The problem of the army at this period was complicated by the increasing number of mercenaries who were pouring into the legions. 'The military spirit had almost died out among the Romans. Ever since the 3rd cent. the military profession had been declining in the public esteem. Recruits were branded on entering the service, as if they were slaves in an ergastulum. The aversion to military service appears to have been growing.'[*] Efforts were naturally made to avert the lowering and paganizing of the legions. By A.D. 416 Theodosius II. had strictly forbidden any pagan to enter the army; it was to be composed entirely of Christian soldiers, and uncontaminated by heathen recruits. The ideal was 'a lovely company'; only Theodosius was not a Cromwell, and the supply of honest and godly men was inadequate. Now, if men occasionally mutilated themselves rather than enter the army, it was natural that Christian scruples should also operate against the service, when service had become otherwise unpopular. The steadying verdict was given by Augustine in the opening of the 5th century. On this, as on many other points of dogma and practice, his opinion came to be virtually authoritative. It was not an abstract decision. He was consulted by some officers on the matter, among others by Boniface, the distinguished military governor of N. Africa,[†] and his correspondence with them presents his mature opinion. Intrinsically, he holds, Christianity does not forbid military service; otherwise, John the Baptist would not have allowed the soldiers to remain in the army.[‡] Besides, think not only of David but of the centurions whom Jesus and Peter praised. In the present situation of mankind some must fight against the barbarians in defence of order and justice; every one has his own gift from God, and military service is at least a subdivision of labour in the one kingdom of the Lord. He repudiates militarism; few writers in the early Church speak more sternly of the callousness, the havoc, and the senseless retaliation which war may breed; war for war's sake is wrong. Also, even in a just war, ferocity and treachery are inconsistent with a Christian soldier's duty ('When a promise is made, it has to be kept even with the enemy against whom you are fighting'), as he tells Boniface. He would have heartily agreed with Seneca, who canonized Scipio Africanus, 'non quia magnos exercitus duxit, . . . sed ob egregiam moderationem pietatemque' (*Ep. Mor.* lxxxvi.). He emphasizes the need of personal religion, in view of the many temptations incident to military life. In short, the Christian soldier now becomes a definite type, more definite than the εὐσεβὴς στρατιώτης of Ac 10^{7}. This attitude was widely accepted. What Augustine did was (i.) to re-affirm not only the legitimacy but, for certain men, the duty of serving in the army, and (ii.) to suggest some of the principles which should determine war. He includes among just wars (in which, he admits, terrible suffering is caused [*de Civ. Dei*, xix. 7]) even a war for the purpose of humbling some arrogant power—the 'debellare superbos' of Vergil's time. He assigns a paternal authority to the Roman State, in virtue of which war may be a disciplinary measure for the good of other peoples. But into the details and consequences of this Augustinian philosophy and moralization of war we cannot enter. The relevant point here is to note that Augustine's opinions, expressed incidentally (*a*) in some of his commentaries like the sixth book of the *Quæstionum in Heptateuchum*, or (*b*) in his correspondence with Christian officers and officials, or (*c*) in the treatise *c. Faustum* (xxii. 74 ff.), possess a significance which attaches to no individual judgment prior to himself, and for the first time present a considered judgment upon war from the Christian standpoint. They express the central good sense of the Church, which declines to identify Christianity with either the negation or the glorification of warfare.

(*a*) In the commentary on Joshua (vi. 10) he claims that a righteous war, and a righteous war alone, justifies the use of stratagems and spies such as Joshua employed. 'Righteous wars may be defined as wars to avenge wrongs, when a nation or state has to be attacked for neglecting either to make reparation for some misdeeds committed by its own citizens or to restore what has been wrongfully seized.'

(*b*) The correspondence with Marcellinus, the Imperial commissioner, and with Boniface elaborates Augustine's judgment on war from a Christian standpoint. In a long letter (*Ep.* cxxxviii.) to the former on various doctrinal and practical difficulties, including the question of the compatibility of the Sermon on the Mount with effective citizenship, he uses Lk 3^{14} to prove that the Christian religion did not prohibit military service. If all soldiers—and even citizens—would live up to these gospel-demands, there would be no fear of weakness to the State (cxxxviii. 3. 15). He repeats to Boniface (*Ep.* clxxxix.) this argument from John the Baptist's rule, and adds that war is only a lamentable necessity, a last resort, a means to secure peace, not an end in itself. 'Peace ought to be your desire, war only your necessity . . . peace is never sought for the purpose of stirring up war, but war is waged in order to win peace.[*] Hence, even in warfare, be a peacemaker, that you may, by conquering your assailants, bring them over to the advantages of peace. . . . Let it be necessity, not your desire, which slays the foe in fight.' This is a Christian replica of the spirit which prompted Lucan's (ix. 199) famous praise of Pompey: 'Praetulit arma togae, sed pacem armatus amavit.' It is civilians who are truculent more often than those who have actually to fight, but Augustine knew that even generals needed a word on moderation in the hour of victory. When Boniface, after his wife's death, had almost resolved in a fit of depression to quit the public service and become a monk, Augustine (*Ep.* ccxx. 3) dissuaded him, pointing out that by forcibly restraining the invaders of N. Africa he could render far better service to the Church, which would then be protected from these barbarian hordes. The supreme obstacle to a good life, as he says, is not *militia* but *malitia*, not the army but iniquity. Thus Augustine not only indicates the army as a profession for Christian laymen,[†] but actually insists on military efficiency no less than on self-restraint in a general (cf. Cicero, *de Offic.* I. xi. 35). A Christian soldier must regard his profession as a 'gift from God,' in the sense of 1 Co 7^{7}, and he must therefore use his gift to the fullest advantage for God.

(*c*) It is 'a passion for doing injury, cruel revenge, a fierce and implacable temper, savage fury, the lust of power, and things like these, that sum up what is rightly reprobated in war. It is generally to punish these crimes rightly that good men undertake war at all and carry it on, in obedience to God or some lawful authority, against violent opposition.' This had been, of course, the aim of the ideal Hebrew monarch; he wielded the sword (Ps 45^{3-4}) 'on behalf of loyal piety, humility, and justice.' But Augustine refers to a NT argument. He quotes: 'Render to Cæsar what is Cæsar's and to God what is God's.' Then he adds, 'And tribute money is paid for the very purpose of providing pay for the soldiers who are needed to fight. . . . The natural order of things, which promotes the peace of mankind, lays it down that a ruler has the authority and ability to undertake war, while soldiers must serve in the execution of military orders on behalf of the common peace and safety. It is wrong to doubt that war is righteous when it is undertaken in obedience to God, to overawe or crush or master human arrogance. . . . There is no power except from God (Ro 13^{1}), by His command or permission; consequently a righteous man who happens to be serving under even a sacrilegious king, is justified in fighting under his monarch's orders'—for, even when these orders are not obviously just, the responsibility does not lie with the soldier. Such is the argument of the treatise against Faustus. Ever since the fulfilment of Ps 72^{11} ('All kings of the earth shall worship him, all nations shall serve him') in Christ, who is the true Solomon or Peace, 'Christian emperors, putting entire confidence in Christ, have won splendid victories over sacrilegious foes who relied on the rites of idols and demons.' The entire argument turns upon the objection raised by the Manichæans, as earlier by the Marcionites, to the use of force by the OT God.

---

[*] Samuel Dill, *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Roman Empire*, London, 1898, p. 196.

[†] Cf. J. Moffatt, 'St. Augustine's Advice to an Army Officer,' in *Exp*, 8th ser., xi. [1916] 409.

[‡] This passage is referred to in the prayer of the (13th cent. ?) *Benedictio novi militis*, the bishop *blessing* the sword against heretics, pagans, and plotters, and then bidding the recruit 'esto miles pacificus, strenuus, fidelis, et deo devotus.'

[*] As Cicero had already urged (*de Offic.* I. xxiii. 80: 'War should be undertaken in such a way as to make it plain that the only aim is peace'; I. xi. 35: 'Wars have to be undertaken simply in order to secure freedom from harm in peace, but, once the victory has been gained, those who have not been cruel and savage in warfare are to be spared').

[†] Eusebius is the first (*Dem. Evang.* i. 8) to assert that fighting in a just cause is one of the secular avocations which, like trade and family-life, are not permissible to the apostolic spirit of the clergy; but he makes this remark quite incidentally. It is only in the so-called *Apost. Canons* (5th cent. ?) that the clergy are forbidden to take military service, and even there it is pluralities that are condemned ('any bishop or presbyter or deacon engaging in military service and claiming to hold both offices, that of a Roman official and of the Christian priesthood, shall be deposed. For what is Cæsar's is Cæsar's, what is God's is God's,' 83).

LITERATURE.—In 1908 **Karl Kautsky** published a monograph on *Der Ursprung des Christentums* (Stuttgart), a so-called 'historical investigation,' in which (especially p. 384 f.) he attempted to prove that Jesus had been a Messianic leader of revolt, who had really been put to death for His seditious and fanatical Galilæan uprising, and that the failure of this movement led to a pacific reinterpretation of His career, which in the NT has replaced but not entirely obliterated the originally militant aspect of His gospel. The reply to this unhistorical restatement of primitive Christianity came from **Hans Windisch** in his *Der messianische Krieg und das Urchristentum*, Tübingen, 1909. In addition to the literature already cited in the course of this article, the following more or less recent monographs on the relation of early Christians to warfare and the Roman army may be mentioned as specially valuable: **A. Bigelmair**, *Die Beteiligung der Christen am öffentlichen Leben in vorconstantinischer Zeit*, Munich, 1902, pp. 164–201; **K. H. E. de Jong**, *Dienstweigering bij de oude christenen*, Leiden, 1905; **A. Harnack**, *Militia Christi: die christliche Religion und der Soldatenstand in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, Tübingen, 1905; **P. Batiffol**, essay in the volume of collected essays entitled *L'Église et la Guerre*, Paris, 1913; some pages (pp. 24–28) in **E. Le Blant**, *Les Persécuteurs et les martyrs aux premiers siècles de notre ère*, do., 1893, as well as in his earlier *Inscriptions chrétiennes de la Gaule*, do., 1856, i. 81–87; **J. B. Mullinger**, art. in *DCA* ii. 2028–2030; and **H. B. Workman**, *Persecution in the Early Church*, London, 1906, pp. 181–188. The European war has naturally produced a crop of pamphlets and studies, which occasionally discuss the early Church's attitude to war in general, but seldom to any scientific profit; the large majority, whether written by pacifists or by patriots, suffer from an unhistorical imagination, and for the most part discover evidence for conclusions already formed. **C. W. Emmet's** essay on 'War and the Ethics of the NT,' in *The Faith and the War*, London, 1915, is a notable exception.

JAMES MOFFATT.

WASHING.—See LAVER, PURIFICATION.

WATCHING.—If waiting (*q.v.*) rather points to the expectation of a specific experience or event, watching indicates a general attitude of alertness on the part of the Christian believer, in view of actual or imminent tests of his spiritual life. It is a favourite word of our Lord (γρηγορέω, Mt $24^{42.\,43}$ 25^{13} $26^{38.\,40.\,41}$, Mk 13^{35} $14^{34.\,37.\,38}$, Lk $12^{37.\,39}$), employed in inculcating the duty of vigilance (frequently combined with prayer) in regard either to the sudden day or hour when the Son of man shall arrive or to some actual crisis or trial (especially the agony of Gethsemane), or as a preparation for some impending temptation. In Ac 20^{31} it is found in the exhortation by St. Paul to the elders at Miletus, in view of the apostasy that has taken place or may be repeated under the influence of 'fierce wolves.' The duty of alertness as opposed to a slack or somnolent spirit is proclaimed in 1 Th 5^{6}, 1 Co 16^{13}, Col 4^{2} (where J. Moffatt, *The New Testament, a New Translation*^{3}, London, 1914, p. 252, translates the verb '*maintain your zest* for prayer by thanksgiving'), 1 P 5^{8}, Rev $3^{2.\,3}$ 16^{15}. With these may be compared a passage in Ignatius, *ad Polyc.* i. 3, where the duty is pointed by reference to the ἀκοίμητον πνεῦμα of the Christian. In two of the above cited passages (1 Th 5^{6} and 1 P 5^{8}) the verb 'to watch' is combined with νήφω, 'to be sober,' which in 2 Ti 4^{5} and 1 P 4^{7} is translated in AV as 'be watchful' or 'watch': νήφω means, however, to be temperate or sober (originally, to abstain from wine) and conveys the sense of calmness or coolness prepared for any emergency and arising out of abstinence from what will excite rather than the more general self-control of ἐγκράτεια and σωφροσύνη.

To sum up, watchfulness or watching indicates that the Christian is alert or vigilant, in order to defend himself against a spiritual foe or to be properly prepared for any surprise or sudden change in his circumstances, and above all in order that his fellowship with God in prayer may be undistracted and efficacious.

R. MARTIN POPE.

WATER (ὕδωρ).—In the NT, after the Gospels, water is nearly always used in a figurative or symbolical sense.

1. The words employed by Christ in Ac 1^{5} seem to echo Mt 3^{11}, Mk 1^{8}, Lk 3^{16}, Jn 1^{33}. Water was the element in which John baptized his penitents, and the best that he had; but he was profoundly conscious of its inadequacy, and eagerly expectant of an altogether different kind of baptism, to be introduced by the Messiah. It has been contended that the πνεῦμα ἅγιον and the πῦρ which he desired were the sweeping wind and the destroying fire of judgment (so, *e.g.*, A. B. Bruce, *EGT*, 'Matthew,' London, 1897, p. 84), but it is more likely that what he longed for was the life-giving breath and the purifying fire of the Messianic era. If we must not read into his words the Pentecostal and similar experiences, we need not eliminate from them the highest prophetic ideals. When Christ confirms His forerunner's distinction between baptism in water and baptism in the Holy Spirit (Ac 1^{5}), He certainly regards the latter not as a blast of judgment but as the supreme gift of Divine grace; and Peter, who 'remembered the word of the Lord,' and no doubt the tone in which He uttered it, quotes it not as a menace but as an evangelical promise (11^{16}). Water is referred to in connexion with the baptism of the eunuch ($8^{36.\,38.\,39}$) and of Cornelius (10^{47}). In the latter case the baptism in water is the immediate sequel to the earliest baptism of the Gentiles with the Holy Spirit, which was attended with the rapturous utterances known as *glossolalia*.

2. In Eph 5^{26} the Church is said to be cleansed by the washing (or laver, τῷ λουτρῷ) of water with the word, baptism being regarded as the seal and symbol of a spiritual experience which is mediated by faith in the gospel.

3. The writer of Hebrews (9^{19}) says that water was used along with blood—either to prevent coagulation or as a symbol of purity—at the institution of the ancient covenant, a detail which is not mentioned in Ex $24^{3\text{ff.}}$. It is a striking fact that in his review of the Levitical ordinances this writer never quotes the LXX phrase ὕδωρ ῥαντισμοῦ, 'water of sprinkling,' which occurs four times in Nu 19, but coins in its place the phrase αἷμα ῥαντισμοῦ, 'blood of sprinkling' (He 12^{24}). It is his conviction that, while the blood of goats and bulls and the ashes of a heifer (according to a Scripture which he does not question) cleanse the flesh (9^{13}), and while water purifies the body (10^{22}), only the blood of Christ can sprinkle the heart from an evil conscience (9^{14} 10^{22}). He does not, as F. Delitzsch (*Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, ii. [Edinburgh, 1870] 179) thinks, suggest that the water of baptism has cleansing virtue because 'sacramentally impregnated' with the blood of Christ. Just as he altogether ignores the sacramental value of the Levitical rites which he enumerates, it is not his task to give a philosophy of the Christian sacraments. His distinctive doctrine, to the enforcement of which he devotes his whole strength, is that, while all ritual is at the best but outward and symbolic, the spiritual appropriation of Christ and His atonement by faith has virtue to penetrate and purify the whole personality, beginning with the heart.

4. Peter sees a parallel between the water of Noah's flood and that of baptism (1 P 3^{20}), and Paul finds a mystical and sacramental meaning in the sea and the cloud, in both of which the Israelites may be said to have been baptized into Moses (1 Co 10^{2}).

5. It is the teaching of John that Jesus Christ came by (*διά*) water and blood, not with (*ἐν*) the water only, but with the water and the blood (1 Jn 5^{6}). Historically the baptism and death of the Messiah were crises in His activity, occurring once for all at the beginning and the end of His ministry, but spiritually He ever abides with and in the water and the blood, which are 'the two wells of life in His Church, His baptism being repeated in every fresh act of baptism, and His blood of atonement never failing in the communion cup' (H. J. Holtzmann, *Handkomm. zum NT*, Freiburg i. B., 1891, ii. 236).

6. James ($3^{11.\,12}$) illustrates the moral law that the same heart cannot overflow in both blessings and curses by the natural law that the same fountain cannot send forth both sweet water and bitter—a variation on Christ's words in Mt $7^{16.\,17}$.

7. The prophet of the Revelation (recalling Ezk 1^{24} 43^{2}) once compares the voice of Christ (1^{15}), and twice that of the great multitude of the redeemed (14^{2} 19^{6}), to the voice of many waters, in the one case thinking perhaps of the music of waves quietly breaking, in the other of the thunder of great billows crashing, around the Ægean island which was his place of exile. He constantly uses fountains of water, and clear rivers, as symbols of spiritual life and blessing. *Per contra*, he imagines 'the angel of the waters' turning Rome's rivers and fountains of water into blood (16^{4}); for, as she has shed the blood of saints like water, it is but just that she should have to drink blood—a grim species of poetic justice. The great star Wormwood falls in Earth's sweet waters, turning them to wormwood, and those who drink of them die because they are so bitter (8^{9-11}). The waters of the Euphrates are to be dried up, like the Jordan before Joshua, that the powers of the East—Parthia and her confederates—may come to the invasion of the Roman Empire (16^{12}). The great harlot, Rome, sits proudly upon many waters—ruling peoples and nations by many rivers and seas ($17^{1.\,15}$)—but her day of judgment and dethronement is in sight (17^{1}).

JAMES STRAHAN.

WAY (*ὁδός*).—A striking peculiarity of the Book of the Acts is that in several passages the Christian religion itself is called 'the Way.' Saul, if he finds at Damascus 'any that were of the Way' (*ἐάν τινας εὕρῃ τῆς ὁδοῦ ὄντας*), is to bring them to Jerusalem (9^{2}). 'Some were . . . speaking evil of the Way'; 'there arose no small stir concerning the Way'; 'I persecuted this Way unto the death'; 'Felix, having more exact knowledge concerning the Way' ($19^{9.\,23}$ 22^{4} 24^{22}). The idiom, though found only in the Acts, must have been familiar. We do not wonder that a word lending itself so easily to figurative use should be applied to religion as frequently as is the case in Scripture, and that Christianity should be called pre-eminently 'the Way.' It is an interesting parallel that in Taoism, the second indigenous religion of China, *Tao* means 'Way'; *Tao-teh-king*='Book of the Way of Virtue.' In the NT we are familiar with 'way of the Lord,' 'of salvation,' 'of God,' 'of truth'; 'I am the way' (Jn 14^{6}); 'the narrow and the broad way' (Mt $7^{13f.}$). The phrase is even more common in the OT than in the NT, as a reference to the art. in *HDB* (iv. 899) will show. It is specially frequent in the Psalter: 'The way of the righteous . . . the way of the wicked' (Ps 1^{6}). Other notable passages are Is 30^{21} 35^{8}. The *Didache*, an early Christian manual, expatiates on the way of life and the way of death. The phrase seems to suggest the active, practical aspects of religion—God's dealings with man, man's conduct towards God and his fellows. The commandments, worship, prayer, holiness, repentance, all have an ethical side and are even ethical in essence. J. Butler's remark that religion is a practical thing is quite in the spirit of the whole of Scripture, as seen in the Prophets, the Sermon on the Mount, the Parables, and the Epistles. 'Every one . . . which heareth these words of mine, and doeth them . . . and doeth them not' (Mt $7^{24.\,26}$); 'Inasmuch as ye did it . . . did it not' (Mt $25^{40.\,45}$). The proof of love is keeping the commandments. The teaching of Paul and Peter, John and James is no less practical than that of the Master.

LITERATURE.—Commentaries on Ac 9^{2}; A. E. Garvie, *HDB*, art. 'Way.'

J. S. BANKS.

WEALTH.—There seem to be in the NT two main conceptions about wealth and the wealthy: the first that wealth and the desire for wealth are dangerous to the moral and spiritual life, the second that the wealthy as a class are wicked. It is possible that these two conceptions are related to each other, but it is also possible that the conception of the rich as normally an ungodly class represents some special tradition of the later Judaism.

There are not many references to the subject in the Gospels, but the few there are are very emphatic. In the exposition of the Parable of the Sower our Lord speaks of the 'deceitfulness of riches' as one of those things which 'choke the word' and render it unfruitful (Mk 4^{19}, Mt 13^{22}; cf. Lk 8^{14}), and this conception finds a dramatic illustration in the story of the rich young ruler, whose refusal to give up his wealth and follow Christ leads our Lord to say, 'How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God!', and 'It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God' (Mk $10^{23.\,25}$, Mt $19^{23.\,24}$, Lk $18^{24.\,25}$). To these sayings of our Lord is probably related the phrase, 'Ye cannot serve God and mammon' (Mt 6^{24}, Lk 16^{13}). It is alongside of these passages in the Gospels that we should place the treatment of wealth and of the desire for wealth in 1 Timothy. The desire for wealth is dangerous to men, and 'the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil' (1 Ti $6^{9.\,10}$); the wealthy are warned not to be high-minded, or to put their trust in riches, but to use their wealth in good works (1 Ti 6^{17-19}). In these passages of the Synoptic Gospels and of the Pastoral Epistles we have, then, no condemnation of the wealthy, or of wealth as intrinsically evil, but warnings against the great dangers that attend its possession.

In the Epistle of St. James we have a somewhat different conception. Here the wealthy are treated as though they were normally wicked and enemies of the Christian community. God has chosen the poor, but the rich dishonour and set them at naught, and drag them before the judgment-seat, and 'blaspheme the honourable name by the which ye are called' (Ja 2^{5-7}). And, again, the rich are warned of the judgment which is about to overtake them; they have oppressed and defrauded the labourers, and have killed the righteous man (Ja 5^{1-6}).

It is not very clear to which of these conceptions our Lord's words as reported in St. Luke's Gospel belong, 'Woe unto you that are rich! for ye have received your consolation! Woe unto you, ye that are full now! for ye shall hunger' (Lk $6^{24.\,25}$).

A. J. CARLYLE.

WEEK.—See TIME.

WHEAT (*σῖτος, σεμίδαλις*). — Apart from the Gospels the only books in the NT which contain a reference to wheat are the Acts of the Apostles, St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, and the Apocalypse. The reference in Acts (27^{38}) requires no comment. The operation there alluded to completed that begun in v.^{18}. In 1 Co 15^{37} it occurs in a simile introduced by St. Paul in his dissertation on the Resurrection. The general meaning of the passage is: Thou sowest not the body that shall appear—*i.e.* the bladed stem with ears of corn—but a naked grain. In Rev 6^{6}, the Voice fixes the maximum price for the main food-stuffs. The *denarius* was the daily wage (cf. Mt 20^{2}) and a *χοῖνιξ* of wheat the average daily allowance of the workman. Barley, being much cheaper, formed the main staple of food of the poor, and in NT times the proportionate value of these two different kinds of grain was probably as three to one as estimated here. The Greek measure *χοῖνιξ* was probably something under two pints. The proclamation is addressed to the nameless rider who represents Dearth, and is a prohibition of famine prices.

In the great dirge over the fall of Babylon in Rev 18, reference is made to fine flour and wheat as two of the commodities for which the merchants of the earth are no longer able to find a market. The fine flour was no doubt imported for the wealthy. The word used, *σεμίδαλις*, is a *ἅπαξ λεγ.* in the NT. The wheat supply of Rome came largely from Egypt and was conveyed by ship from Alexandria. The land of its origin is a matter of speculation, but Mesopotamia, the enormous wheat-harvests of which were in ancient times proverbial, probably has as good a claim as any other country.

The knowledge of agriculture certainly goes back to pre-Semitic times, for grind-stones belonging to that period have been discovered (cf. the present writer's *Latest Light on Bible Lands*, London, 1913, p. 213). Several varieties of wheat are grown in Palestine, of which the most common is the *Triticum spelta*. Two other important varieties are the *Triticum compositum* and the *Triticum hybernum*. Wheat has been an article of export from very early times (cf. Ezk 27^{17}, Ac 12^{20}). The principal wheat-growing district is the plain of the Ḥaurān.

See, further, HARVEST, SICKLE.

LITERATURE.—H. B. Tristram, *Natural History of the Bible*^{10}, London, 1911, pp. 488–493; R. B. Rackham, *The Acts of the Apostles*, do., 1901, p. 490; A. Robertson and A. Plummer, *ICC*, 'First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians,' Edinburgh, 1911, p. 369 f.; H. B. Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*^{2}, London, 1907, pp. 88, 234; *The Speaker's Commentary*, iii. [do., 1881] 367; W. M. Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, 3 vols., do., 1881–86, *passim*; J. C. Geikie, *The Holy Land and the Bible*, do., 1903, p. 53; *DCG* ii. 821; *SDB*, p. 972; *EBi* iv. 5299 f.

P. S. P. HANDCOCK.

WHITE.—See COLOURS.

WHORE, WHOREMONGER.—See HARLOT.

WHOREDOM.—See FORNICATION.

WICKED. — The words 'wicked,' 'wickedness' occur 24 times in the AV of the English Bible. The passages are Mt 12^{45} 13^{49} 16^{4} 18^{32} 22^{18} 25^{26}, Mk 7^{22}, Lk 11$^{26.\ 39}$ 19^{22}, Ac 2^{23} 8^{22} 18^{14} 25^{5}, Ro 1^{29}, 1 Co 5$^{8.\ 13}$, Eph 6$^{12.\ 16}$, Col 1^{21}, 2 Th 2^{8} 3^{2}, 2 P 2^{7} 3^{17}, 1 Jn 5^{19}. In eight of these RV has substituted some other reading: 'evil' in Mt 12^{45}, Lk 11^{26}, Eph 6^{16}, Col 1^{21}, 1 Jn 5^{19}, 'lawless' in Ac 2^{23} (on the basis of a different reading: *διὰ χειρὸς ἀνόμων* instead of TR *διὰ χειρῶν ἀνόμων*), 2 Th 2^{8}, 'amiss' in Ac 25^{5}. In four of these instances the change from 'wicked' to 'evil' is due to the fact that evil spirits are referred to; in Ac 2^{23}, where, with the changed text, *ἄνομος* ceases to be an attribute of hands and becomes a characterization of persons, it naturally resumes its literal meaning of 'lawless'; in 2 Th 2^{8} 'the lawless one' is preferable, because *ἄνομος* probably rests on pre-Pauline Jewish tradition which represented the Antichrist as an enemy to the Law, so that 'wicked' would be too vague a translation; in Ac 25^{5} 'amiss' reproduces *ἄτοπον* more closely than 'wicked.' The change in Col 1^{21} from 'wicked works' to 'evil works' has nothing in the context to recommend it.

The prevailing Greek equivalent for 'wicked,' 'wickedness' is *πονηρός, πονηρία*. *κακία* occurs only once (Ac 8^{22}), *ἄθεσμος* twice (2 P 2^{7} 3^{17}). The *ἄθεσμος* is one who transgresses fundamental Divine ordinances for moral conduct (from *ἀ + τιθέναι*). In regard to the specific force of *πονηρός* and its difference from *κακός* the following should be noted: *πονηρός* is derived from *πόνος* and usually explained as 'qui *πόνους* facit,' 'who causes trouble.' But according to others (Schmidt, Cremer) the connexion between it and *πόνος* would be of a different nature, the poor being called *πονηροί* because their life is laborious, full of *πόνοι*, and then, by a not unusual transition, through what Trench calls 'the aristocratic tendencies of the language,' the word for 'poor' becoming also the word for 'wicked.' But, whether etymologically correct or not, the former explanation strikingly illustrates the specific meaning of *πονηρός* and its difference from *κακός*. While *κακός* describes a thing or person as inherently lacking that which is required by its idea, nature, or purpose, either in a physical or in a moral sense, *πονηρός* expresses the positive tendency to do harm in things, and the conscious pursuit of the injury of others in persons. The opposite of *κακός* is *ἀγαθός* (see art. GOODNESS); of *πονηρός* it is *χρηστός* (see art. KINDNESS). This difference between the two words can best be felt in passages where both are combined (1 Co 5^{8}, Rev 16^{2}, Mt 15^{19}; cf. with Mk 7^{21}). In Mt 7^{18} 'evil fruits' = 'unwholesome, injurious fruits'; Ac 28^{21}, 'evil words' are 'harmful words'; 1 Co 5^{13}, 'the wicked' fornicator is so called because his uncleanness infects the whole Church (v.^{6}). 'Evil times' are dangerous times (Gal 1^{4}, Eph 5^{16} 6^{13}). Sometimes the word is used in a less serious sense of the harmfulness of inefficiency (Mt 25^{26}, 'wicked and slothful servant'; cf. the *κακὸς δοῦλος* of 24^{48}, who is lacking in fidelity and diligence). Especially of Satan and other evil spirits the word *πονηρός* is appropriately used, because they are intent upon doing evil and working harm (Eph 6^{16}), but for the same reason it applies to men who seek to injure others (Ac 17^{5} 18^{14} 25^{18}). In Col 1^{21} the works of paganism are called *ἔργα πονηρά* because they establish enmity between God and men: the rendering 'wicked works' of AV expresses this better than 'evil works' of RV. Cf., further, 2 Th 3^{2} of the maliciously persecuting Jews, 2 Ti 3^{13}, 3 Jn ^{10}.

From the connotation of evil intent it is to be explained that *τὸ πονηρόν, τὰ πονηρά* are never used of the physical evil of Divine retribution. *κακόν* and *κακά* are the words for this, because, even when God finds it necessary to punish, no evil intent can be predicated of Him. This applies to both the LXX and the NT. It is no exception when occasionally the adjective is used with such things as *ἕλκος, νόσος* in the sense of 'malignant,' for here the evil intent is metaphorically attributed to the disease (Dt 6^{22}).

In Mt 6^{13}, Jn 17^{15}, 2 Th 3^{3}, 1 Jn 5^{19}, expositors differ on the question whether the inflected forms are from the masculine *ὁ πονηρός* or the neuter *τὸ πονηρόν*. Only in regard to the last-mentioned passage is the personal reference to Satan placed beyond doubt by v.^{18}; hence the rendering of RV, 'in the evil one,' is to be preferred to the 'in wickedness' of AV. In the other cases where the two versions differ in the same manner no certain contextual indications to decide the question are present.

LITERATURE.—**J. A. H. Tittmann**, *De Synonymis in NT*, London, 1829–32, p. 19; **R. C. Trench**, *NT Synonyms*^{8}, do., 1876, pp. 303–306; **G. Heine**, *Synonymik des neutest. Griechisch*, Leipzig, 1898, pp. 100, 106; **H. Cremer**, *Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch der neutest. Gräcität*^{9}, Gotha, 1902, pp. 500–584, 850–853; **J. H. H. Schmidt**, *Synonymik der griechischen Sprache*, Leipzig, 1876–86.

GEERHARDUS VOS.

WIDOWS.—Widows and orphans are alluded to by St. James (1^{27}) as a class specially needing sympathy and support, and those who visit this class and extend to it sympathetic help thereby truly serve God, who is 'a father of the fatherless, and a judge of the widows' (Ps 68^{5}). An emphatic expression of the same idea, viz. of charity to widows as true worship, occurs in Polycarp (*ad Philipp.* 4), who speaks of widows as a θυσιαστήριον, 'altar of sacrifice,' on which Christians should lavish their offerings as of old worshippers of Jahweh placed their gifts on the altar in the Temple. The same expression is reproduced in *Apost. Const.* (iii. 6). The same attitude towards widows is found in almost all the literature of the sub-Apostolic Age. In Hermas we find repeatedly such sentiments as the following: 'Instead of fields then buy ye oppressed souls as each one can, and widows and orphans mercifully visit (ἐπισκέπτεσθε) and do not overlook them' (*Sim.* i. 8). Fasting is recommended so that by the saving thus effected the widow and the orphan might be filled (v. 3). Deacons who exercise their office wickedly, robbing widows and orphans of their livelihood, are spots on the Church (ix. 26). Heretics are censured by Ignatius because 'they do not care for the love-feast *or* for brotherly love (περὶ ἀγάπης), nor yet for the widow nor the orphan' (*ad Smyrn.* 6). As against this, those who do care for this class are praised. Aristides in his *Apology* can say of Christians as a whole: 'From the widows they do not turn away their countenance; they rescue the orphan from him who does him violence' (see Hermas, *Vis.* II. iv. 3; *Ep. Barn.* xx. 2; Justin, *Apol.* i. 67; *Apost. Const.* ii. 26, iii. 6; and many similar passages). That there was need of such injunctions is clear, because church-officers might selfishly appropriate funds for their own use, and also because widows themselves might in a mercenary spirit take too much and 'make their widowhood a profitable trade' (E. Hatch, art. 'Widows,' in Smith and Cheetham's *DCA* ii. 2033^{b}; see also *Apost. Const.* bk. iii., where the faults of widows are enumerated).

The OT (Dt 14^{29}, Job 29^{13}, Is 1^{17}, Jer 22^{3}, Ezk 22^{7}, Zec 7^{10}, Mal 3^{5}), the Apocrypha (Sir 4^{10}, 'Be as a father to orphans, and in place of a husband to their mother'), and Rabbinical literature (W. O. E. Oesterley, *EGT*, London, 1910, on Ja 1^{27}) all lay stress on the duty of 'practising kindness' towards widows. There were deposits for widows and orphans in the treasury of the Temple (2 Mac 3^{10}), and from the gospel we learn that even well-to-do widows were robbed by the Pharisees and that others were subject to spoliation without legal redress (Mk 12^{40}; see Swete, *in loc.*; Lk 18$^{1-8}$; see also, for widows in the early Church, J. B. Mayor on Ja 1^{27}).

No doubt the poor among the Palestinian saints for whom St. Paul cared so much (τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῶν ἁγίων, Ro 15^{26}), and whom he helped by means of the offerings of the Gentile churches (1 Co 16), would include widows. Of course there were widows who were not poor, such as the mother of John Mark, and there were others for whom their relatives could provide; but as a class widows were poor, and the Church could not let them starve. From Ac 6$^{1ff.}$ we learn that in the Church of Jerusalem there were many widows, not only Aramaic-speaking widows, but also those of Jewish blood who spoke Greek. The latter class was evidently neglected compared with the former, but when this grievance was brought to the notice of the Apostles they appointed seven men to supervise the charity of the Church. This was in intention a temporary and local arrangement. It is possible that seven were appointed because there were seven meeting-places in the city, but one cannot be in any way certain that there was any special reason for the precise number. These men saw to it that the Hellenist widows as well as the others were fed at the daily ministration—probably meals were procured daily wherever the church met for worship. Monetary help and clothing would also be provided. Before this the duty of helping the poor, and among them widows, was left to the dictates of spontaneous individual charity in the daily ministration; now it was partially organized. Nothing is said, however, of a roll of widows or of specific qualifications such as age being necessary before relief could be given. These questions were yet to arise in the expanding Church. Certainly there is nothing here of the nature of a definite Church order. In Joppa Tabitha (Dorcas) had instituted a species of clothing society for the help of widows (Ac 9$^{36ff.}$), and no doubt in other places also this class was helped if not by the Church as a whole then by individuals of an active charitable disposition. In both of these passages widows are brought before us as a needy class who were tended by the charity of their fellow-believers. Christian benevolence would not indeed be restricted to the household of faith, but it had the first claim.

When 1 Ti 5$^{3-16}$ was written the question of the Church's relation to widows—in Ephesus at any rate—had become a serious problem. There were at least two pressing questions, viz. (1) the wise administration of the Church's financial resources, and (2) the clear enunciation of the basal principles of Christian charity. The Apostle makes it clear that no widows were to be relieved who had children or grandchildren able to support them. This was not simply to save the scanty finances of the Church, but much more in order to enforce a binding moral principle. There is every reason to believe that there were families who tried to evade what was a cardinal obligation of piety by attempting to get their widowed mothers or grandmothers to be supported by the Church. Possibly some widows were themselves eager to do so, so as to gain thus greater personal liberty. Against this St. Paul is emphatic in declaring that descendants ought to support their widowed relatives. He repeats this duty thrice. To neglect it is not only to violate Christian law (Mk 7$^{10-13}$), but also to fall below the moral standard of paganism (cf. 1 Ti 5^{8}, 'But if any one exercises no care for his relatives, and especially members of his own family, he has denied the faith and is worse than an unbeliever'). The principle is stated generally in vv.$^{3-4}$, 'Respect widows who are really widows. But if any widow has children or grandchildren, let such descendants learn first of all to act piously towards their own households and to requite their parents'; and a specific application of the same principle is thus expressed: 'If any believing woman has widows, let her provide for them, and let the church not be burdened, lest really deserving widows have not sufficient support' (v.^{16}). The Apostle here lays down a basal principle of Christian charity in general, making it apply specifically to the case of widows. Church support is not a substitute for filial indifference or neglect. To the Apostle the family is the important unit in regard to charity, not the Church. The Apostle also states that those widows who lived a fast life—a living death—were not to be supported out of Church funds. Those widows only are to be cared for who are really destitute and who have their hope fixed on God and keep to their prayers night and day—in other words, thoroughly God-fearing widows who have no relatives to whom they can look for help. This gave Timothy a guiding principle by which the resources of the Church could be husbanded and by which moral duty could be enforced at the same time. If the Apostle had stopped here, there would be no difficulty in understanding the teaching of the passage, but he goes on to speak of a roll (κατάλογος) of Church widows, and the question is whether this roll is a poor roll simply or whether it is a sort of inner circle selected from all those widows whom the Church relieved. If the latter view be correct, then we have an indefinite band of destitute widows, of all ages, supported by the Church, and of this band a select few who are on a roll of honour because they occupy some status in the Church. As regards this roll, what the Apostle says is this. Only destitute widows of sixty and upwards can be included, who have hitherto had a blameless career and a record of good works. Such an enrolled widow must have been 'a woman of one man,'* must have brought up her family well, must have washed the disciples' feet, shown hospitality to strangers, done service to the oppressed. If the Apostle intended the help of the Church to be restricted to such, then what was to become of destitute widows under sixty or even of those who did not come up to the moral requirements demanded? It is because this ruling appears so harsh that many scholars see in this catalogue not a poor catalogue at all, but a roll of widows with ecclesiastical functions and status. The Apostle excludes from this roll all younger widows. Before this, evidently, they were not excluded, and the consequence was that many of them married, others, owing to their freedom, went about as busybodies and gossips, and indeed some succumbed to sensual temptations, with the result that Christianity was evil spoken of. The widows on the roll were expected to remain unmarried, but the Apostle advises the younger widows to marry and become good housewives.

It is clear that this catalogue, even if it is regarded as more than a poor roll, cannot refer to the widows found in the Western Church in the 5th cent. and onwards, for in this order were included all widows of whatever age who took the vow of abstinence and donned a special ecclesiastical dress. They had little or nothing to do with Church support, and indeed many of them were well-to-do. The duties of this later class in the West corresponded with the duties of deaconesses in the East. But it is contended that there was an earlier order of widows in some churches (cf. Tert. *de Virg. Vel.* 9) dating at least from the 3rd cent., and that we find here the earliest evidence of its existence. The much-disputed passage in Ignatius (*ad Smyrn.* 13), 'I salute the virgins who are called widows' (see Lightfoot *in loc.*), is claimed to support the contention, but against it is the fact that the Apostle says nothing as to the duties of the catalogued widows; and indeed the age limit imposed would render many of them unable to do any strenuous work for the Church. Besides, the whole passage is on the face of it concerned mainly with Church support, and again in the East, even in Chrysostom's time, widows were regarded mainly if not exclusively as Church pensioners. That the Apostle does not refer to deaconesses is plain because in a previous section ($3^{11ff.}$) he discussed them. No doubt by the end of the 2nd cent. deaconesses would in many cases be taken from the ranks of the widows (Tert. *de Virg. Vel.* 9, *ad Uxor.* i. 7; cf. Ign. *ad Smyrn.* 13). In Tit 2^3 the aged women referred to are not female presbyters, and so on the whole it is better to regard the roll here spoken of as a catalogue of those widows who ought to be supported by the Church, and perhaps of these it was expected that they would give their time and skill to the service of the Christian community. Certainly they were not to remarry; in fact, the age limit made that practically impossible.* There is no reason, however, to think of a fixed ecclesiastical order with definite status and functions. That St. Paul speaks so strongly about the remarriage of young widows is no proof—on our view of the meaning of 'a woman of one man'—that younger widows if they remarried and again became widows would be excluded from the roll, for they would still be faithful to one husband. On the other hand, the case of a destitute widow under sixty is not directly discussed. It is not the Apostle's manner, however, to be exhaustive in his treatment of any subject. Such a woman would not be left to starve, but she might well be helped to look after herself and to abstain from going definitely on the roll of the Church. The Church's earlier relations to widows were distinctly eleemosynary, whatever the later may have been, and there is no reason to believe that anything else is intended by St. Paul here.

The right of widows to remarry is tacitly taken for granted by the Apostle in Ro 7^3 and 1 Co $7^{8.\,39}$; and, although in the latter passage he advises them to remain as they are, it is because of special reasons of temporal distress. His view on this subject, even in 1 Cor., is separated by a wide chasm from the opinion which became prevalent later when the remarriage of widows was regarded with horror. This view was based on the depreciation of marriage itself as early as the *Pastor* of Hermas (*Mand.* iv. 4), but remarriage is not yet regarded as sinful. But it is so regarded by Athenagoras, who says that 'a second marriage is a pleasing adultery' (εὐπρεπὴς μοιχεία, *Leg.* 33; cf. Clem. *Strom.* III. xii. 82, and the long note by A. Hilgenfeld, *Nov. Test. extra Canonem Receptum*, Leipzig, 1876, p. 173). In 1 Tim. the Apostle shows a much more sympathetic appreciation of family life and of the marriage relationship.

Once, in Rev 18^7, the term 'widow' is used of a city in affliction—a usage borrowed from the OT prophets (cf. Is 47^8). The idea of Grotius that Euodia and Syntyche mentioned in Ph 4^2 were 'widows' can be neither proved nor disproved.

LITERATURE.—Bible Dictionaries, art. 'Widow.' For widows of a later age, see **E. Hatch**, art. 'Widows,' in Smith and Cheetham's *DCA* ii. 2023 ff.; **J. B. Lightfoot**, *Apostolic Fathers*, pt. ii.^{2}, London, 1889, ii. 304, 322; **A. Harnack**, *Mission and Expansion of Christianity*, Eng. tr.^{2}, do., 1908, i. 122. All these discuss the relation between the widow and the deaconess. See, further, **J. S. Howson**, *Deaconesses*, London, 1862; **Cecilia Robinson**, *The Ministry of Deaconesses*, do., 1898. All expositors of 1 Ti $5^{3\text{-}16}$ deal with the question; see also **W. M. Ramsay**, *Exp*, 7th ser., ix. [1910] 436 ff.

DONALD MACKENZIE.

WIFE.—See FAMILY, MARRIAGE.

WILDERNESS.—See DESERT.

WILL.—The consideration of the place of the will in the teaching of the apostolic writings must be carefully distinguished from the question of free-will (see art. FREEDOM OF THE WILL). The line between them is not easy to draw in all cases; but the aim of this article is to consider the conception or conceptions of the will implied in the Acts and Epistles, and its relation to views current in modern psychological writings. At the present time there is a strong tendency to throw commanding emphasis on the will. All consciousness, it is agreed, implies the three factors, volition or conation, cognition, and sensation or feeling; but, if any one of these can be said to be primary, it is volition. Consciousness grows by functioning; and, except in its rudimentary stages, functioning is impossible apart from volition. Much attention has naturally been given to the relations between will on the one hand and wish and desire on the other, to the connexion between will and attention and habit, and also to the possibility of action against the will. Is the will a matter of detached impulses or is it properly the expression of the personality, the self? These questions are of great importance to the student of the NT. Schopenhauer, and later Nietzsche, raised the subject of the will to a new importance in philosophic discussion; and the questions mentioned above have been recently emphasized by the various writings of William James, and the important and far-reaching contentions of Eucken and of Bergson. The theist has a further set of questions to answer: What is the relation of the will of man to the will of God? Does the latter compel the former? And is it similar in kind? What is the real meaning of the 'surrender of the will' so often demanded in religious writings? Which should be placed highest in religion, the active and conative, the intellectual, or the emotional element?

---

* This phrase can mean either (1) a widow who has been only once married, or (2) a widow who has been faithful to one man, *i.e.* who was not guilty of pre-nuptial or viduary fornication or of conjugal infidelity. To the present writer the latter meaning is far more likely.

* Whether St. Paul himself fixed this age limit or whether he found it in existence we cannot say.

All these questions, more or less connected with one another, occur at once to the mind; but in the NT no direct answer to them is to be found. The NT writers were not in any sense psychological analysts; their object was to describe their religious experiences and to induce them in others. Their psychological equipment for doing this—if the adjective can be used at all—was the language of the OT and the simple categories common to the conversation of plain but thoughtful men. In their psychology the Rabbis themselves were no more than thoughtful amateurs—perhaps the world has gained rather than lost thereby. On the other hand, the language of the NT writers on this subject—like their use, *e.g.*, of the Greek prepositions—though simple, is surprisingly careful. They did not work out their theology; but a theology was implicit in all that they wrote; and, without being conscious of doing so, they have given us materials for a reasoned conception of the will, as it may be predicated of both God and man.

To understand this, we must first pay attention to the writers' vocabulary. The choice of words is determined as much on subconscious as on conscious levels; we employ one expression and reject another instinctively; and in cases like the present, where a system or a belief is implicit rather than explicit, language yields some of our best evidence. The language of the OT suggests three manifestations of will: (*a*) desire and aversion—the latter perhaps more often actually expressed—מָאֵן, אָבָה (לֹא), אִוָּה, חָמַד, terms which can all be applied either to man or to God; (*b*) satisfaction in a certain state of things, real or contemplated—רָצָה, with the cognate noun, and חָפֵץ; these again are equally applicable to man and to God; (*c*) a continued and persistent purpose, הוֹאִיל, or the phrase שִׂים לֵב or אֶל־לֵב; the former is more commonly used of man; the latter suggests the familiar connexion between will and attention, לֵב being always regarded by the Hebrews as the seat of thoughts rather than of emotions. The NT writers start from the same circle of ideas. From the undifferentiated material of likes and dislikes are developed deep mental and moral satisfactions, and acute physical desires or loathings. Will, for or against, is the natural precursor of action. Two wills may clash—those of man and man or of man and God. And out of will may grow a steadfast purpose, good or evil, which may fix the destiny of the whole life. When we examine the NT vocabulary more closely, a further distinction emerges. 'Will' is expressed by both θέλω and βούλομαι and their cognate nouns, as well as by a further little group of words which must also be noticed.

θέλω is nearly always used of man. There are exceptions in Ac 18^{21}, Ro $9^{18.\ 22}$, 1 Co 4^{19} 12^{18} 15^{38}, Ph 2^{13} (the only occurrence of the word in this Epistle), Col 1^{27}, and Ja 4^{15}. In the Gospels, the word is very commonly used of man in general, and of Jesus; rarely of God, outside the quotations from the OT—Hos 6^{6} in Mt 9^{13} and parallels, and Ps 22^{8} in Mt 27^{43} (where the original is חָפֵץ). The non-classical cognate noun, θέλημα, however, is almost entirely used of God. There are exceptions in Eph 2^{3} (cf. 1^{11}) and 2 P 1^{21}. The word is generally singular, but the plur. occurs in Ac 13^{22} and Eph 2^{3}. In He 2^{4} θέλησις is found, also of God. The same usage is found in the Gospels, especially in the Fourth Gospel ('the will of my Father,' 'of him that sent me'); the exceptions really prove the principle (1^{13} 5^{30} 6^{38}).

The above makes it clear that the verb is used quite generally for 'wish,' 'desire,' and 'want.' The distinction common in English psychology since T. H. Green, between more and less conscious self-presentation in the act of will, is absent from the NT. But the verb covers a range wide enough to stretch from St. Paul's favourite phrase, οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, to the baffling experiences hinted at in Ro 7. It can thus be used of both man and God. On the other hand, the noun is practically confined to the idea of a solemn Divine purpose; hence its inapplicability to human desires.

When we turn to βούλομαι we find that the verb is always used of man, except in Lk 22^{42}, He 6^{17} (the only case where the word occurs in Heb.), 2 P 3^{9}, and Ja 1^{18} (cf. Mt 11^{27}, 1 Co 12^{11}). The nouns βουλή and βούλημα are rare; βουλή is used about equally of God and of man (for the latter use see Ac 5^{38} 19^{1} $27^{12.\ 42}$; for the former Eph 1^{11} and He 6^{17}; note also 1 Co 4^{5}, βουλὰς τῶν καρδιῶν). In the Gospels it occurs only twice—in Lk 7^{30} of God, and in 23^{51} of man. βούλημα is used once of man (Ac 27^{43}), once of God (Ro 9^{19}), and once of the 'nations' (1 P 4^{3}).

The verb thus denotes plan and settled deliberate purpose, rising, however, out of uncertainty, needing effort for its realization, and liable to frustration; hence it is unsuitable for application to God. The noun denotes a deliberate and settled choice, which is more appropriate to the calm omnipotence of God (cf. Ac 2^{23}) than the ignorant strivings of man; it may, of course, imply a choice of alternatives, though not necessarily a long balancing between them. βούλευμα does not occur; βουλεύομαι is not used of God. βουλή, indeed, would seem to correspond somewhat nearly to the Aristotelian προαίρεσις (*Eth. Nic.* iii.). εὐδοκία denotes a choice in which satisfaction is found; it is used of both God and man; like the cognate verb, however, it is comparatively rare (cf. Ro 10^{1}, Ph 1^{15}, 2 Th 1^{11}). In Lk 2^{14} εὐδοκία corresponds to the Hebrew רָצוֹן, and the whole phrase most naturally means 'men in whom God feels satisfaction,' not 'good-will' in the sense of the AV.

ἐπιθυμία, on the other hand, denotes an eager longing or craving, which may pass out of control and become πάθος, an overmastering passion. The verb *ἐπιθυμέω* is used only of man. It occurs outside the Gospels six times in a bad sense, twice in a good sense, and twice neutral; in the Gospels, however, out of six instances only one is bad. The noun is generally used in a bad sense, often with reference to bodily desires (note Jn 8^{44}). Like the verb, it is never used of God. *πάθος* suggests an ungovernable passion in the three places where it occurs (Ro 1^{26}, Col 3^{5}, 1 Th 4^{5}). A deep and overmastering longing for a good object is expressed by *ἐπιποθέω* (*e.g.* Ro 1^{11}, 2 Co 9^{14}, Ph 1^{8}, 1 P 2^{2}; it also meets us in the obscure passage in Ja 4^{5}).

Hence, out of the simple material of desires and aversions are developed overpowering cravings or settled purposes; when the latter become thought of as entirely fixed, they are connected exclusively with God. At the same time, NT language shrinks from the idea that God could actually deliberate. Thus the main distinction recognized by the language is religious rather than psychological; it is drawn between the will as manifested in man and in God rather than between the greater and less identification with the self.

But further questions arise at once. (1) What is the relation of a man's will to God? Is a clash, as of two independent wills, really possible, until a point is reached where man says 'Not as I will but as thou wilt'? (2) Is man's will equally independent as regards evil? Here too we shall find no system; but we must ask whether by anything in the apostolic expressions an intelligible system is implied. We shall begin with the second point. Several expressions imply an influence exercised by evil, as itself an independent power, over the will—*e.g.* Ac 5^{3}: 'Why hath Satan filled thy heart?' (but note v.^{9}: 'How is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord?'); 2 Co 2^{11}: 'that no advantage may be gained over us by Satan'; 2 Co 4^{4}; Ja 1^{14}: 'Each man is tempted, when he is drawn away by his own lust, and enticed' (the words used suggest the metaphor of an angler). Ac 8^{23} 13^{10} hint at the same idea, and perhaps Gal 3^{1}; cf. also Ro $7^{11.\,20}$, where sin itself is spoken of as the agent of deception and death (cf. Ro 8^{20}). This does not, however, destroy the responsibility of the sinner (Ro $1^{24.\,26}$ $2^{1.\,5.\,6}$, and Ac $28^{25\,\text{ff.}}$ quoted from Is $6^{9.\,10}$). The last passages imply a state; the evil will is a matter not of acts but of habits, or, as Aristotle would call them, *ἕξεις* (cf. *Nic. Eth.* iv. 2, 1122^{b} 1). This state is called death, the absence of all will, or power, *i.e.* of all will to do good (Eph 2^{1}, 2 Co 4^{3}). Very similar language is used by St. Paul about the race as a whole—'death passed unto all men, for that all sinned' (Ro 5^{12}). On the other hand, a man so dead can be made alive (Eph 2^{5}, Col 2^{13}); cf. also 1 Jn 3^{14}: 'We know that we have passed out of death into life, because we love the brethren.' Life, however, means death to sin and to the Law which enslaved to sin (Ro 7^{6}, Col 2^{20} $3^{3.\,4}$: 'Ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God . . . Christ, who is our life'). To this state the term death (to sin) is applied, since here the will is regarded, at least by implication, as being 'dead' to evil impulses, as before to good ones. Yet it is noteworthy that the activity of the will is still called for—'Let not sin reign in your mortal body' (Ro $6^{11.\,12.\,16}$); and that this activity is essential is shown very clearly by the appeals to moral conduct which occur regularly at the close of St. Paul's Epistles, as well as elsewhere in the NT.

A definite cycle seems thus to be contemplated, whether as regards the race, the 'heathen' (Ro 1), or individuals: first, there is the active will to evil; then, evil becomes inevitable; the agent is practically powerless, 'sold under sin' (Ro 7^{14}); then, after his rescue from this state, the will is again called for, but this time it points habitually in the opposite direction. That is to say, choice is a real thing, but it exists in a world which contains both certain definite uniform sequences and an enticing and enslaving power of sin and 'lusts' (Ja 1^{14}). This is sometimes but not always connected with the discarnate personality called Satan (see artt. DEVIL, SIN).

But what of the rescue itself? Is it independent of man's will? Does it simply depend on God's decision to effect it, in some cases, but evidently not in others? Man's will appears to be clearly called for in such passages as 2 Co 5^{20}, 'Be ye reconciled to God,' but against them Ro 9^{18} may be quoted, and perhaps, though it is not dogmatic or doctrinal in tone, Ac 2^{21} (see CONVERSION, FREEDOM OF THE WILL). However this antinomy is reconciled, there is no doubt that St. Paul regards grace and faith as vital to the change (Eph $2^{4.\,8}$: 'God . . . quickened us together with Christ—by grace have ye been saved— . . . for by grace have ye been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God'; cf. also Ro 4^{5}, Gal 1^{15}). By itself the reference to grace might imply that man was merely passive; but the call for faith (as we shall see below, faith is an act of the will) shows that this is very far from being the case; indeed, faith is in general emphasized considerably more than grace as the agent in conversion. A still more fundamental connexion between the activities of God and man is expressed in what at first seem wilful contradictions in terms, in Ph $2^{12.\,13}$ and Gal 2^{20} ('Work out your own salvation . . . for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to work'; and 'I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me'). In Gal 3^{25} we read of faith as 'coming,' with the result that we are 'no longer under a tutor,' but 'sons of God through faith' (cf. 1 P 1^{13}, 'the grace that is being brought unto you,' RVm). But even in this new sphere of life through faith the will reappears, as a persistent endeavour after progress (Ph 3^{12}, 2 P 1^{10}). The new life is marked by special gifts—*χαρίσματα*—but they must be strenuously cultivated (Ro 12, 1 Co 12). The whole Church may receive an illumination from the Holy Spirit, yet it will use language that implies co-operation rather than passivity (Ac 15^{28}). The new condition can therefore be rightly called one of freedom (cf. Gal 5^{13}), and as such it is characterized by the confidence of open speech, as of equal with equal (*παρρησία*, Eph 3^{12}, He 3^{6}, 1 Jn 3^{21}).

It is thus quite clearly, though perhaps even yet not explicitly, recognized that will is something more than an impulse or a series of impulses, good or bad. It is the expression of the self, which, when bad, needs to be changed by an operation which has an external origin. Yet it is manifested in constant choices and struggles. The Christian is conscious of a new power in him (Gal 2^{20}), seizing him (Ph 3^{12}); yet the result is to produce in him for the first time the true activity. Transformed conation becomes the central thing in his life.

There is another aspect of the subject which is familiar to modern psychologists, and is not as entirely neglected in the NT as might at first appear. Conation is often represented as being almost identical with deliberate attention. Fully developed conation demands that prolonged presentation of an object to consciousness whose basis is voluntary attention. For the cultivation of self-control and the building up of character this truth is of the greatest importance. In the NT the chief elements in the growth of the Christian character are faith, hope, and love. To the new life, and therefore to the new will, these are vital. They have been regarded as being mainly emotional qualities. But this is a mistake. Each involves a trained and cultivated attention. This is clearly the case with He 11. The psychologist might well describe the conception of faith worked out in that famous chapter as the concentration of attention on what would otherwise be forced up to, or beyond, the margin of consciousness (esp. vv.$^{6.\ 13-16.\ 27}$ and 12^{1}). A wider rôle is assigned to faith in the Pauline Epistles, but the element of unswerving attention therein is clear from Ro 4^{20} and Gal 3, (*passim*). This is even more marked in the Epistles of St. John. There faith is spoken of as the weapon by which the world is overcome (1 Jn $5^{4.\ 5}$). But the nerve of this faith is the conviction that Jesus is the Son of God; in other words, if the attention is concentrated on this object, the universe of evil around him is powerless to harm the Christian. In the Synoptic Gospels faith means confidence in the power of Jesus to do what He offers or is asked to do; but the demand for faith thus made involves the securing of attention by means of a strong suggestion. In Ph 4^{8}, St. Paul appears to recognize the value of wisely directed attention still more clearly.

It is not always easy to distinguish between faith and hope in the apostolic writings; hope, like faith, is directed on the unseen, and it demands endurance (Ro $8^{24.\ 25}$), *i.e.* the deliberate holding of an idea before the mind; indeed, the connexion of hope with endurance rather suggests that it is the part of faith to set the object before the attention, and of hope to keep it there. Love, as St. Paul describes it in 1 Co 13, is very much more than an emotion; it is distinctly an attitude; the qualities mentioned in vv.$^{4-6}$ all point to attention directed to objects which most of us, especially under provocation, find it very hard to bear in mind. In the Epistles of St. John, faith, love, and obedience form an inseparable triad; the Christian character is secured, and fulfilled, by fixing the mind on Christ's precepts and carrying them out. Of this process, love is both the pre-requisite and the end; and, if this seems a contradiction, we must remember that to the psychologist, as to the theologian, analysis is but a makeshift; everything that appears in the course of the development of a conscious state was there at the beginning, or it could not have come into existence at all. Love is the going out of the whole soul to God, or to men in eager desire for their highest bliss; but this is impossible apart from definite mental concentration. The three Christian graces thus imply attention, and are all conative.

It is strange that all this was not analyzed further in the NT. But the main interest of the writers, after all, lay in God's will, not in man's. The patience needed by the descriptive psychologist was impossible for men whose one desire was to express the highest rapture of their lives, the sense of the redeeming and sanctifying will of God surging through every part of their being. And this constant turning of the attention to God led them to emphasize aspects of God's will which might seem to come near to fatalism, were it not that God's will is always thought of as acting through the good man, not outside of him. These aspects are four: a certain irresistible compulsion experienced by the Apostles, reminding one of Socrates' *daimon*, but going far beyond it (Ac $16^{6.\ 7}$; cf. 18^{5}); a curious sense of the 'fated,' or *πεπρωμένον*, as a classical Greek might have called it, which especially pervades Ac 20. 21. 27; the eschatological expectation, prominent in the earlier Epistles of St. Paul and in Rev.; and, side by side with this cosmical aspect of the sovereign will of God, the recognition of a moral necessity, especially in the sufferings of the Messiah, which formed the great fulfilment of prophecy (Ac $3^{18.\ 21}$, He 2^{10} 7^{26}). In fact, we may almost think of God's will as a kind of *primum mobile*, the all-embracing sphere by which the other spheres are controlled and set and kept in motion. The maturity of man's will is thus an attainment, not an endowment. It acts properly only when it is roused and directed by Divine grace. The necessity for its exercise will never be superseded; but the more it is exercised under Divine control, the more it becomes God's will in man, and the more it becomes man's own will, acting at last in complete freedom. St. Paul's metaphors of the soldier and the athlete are quite natural and harmonious. They provide room for the sternest endurance and struggle, and yet they point to the perfect precision and joy of well-disciplined activity. And this perfect precision is not simply in obedience to God's will; it becomes the actual manifestation of God's will. So experienced, God's will is identical with His love. It 'moves the sun and the other stars'; it is the *πρῶτον κινοῦν*.

We are now in a position to sum up briefly the relation of the NT conception of the will to modern psychological discussions. Cognition, conation, and feeling are all recognized; activity is central and is something more than response to impulse; it is self-expression as opposed to wish or desire. Action against the will is possible, but only when the will is itself imperfect. Surrender of the will is really re-affirmation of the will in a new direction. The conceptions of Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, however, the 'will to life' or 'to power,' constitute a perilous self-assertion which can only lead to death. There is much in the thought of St. Paul that recalls Eucken. The controlling force of the world is spiritual; and into the little land-locked pools of our own individuality, soon becoming stagnant if left to themselves, must flow the great tides of the Divine will. But that will is personal and redemptive; it is not a mere force, however exalted; it is the loving activity of the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. St. Paul has less in common with Bergson. The principle of life is not merely change; nor is its action experimental and uncertain. It moves onward through all time with a directness which can also communicate itself to our own wills. Finally, we may refer to the well-known phrase of the pragmatist William James, the 'will to believe.' The expression is not meant to state a relation between will and belief, but is used to suggest that belief (whatever its psychological analysis) is founded only on a subjective and individual choice, not on truth or fact. Mathematical formulæ and scientific 'laws' are accepted by us because they 'work'; God's love and man's immortality are accepted for the same reason. To St. Paul the principle, so stated, would have been incomprehensible or impious. Love and immortality are true because they are 'revealed,' brought to light; it is the function of will to fix the mind on them, and act in accord with them. W. James's view is a simple case of *ὕστερον πρότερον*. As a psychological or philosophical basis for belief, its correctness is not here in point; what is significant to the student of NT thought is that the great doctrines of Christianity are there felt to become more and more clear as the will accepts and obeys them. The will does not create truth; but there is not a truth which the will does not illumine and test (Jn 7^{17}, 1 Jn $2^{20.\ 27}$ 5^{20}).

Literature.—For representative modern discussions of the question of the will in general see **J. Martineau**, *Study of Religion*^{2}, 2 vols., Oxford, 1889, vol. ii. bk. iii. ch. ii.; **H. Lotze**, *Microcosmus*, Eng. tr., 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1885, vol. i. p. 256 ff.; **J. Ward**, *Naturalism and Agnosticism*, London, 1899; **G. F. Stout**, *Analytic Psychology*^{2}, 2 vols., do., 1902, vol. ii. chs. ii., iii., xi.; **W. James**, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, do., 1902, lectures ix., x., *Will to Believe*, do., 1902, pp. 1 ff., 145 ff.; **H. Bergson**, *Time and Free Will*, do., 1910, ch. iii. For discussions of the subject from a theistic point of view see **T. B.**

Strong, *Christian Ethics*, do., 1896, chs. i., ii.; W. L. Walker, *Christian Theism and a Spiritual Monism*, Edinburgh, 1906, pt. ii.; W. R. Inge, *Faith and its Psychology*, London, 1909; G. Galloway, *Philosophy of Religion*, Edinburgh, 1914. For the psychology of religion see E. D. Starbuck, *Psychology of Religion*, London, 1899, chs. xxv.–xxvii.; J. B. Pratt, *Psychology of Religious Belief*, New York and London, 1907; G. B. Cutten, *Psychological Phenomena of Christianity*, London, 1909, ch. xxv. For the biblical conceptions of the will see H. Wheeler Robinson, *Christian Doctrine of Man*, Edinburgh, 1911, 'Hebrew Psychology in Relation to Pauline Anthropology,' in *Mansfield College Essays*, London, 1909; H. Weinel, *St. Paul, the Man and his Work*, Eng. tr., do., 1906; W. P. DuBose, *The Gospel according to St. Paul*, do., 1907. See also Literature under art. FREEDOM OF THE WILL.

W. F. LOFTHOUSE.

WILL (TESTAMENT).—Here, accepting the conclusion (see art. COVENANT) that in Gal 3^{15} and He $9^{16.\ 17}$ we find the thought of a human 'will' or 'testament,' we proceed to ask whether the idea can be more closely defined.

1. In his *Historical Commentary on the Galatians* (p. 349 ff.), Ramsay argues that there are clear indications that St. Paul is alluding to the customs of Greek law. He maintains that a Greek will was (*a*) public and (*b*) irrevocable. It was 'confirmed' (3^{15}) when it had passed through the Record Office of the city; when duly executed it could not be revoked, even by a subsequent act of the testator. Hence, whilst St. Paul could not apply to God an analogy drawn from such wills as we are familiar with, his illustration is seen to be a perfect one as soon as we recognize the nature of a Greek will. Yet on closer examination these positions appear untenable. Norton states that only two instances are to be found where a will was deposited in official custody; and he adds: 'There is no evidence or trace of registration of Greek wills in the classic period, nor of official inspection of their contents' (*A Lexicographical and Historical Study of* ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ, pp. 61–62). As to the question of irrevocability, he quotes an interesting case from Isæus, which turned on the question whether undue influence had not been exerted to prevent a dying man from exercising his undoubted right of amending his will (*ib.*, pp. 63–64). Ramsay's only proof appears to be that wills found in Egypt often contained the provision that the testator is free to alter or invalidate (*op. cit.*, p. 366). But, whatever may be the explanation of this, it cannot mean that by inserting a clause to this effect the testator could alter an established law. It reminds us rather of our modern legal phrase 'without prejudice,' which claims acknowledged rights without creating new ones. (For a fuller examination of this question see Schmiedel's searching discussion in *EBi* ii. 1608–11.)

2. Halmel, in his pamphlet *Über römisches Recht im Galaterbrief*, urges, on the other hand, that St. Paul uses the technical terminology of Roman law with scientific exactness. According to Roman law a man could make a will, and afterwards either invalidate it or add codicils at his pleasure. St. Paul's argument is that the Mosaic Law is not a will at all, but a codicil which does not revoke the will but merely suspends its operation. In general this seems the best exposition. Halmel's attempt to illustrate St. Paul's use of the singular 'seed' (*σπέρμα*) as opposed to the plural 'seeds' (*σπέρματα*) from the Roman provision that the legatee must be exactly defined (*persona certa*), and that a number of persons loosely designated (*personæ incertæ*) could not inherit, seems too fantastic. St. Paul's argument savours more of the Rabbinic school than of the Roman law-court. (For a full discussion of Halmel see Dawson Walker, *The Gift of Tongues*, 'The Legal Terminology in the Epistle to the Galatians,' p. 101 ff.)

3. Both passages (Gal. and Heb.) are explained when we remember that in NT times the general principles of Roman law were well established and were known throughout the Empire. The mixed population of the Galatian churches, whether we adopt the N. or the S. Galatian theory, forbids us to think that when St. Paul speaks 'after the manner of men' he would appeal to specialized knowledge familiar only to certain sections of his readers. But all St. Paul's readers, as well as the readers of the Epistle to the Hebrews, whether these were Palestinian or Italian, knew the general customs with regard to will-making—customs which have lasted to our own day.

LITERATURE.—The works cited under COVENANT, esp. F. O. Norton, *A Lexicographical and Historical Study of* ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ, Chicago, 1908; W. M. Ramsay, *Historical Commentary on the Galatians*, London, 1899; T. Zahn, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater*, Leipzig, 1905; Dawson Walker, *The Gift of Tongues*, Edinburgh, 1906, pp. 83–175; A. Halmel, *Über römisches Recht im Galaterbrief*, Essen, 1895; P. W. Schmiedel, art. 'Galatia,' in *EBi* ii. 1608 ff.

WILFRID J. MOULTON.

WINDOW (*θυρίς*).—The Gr. word properly means 'little door' (from *θύρα*). Though glass was largely manufactured by the Phœnicians, who *may* have learned the art from the Egyptians (as is maintained in *EBi* ii. 1737, but see *EBr*^{11} xii. 98), it was apparently never used by them or their Jewish neighbours for windows, which were mere apertures—or apertures fitted with lattice-work—in the walls of houses. The discoveries at Pompeii furnish convincing evidence that glass had begun to be used for windows in the early days of the Roman Empire. In the *tepidarium* of the public baths a bronze lattice has been found with some of the panes still in the frame. In the houses of the East, which still differ but little from those of ancient times, windows do not usually look out upon the street, but balconies project from the upper stories over the street, with windows in which the lattice-work is often of a highly ornamental kind. In the case of houses built upon the city wall, the window has always afforded a ready means of escape into the country (Jos 2^{15}, 2 Mac 3^{19}, 2 Co 11^{33}). Baskets are often seen being lowered from such windows to-day, most likely for the purpose of being filled with fruit (W. M. Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, London, 1910, p. 78). While St. Paul was preaching in the upper room of a house at Troas, Eutychus sat on the window-sill (*ἐπὶ τῆς θυρίδος*), and, falling asleep and losing his balance, fell down from the third story (*ἀπὸ τοῦ τριστέγου*) (Ac 20^{9}). In a crowded room lighted with lamps the windows would naturally be wide open.

LITERATURE.—W. Ramsay, art. 'Vitrum' in Smith's *DGRA*^{2}, London, 1875; G. M. Mackie, *Bible Manners and Customs*, do., 1898, p. 95 f.; C. Warren, art. 'House' in *HDB*.

J. STRAHAN.

WINE.—See ABSTINENCE, DRUNKENNESS, EUCHARIST, TEMPERANCE.

WING (*πτέρυξ*).—The term occurs but five times in the NT: three times in its usual significance, of birds (Mt 23^{37}, Lk 13^{34}, Rev 12^{14}), and twice of imaginary creatures (Rev 4^{8} 9^{9}). The three passages which fall within the scope of apostolic history are very instructive.

1. Rev 4^{8}, 'And the four living creatures, having each one of them six wings, are full of eyes round about and within: and they have no rest day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God, the Almighty, which was and which is and which is to come.' The Seer here combines in one picture the characteristics of Ezekiel's cherubim ($1^{24\text{-}28}$) and of Isaiah's seraphim ($6^{1\text{-}4}$). It is the seraphim that supply the 'wings.' He ignores any differences which may originally have existed between cherubim and seraphim (cf. *Enoch* lxi. 10). Combined, they are here the representatives of redeemed creation, vicegerents of God, powerful and filled with judgment, praising God's holiness, and confident of

God's victory in the tribulations which are sure to follow.

2. Rev 9^{9}, 'And they [the locusts] had breastplates, as it were breastplates of iron; and the sound of their wings was as the sound of chariots, of many horses rushing to war.' The picture here is that of a destructive swarm of weird locusts coming out of the smoke of the deep abyss, presenting a dire vision of judgment. The locusts are fancifully and preternaturally magnified by the Seer's imagination; they have crowns of gold on their heads, the faces of men, the hair of women, the teeth of lions, breastplates of iron, 'wings' that sound like the sound of many chariots, and tails like the tails of scorpions (cf. Jl 2^{2-11}). Arabian poets describe locusts in a similar manner.

3. Rev 12^{14}, 'And there were given to the woman the two wings of the great eagle, that she might fly into the wilderness unto her place, where she is nourished for a time, and times, and half a time, from the face of the serpent.' In this picture the woman is the embodiment of light and the emblem of the historical Church of God. As such she has a mission in the world, but she must perform it in the midst of tribulation and severe persecution. The dragon is ever ready to oppose her and devour her offspring; he leads the hosts of darkness. But the woman is not forsaken in the contest. 'The two wings of the great eagle' of God's protection are given her that she may fly into the wilderness, unto the place prepared of God for her protection. There is an emphasis apparently upon the 'two,' God's protection being commensurate to her need of it.

GEORGE L. ROBINSON.

WISDOM.—1. In OT and Apocrypha.—In the OT, Wisdom in its nature and office is discussed in the series of books known as the *Hokhmāh* or Wisdom literature of the Hebrews. We find here not so much a philosophy as the rudiments of a philosophy on the practical side. The 'wisdom,' *e.g.*, of Joseph or Solomon, in the earlier literature of the OT, is 'the clever judicial decision, the faculty of clothing a practical experience in a rule of life or a witty saying, the acuteness which can solve an enigma' (Duncker, quoted by Skinner in *Cent. Bible*, 'I and II Kings,' p. 88).

Wisdom was not regarded as the peculiar possession of Israel; indeed in certain portions of the OT, Edom is regarded as its home. As time went on, however, and brought the people sorrow and crisis, when trouble pressed hard upon the heart, and faith wavered or declined, Wisdom developed into a serious spirit of inquiry.

A. B. Davidson (*Biblical and Literary Essays*, London, 1902, p. 29) differentiates the Hebrew Wisdom from the Greek or any other secular philosophy by its standpoint or approach to the problems of the world's life; the former started with God, while the latter reached Him, if at all, only at the end of a long process. The Wisdom of the Hebrews, since it came down from God upon life, was a process of *recognition*, while secular philosophy was one of *discovery*. The nature of the Hebrew Wisdom is apparent: 'It is not a view of the Universe distinct from God, much less a view of God distinct from the Universe; it is a view of the Universe with God indwelling in it' (*ib.*, p. 32).

For the understanding of Wisdom, as it appears in the discussions of the Apostolic Age, the Book of Proverbs (chs. 1–9, and especially ch. 8) is of capital importance, for there in germ is the speculation of Philo, and the subsequent identification of Wisdom with the Logos of the Fourth Gospel. 'The eighth chapter of Proverbs, and those associated chapters of the Apocryphal Wisdom-books, are fundamental for the primitive Christology' (*Exp*, 8th ser., xii. 169). The development has been thus traced—'the unity of thought and efficiency that animates and operates the world may be abstracted from God, the actual living Operator. . . . This plan or organism of principles may be idealized, and regarded as animated and active, and have consciousness attributed to it, . . . it may become the Fellow of God . . . it may be described as "playing" before God, in the joyous consciousness of power and capacity, and having its delights with the children of men. . . . This remarkable conception is the contribution which the literature of the Wisdom furnishes to the Christology of the Old Testament. . . . There can be no doubt that' this conception of Wisdom 'entered into the Messianic consciousness of Israel, and enriched it; and' it is 'reproduced in the New Testament in connection with the Son. "The Word was with God." "All things were made by Him." "In Him do all things subsist"' (Davidson, pp. 34, 80 f.; the reader may also be referred to an interesting series of papers by Rendel Harris on 'The Origin of the Prologue to St. John's Gospel' in *Exp*, 8th ser., xii. 161). This Wisdom literature strongly influenced both the Jewish and the Christian Church, but it is, perhaps, in its later developments, in the Book of Wisdom and Sirach, and, above all, in the other Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the OT, that we can see the developments of thought that enriched and guided Judaism in the age 180 B.C.–A.D. 100 (cf. R. H. Charles, *Religious Development between the Old and the New Testaments*, London, 1914, p. 184 ff.).

But the Wisdom books, as a preparation for the gospel, raised difficulties which they could not solve, and thus pointed forward to the revelation of God in Christ; through them also contact was made with the Greek world; Judaism and Hellenism met together over the pages of the LXX, especially in its sapiential portions (cf. R. L. Ottley, *The Religion of Israel*, Cambridge, 1905, pp. 154, 172).

In estimating the influence which OT Wisdom literature had upon thought in the Apostolic Age, regard should be had to the various currents of Judaism, and to the fact that in some cases the Wisdom books have a different outlook from that of the prophetic message. Often 'the counsel of the wise' was chiefly political and secular; even Sirach sometimes commends a line of conduct that is more prudential and self-centred than religious. Above all, we should remember the pervasive influence of Hellenism, especially in a centre like Alexandria, where East and West met and mingled (cf. Hort, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, London, 1895, *passim*). All these influence the conception of Wisdom as it crosses the path of apostolic Christianity.

2. Wisdom in the Apostolic Age.—The discussion may be confined to the use of the term in 1 Co 1–3. Other references (Eph $1^{8.17}$ 3^{10}, Col $1^{9.28}$ $2^{3.23}$) will be covered by that discussion. For it is improbable, *e.g.*, that in Colossæ any definite system was being propagated. The indications point rather to a blend of elements from Eastern faiths with notions and practices current among Jewish circles which were sensible to semi-Alexandrian influences (cf. J. Moffatt, *LNT*, Edinburgh, 1911, p. 152).

'The Church of God which is at Corinth' explains the vindication which St. Paul had to make of his gospel and the manner in which he presented it as well as the difficulties he found in the defence of Christian teaching and social order. For Corinth was the city of licence. 'He was here confronted not merely by the old religion of polytheism, not only by a stunted or degraded moral sense; the greatest barrier was the prevailing mode of thought, the spiritual atmosphere, the habit of judging everything according to the form, the rhetoric, and the dazzling dialectic with which it was presented, the habit of accepting nothing, of even being willing to hear nothing, which did not respond to these demands' (C. von Weizsäcker, *The Apostolic Age*, i. [London, 1897] 311). 'Corinthian words' was only another synonym for rhetoric and the frothy speech with which one intellectual party confuted the opinions of another.

It was not strange, therefore, that these parties should be perpetuated inside the Christian Church, where Jew and Greek met one another, each with his contribution to the preparation for the gospel, or his idiosyncrasy of thought inherited from his fathers. From this there sprang up what has been called 'a Græcised Judaism,' an anticipation of the later Gnostic systems, which endeavoured to construct a theology from an allegorical interpretation of the OT, the loftier forms of philosophy, and also from the ideas and mythologies of various Eastern religions. The process is seen in Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* ii. 480 [P.]), whose leading idea is that the Divinely ordained preparation for the gospel ran in two parallel lines, that of the Jewish Law and Prophets, and that of Greek Philosophy (cf. Hort, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, p. 88). Thus, in Corinth, Hellenism and Judaism met and mingled, and there sprang from the combination the pseudo-philosophy which is the morbid growth of an intellectual age among a people that has passed its meridian.

The intellectual ferment imported from the city and the schools into the church at Corinth manifested itself in an outcrop of party-feeling and division which at first was of Jewish origin. But the corrupting leaven soon spread in a community that Clement of Rome (*Letter to the Church of Corinth*, iii.) characterized as prone to faction and quarrel (*στάσις*), and led away by an unrighteous and impious jealousy (*ζῆλος*).

The difficulties of the Church were increased by the fact that in Corinth the Christian religion had to find its footing on Græco-Roman soil. It was not easy for Hellenic thought to fit itself to the new faith whose centre was a Cross, and one can sympathize with, or at least understand, men of an intellectual type who honestly thought they were doing a service to the good cause in presenting Christianity as a *σοφία*, and proclaiming its message in terms of the philosophy of the day. 'Greeks seek after wisdom,' but St. Paul's speech and the thing he preached were not in persuasive words of wisdom (1 Co 2^{4-5} RVm). There is no ground for connecting Apollos with the special method favoured by the Corinthians, which departed from St. Paul's positive doctrine of the Christ, though it may well have been that the eloquent Alexandrian's teaching 'awakened a tendency to further free speculation' (Weizsäcker, i. 322).

From St. Paul's First Epistle we are left in no doubt as to the substance of his first gospel preaching in Corinth. He did not 'begin by opposing idolatry and inculcating monotheism,' and so 'advancing from this basis to the doctrine of redemption, of Christ. . . . He began with the mystery of redemption. . . . He did not begin with those rational principles that might have paved the way for his gospel, but he presented to his hearers in all its strangeness, yet in all its power, the doctrine of the cross' (Weizsäcker, i. 314 f.). These are the historical facts he imparted to them in the first instance: 'I delivered unto you first of all that which also I received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried; and that he hath been raised on the third day according to the scriptures; and that he appeared to Cephas; then to the twelve; then he appeared to above five hundred brethren at once, of whom the greater part remain until now, but some are fallen asleep; then he appeared to James; then to all the apostles; and last of all, as unto one born out of due time, he appeared to me also' (1 Co 15^{3-8}). 'That was absolutely the whole gospel. . . . It was the doctrine with which he began' (Weizsäcker, i. 314).

> 'Christ! I am Christ's! and let the name suffice you,
> Ay, for me too He greatly hath sufficed:
> Lo *with no winning words* I would entice you,
> Paul has no honour and no friend but Christ'
> (F. W. H. Myers, *St. Paul*).

From the vehemence with which the Apostle reiterates the staple of his message, one can infer the distaste with which 'the foolishness of the preaching' was received. The cultured and ruling classes rejected it with something of the energy of contemptuous loathing with which cultured Athenians spoke of the *οἱ βάναυσοι*; it was good enough only for the vulgar, the illiterate, and the base. They, on the other hand, were to be saved by the wisdom of the schools.

To this St. Paul's answer was two-fold: (*a*) the gospel was not a philosophy to be discussed, but a message of God to be believed (cf. *EGT* ii. 774); (*b*) in point of fact, *σοφία* had not brought them the knowledge of God. The verdict of history had shown that 'the world by wisdom knew not God' (1 Co 1^{21}). It has not been saved by dialectic; God 'will not be apprehended by intellectual speculation, by "dry light"' (*EGT* ii. 769). The wisdom of the world (*κόσμος*=the material world) in its very nature could not but fail to interpret the spiritual world (1 Co $2^{11.12}$). As a matter of historical fact, reason, apart from a special revelation, has never been able to attain any practical knowledge of God, nor has it been able 'to show to the soul a fountain of cleansing, healing, and life.' These things 'are beyond the limits of man's intellectual tether' (cf. 1 Co 2^{14}).

The Apostle's experience in Athens (Ac 17^{16-34}) had not encouraged him to meet philosophers on their own ground, and, when he came to Corinth, it was with the deliberate purpose of not commending his message by the devices of rhetorical display, or the arguments of philosophy—'I came not with any striking rhetorical or philosophical display, for I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ, and him crucified' (1 Co $2^{1.2}$). 'When [therefore] eccentric teachers inculcated views which threatened to transform Christianity, to alter, as it were, its centre of gravity, or to pivot it on some new axis, resistance was instinctive' (R. Rainy, *The Ancient Catholic Church*, p. 95).

This resistance ruled St. Paul's presentation of his message: *οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου, ἵνα μὴ κενωθῇ ὁ σταυρὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ* (1 Co 1^{17}). 'The term *κενοῦν* denotes an act which does violence to the object itself, and deprives it of its essence and virtue. Salvation by the cross is a Divine act which the conscience must appropriate as such. If one begins with presenting it to the understanding in the form of a series of well-linked ideas, as the result of a theory concerning man and God, it may happen that the mind will be nourished by it, but as by a system of wisdom, and not a way of salvation. . . . The fact evaporates in ideas, and no longer acts on the conscience with the powerful reality which determines conversion' (F. Godet, *Com. on St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians*, Edinburgh, 1893, i. 89).

Denney in illustration of this point instances a Hindu Society which had for its object to appropriate all that was good in Christianity without burdening itself with the rest. 'Among other things which it appropriated, with the omission of only two words, was the answer given in the Westminster Shorter Catechism to the question, What is repentance unto life? Here is the answer. "Repentance unto life is a saving grace, whereby a sinner, out of a true sense of his sin, and apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ, doth with grief and hatred of his sin turn from it unto God, with full purpose of, and endeavour after, new obedience." The words the Hindus left out were *in Christ*; instead of "apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ" they read simply, "apprehension of the mercy of God." But they knew that this was not compromising. They were acute enough to see that in the words they left out the whole *Christianity* of the definition lay' (*Studies in Theology*, London, 1894, p. 130). St. Paul perceived that by the abstractions of Greek philosophy the gospel would be *emptied* (κενοῦν) of its significance and power, and his answer to this was: 'We preach Christ'—not a system, but a Person—and Christ as crucified.

His method was justified by his experience of the Corinthian Church. Even though 'by the enticing words of man's wisdom' a number of intellectually disposed Greeks had been attracted to the Church, in the absence of what has been called 'profound conscience-work,' the results were not lasting. 'The wants of the understanding and imagination had, in many cases, more to do with their adherence than those of the heart and conscience' (F. Godet, *1 Corinthians*, i. 18). From the Corinthian letter we can see that there was an outcrop of old pagan habits and a reversion to type among men who had never really been evangelized. This was another evidence of the failure of wisdom as a substitute for 'the word of the cross.'

Yet, while the Apostle rebukes and resists the superficial σοφία of the Corinthians, he also has *his wisdom* by which he relates the fact of Christ and 'the word of the cross' to his general view of the world: 'unto them that are called, both Jews and Greeks, [we preach] Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God' (1 Co 1^{24}). Thus he appropriates for the Crucified the 'power' and 'wisdom' of God, terms which were recognized 'synonyms of the Λόγος in the Alexandrian-Jewish speculations' (*EGT*, *in loc.*). But, since the Corinthians were no philosophers (1 Co 1^{26}), 'we speak wisdom among them that are perfect' (2^{6}), *i.e.* his philosophy is intelligible only to the initiated and to the spiritually mature. To them all the things that God hath prepared are revealed. There is a wisdom; it is a revelation, not a discovery but a recognition (cf. Hebrew Wisdom, *ut supra*); it is mediated to men by the Spirit, and otherwise it cannot be discerned. This wisdom the Apostle would have proclaimed *ab initio*, for it is no esoteric doctrine; but how could he? The Corinthians were Christians, they had believed (3^{5}) but they had not yet (οὔπω) reached the stage of a purely spiritual appreciation. 'There is nothing esoteric in Christianity, but the presentation of it has to be adapted to the capacities of those who are taught' (J. E. McFadyen, *The Epistles to the Corinthians*, London, 1911, p. 46). Of some things our Lord said to the Twelve, 'Ye cannot bear them now' (Jn 16^{12}), and He pointed them to the revealing Spirit who would bring them into the full knowledge of the truth. Similarly, concerning the preaching of the true wisdom, St. Paul says, 'I was not able (οὐκ ἠδυνήθην), because ye were not yet able (οὔπω ἐδύνασθε)' (1 Co 3^{1-2}).

3. Humanism versus Christianity. — Apart from its application to the experience of the Apostolic Church, St. Paul's discussion of wisdom has timeless interests in its bearing on the evangelization of the world, and on the true method of what is called evangelical preaching. R. Flint (*Sermons and Addresses*, Edinburgh, 1899) raises the subject in a discourse on the text 'Christ is made unto us wisdom.' 'There were people,' he says, 'who thought he [Paul] might profitably have imitated admired philosophers and popular orators; that he should have had a wider range of subjects and used more enticing words. Those foolish Corinthians have many successors among ourselves, who fancy that the pulpit would gain greatly in power if ministers would only discourse more about science and philosophy, nature and history, political and social reform, and the various so-called questions of the day. . . . The power of the pulpit will most certainly not be increased by ministers forsaking their own glorious work, the direct preaching of Christ, for the lecturing on lower themes. . . . The power of the pulpit lies in preaching Christ, and will be strong or feeble according as He is faithfully and zealously or faithlessly and coldly preached' (p. 217). The persuasions to depart from the centre which Flint, himself a great preacher, so energetically repudiates meet every minister on the very threshold of his office, and are echoed again and again in the more or less strident voices of the world. There is always the aversion of men of taste to evangelical religion, from Corinth to the present day. 'If our connection with Christianity is nothing better than a mixture of captious criticism and transient enthusiasm, with a dash of graceful posing thrown in, we are in danger . . . of just playing with Christ's religion — playing, too, *in the marketplace*, surrounded by the realities of life and death, where business has to be done with God. The grace and gospel of Jesus are too serious to be thus trifled with. Their genius and office are not to be profaned by æsthetic handling either in the pulpit or in the pew' (J. Moffatt, *Reasons and Reasons*, London, 1911, p. 137). One does not need to be an obscurantist or illiberal in turning back again to St. Paul as he contends for the purity and simplicity of the gospel message and vindicates its power. In every generation there will be found some who decry it as 'weak and foolish,' yet history has abundantly justified the power of the word of the Cross, and also the apostolic method in the delivery of the message. The victory over the world has never been with 'moonlight theology' or 'extra-mural Christianity.' Philo was a contemporary of St. Paul, but Philonism did not save the world; it was the simple, unaffected word of the Cross from a preacher such as St. Paul that won the Roman Empire, and brought—what Greek philosophy had failed to bring—a real knowledge of God to bond and free. If a system is to be judged by its fruits, if a method of preaching is to be so judged, one may well endorse the words, 'I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God' (Ro 1^{16}). If Humanism and Christianity be placed on their trial as instruments for the regeneration of the mass of mankind, Christianity has no need to blush for its record, while philosophy, as regards the mass of mankind, has been a light only to itself and an ornament. The contrast between St. Paul and the Corinthian seekers after wisdom is seen in historical examples; in the message of Luther and Erasmus; the Evangelical Revival, 'by its intense reality, its earnestness of belief, its deep tremulous sympathy with the sin and sorrows of mankind, did what no intellectual movement could, it changed in a few years the whole temper of English Society' (J. R. Green, *A Short History of the English People*, London, 1882, p. 718). Thomas Chalmers draws a sad picture of the failure of his earlier ministry, when he preached apart from the Centre, or, as St. Paul would say, laid another foundation for life than that which had been laid. When the light of the Cross broke upon him, his method was changed, and the fruit appeared, and that not only in specifically religious results, but also in the social reforms that the old method (directly as it had sought them) failed to produce.

Amiel, who will not be suspected of narrowness, or bondage to old forms, speaking of the efficacy of religion, writes: 'When the cross became the "foolishness" of the cross, it took possession of the masses. And in our own day, those who wish to get rid of the supernatural, to enlighten religion, to economise faith, find themselves deserted, like poets who should declaim against poetry, or women who should decry love. . . . It is the forgetfulness of this psychological law which stultifies the so-called liberal Christianity. It is the realisation of it which constitutes the strength of Catholicism' (*Journal*, Eng. tr., London, 1891, p. 171). In 'Cleon,' Browning adopts the same attitude in his study of the failure of paganism, even in its forms of highest culture, to solve the riddle of human life and to answer the requirements of the human spirit. Cleon has heard of Paulus and of Christus, but who can suppose that a mere barbarian Jew

> 'Hath access to a secret shut from us'?

The doctrine of Christ preached on the island by certain slaves is reported by an intelligent listener to be one which no sane man can accept. And Cleon will not squander his time on the futile creed of slaves (*Poetical Works*, London, 1883, v. 299). But wisdom is justified of her children. The best Humanism is founded upon the word of the Cross, because it appeals to needs that are common to all the generations of men. This is the Wisdom St. Paul preached: Christ Jesus who was made unto us Wisdom—that is to say, righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption (1 Co 1^{30}); 'a triangular constellation, with Wisdom reigning in splendour in the centre' (cf. A. B. Macaulay, *The Word of the Cross*, London, 1912, p. 162 f.).

LITERATURE.—Art. 'Wisdom' in *HDB* iv. and *EBi* iv.; art. 'Philo' in *HDB* v.; A. B. Davidson, *Biblical and Literary Essays*, London, 1902, p. 23; R. L. Ottley, *The Religion of Israel*, Cambridge, 1905, p. 172; R. H. Charles, *Religious Development between the Old and the New Testaments*, London, 1914, p. 206; C. F. Kent, *The Makers and Teachers of Judaism* (*Historical Bible*), do., 1911, p. 162; *ExpT* viii. [1896–97] 393; *Exp*, 8th ser., xii. 161 ff.; C. von Weizsäcker, *The Apostolic Age*, i., Eng. tr.², London, 1897, p. 303 ff.; F. J. A. Hort, *Six Lectures on the Ante-Nicene Fathers*, do., 1895, *passim*; R. Rainy, *The Ancient Catholic Church*, Edinburgh, 1902, p. 95; M. Dods, *An Introduction to the NT*, London, 1888, pp. 100, 139 ff.; *EGT*, do., 1900, *ad loc.*; *ICC*, '1 Corinthians,' Edinburgh, 1911 (Robertson and Plummer), 'Ephesians and Colossians,' do., 1897 (T. K. Abbott); R. Flint, *Sermons and Addresses*, do., 1899, p. 213.

W. M. GRANT.

WISDOM OF SOLOMON.—1. Place in Canon.—This apocryphal book is not quoted by name in the NT, unless the citation from 'the wisdom of God' in Lk 11^{49} can be regarded as a paraphrase of Wis $2^{19.\,20}$, but it is used in the Epistle to the Romans where 9^{21} is a reproduction of Wis 15^{7}, while in the Epistle to the Hebrews 1^{3} is a reference to Wis 15^{26} (for, indeed, the word *ἀπαύγασμα* occurs nowhere else in the NT); further, in Mt 27^{43} a reference to Wis 2^{18} appears to be conflated with one to Ps 22^{8}, which perhaps has displaced the former ('If the just man be the son of God, he will help him and deliver him from his enemies'), though enough remains to permit of the identification. The quotation in 1 Co 15^{45} bears some relation to Wis 15^{11} (where the *ψυχὴ ἐνεργοῦσα* and *πνεῦμα ζωτικόν* are distinguished like the *ψυχὴ ζῶσα* and *πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν* in the quotation), but is not likely to be taken directly from it.

The work was, therefore, accepted by the early Church as part of the OT, and figures as such in the Canon of Melito (*c.* A.D. 170), though some MSS of Eusebius alter the text (*HE* IV. xxxiii. 15) so as to identify it with Proverbs, and this method is followed in the Syriac version. It is cited by Irenæus (*Hær.* iv. 37, noticed by Eusebius, *HE* v. 29); as 'the Prophet' by Hippolytus (*adv. Judæos*, iv. 16); as 'Solomon' by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* VI. vii. 120); and as 'Scripture' by Dionysius of Alexandria (*c.* A.D. 260; M. J. Routh, *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, 4 vols., Oxford, 1814–18, ii. 406); also by early Latin Fathers, *e.g.* Tertullian (*adv. Valentin.* 2). Eusebius in the 4th cent. classifies it with the *Antilegomena* (*HE* VI. xiii. 6), and Epiphanius (*Hær.* I. i. 6) says the Jews have it, but regard it as of doubtful authenticity. Jerome says (*Præf. in Proverbia*) 'apud Hebræos nusquam est.' In the Muratorian Canon it is said to have been written by Solomon's friends in his honour. It would seem then that its authenticity was assumed in the early Church, but that about the beginning of the 4th cent. its place in the Canon became insecure.

Nothing, it appears, is to be learned about it from the Jewish writers of the 1st cent., Philo and Josephus. To the former Solomon is 'one of Moses' disciples,' and the author of the Proverbs; he shows no acquaintance with the remarkable comments of Wisdom on the manna. Josephus (*Ant.* VIII. ii. 5) transcribes what is said of Solomon's works in Kings, and adds that he had left a collection of charms and spells whereby demons could be controlled; this, as we learn from Bab. *Gittin*, 68*a*, was ultimately based on an interpretation of Ec 2^{8}. The references to it in the Oral Tradition will be noticed in the next section.

2. The language.—Although the Greek, whence the remaining texts which we possess are in the main derived, is exceedingly ambitious and at times eloquent, the literary form of large portions (especially chs. 1–9) in which the Hebrew parallelism is observed indicates that Greek is not the original language in which the work was composed; for those Israelites who composed original works in Greek naturally adopted Hellenic literary styles, the tragedian Ezekiel (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* I. xxiii. 155) writing iambics, the Jewish Sibyl hexameters, and Josephus imitating Thucydides. Further, numerous passages display the irresponsibility of a translator. That the original language was Hebrew is made certain by the preservation in the Jewish Oral Tradition (*Genesis Rabba*, 96, and Jer. *Hagiga*, ii. 1) of a fragment which is clearly grossly mistranslated in $14^{10\mathrm{f}.}$, *καὶ γὰρ τὸ πραχθὲν σὺν τῷ δράσαντι κολασθήσεται· διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἐν εἰδώλοις ἐθνῶν ἐπισκοπὴ ἔσται*, 'for that which is done shall be punished with the doer; on this account there shall be a visitation also on the idols of the Gentiles,' where the first proposition is meaningless, while the attempt to give it a meaning in the AV, 'for that which was made shall be punished together with him that made it,' assigns to the two verbs *πράττειν* and *δρᾶν* a sense which they have in no Greek writing of any period,* and introduces a proposition which is very little better than the other. The true proposition is 'that which is worshipped (הנעבר) shall be punished together with the worshipper (העובר); wherefore he says "and against all the gods of Egypt I will execute judgements" (Ex 12^{12}).' The verb עבר in both Jewish and Christian Aramaic frequently represents the Greek *πράττειν*, and this sense of 'to do' is wrongly given it in the LXX of Dt 12^{30}; that the Greek of Wisdom is in this case a mistranslation of the maxim quoted by the Rabbis does not therefore admit of question. And, as the text occurs in the middle of a paragraph with which it is closely related, the inference drawn extends further than the actual verse.

---

* In 15^{6} *οἱ δρῶντες* means 'the doers,' but is a mistranslation of העושים, Ps 115^{8}.

The work is otherwise used by the Oral Tradition, yet perhaps not in such a way as to permit of any inference with regard to its language. In *Exodus Rabba*, 25, the manna is described as 'having in it all sorts of tastes, so that each Israelite was tasting what he wished'; this represents Wis 16^{20}, *πρὸς πᾶσαν ἡδονὴν ἰσχύοντα καὶ πρὸς πᾶσαν ἁρμόνιον γεῦσιν*, but the correspondence is not quite literal. In *Mechilta*, 13, on Ex 12^{30} (=*Pesikta*, 7) it is stated that, when the first-born of any Egyptian died, the father made an image of him, which he set up in his house; this comes from Wis 14^{15}, where it is suggested that idolatry thus arose, the intention being also to account for the apparent identification of the gods of Egypt with their first-born in Ex 12^{12}. The Oral Tradition employs it for a different purpose; if its phrase צר איקונין be the original of *εἰκόνα ποιήσας*, the language must have already been affected by Greek. In the Midrash *Tanchuma*, i. 79*b* (ed. Warsaw, 1879), the substance of 18^{4} is thus given: 'they [the Egyptians] thought to bind them [the Israelites] in the prison-house; He brought upon them the darkness.' In Bab. *Sanh.* 63*b* (end) the substance of $14^{12.\,13}$ is represented by 'the Israelites knew that the idols had no reality in them and only worshipped them in order to consummate unlawful unions,' though the correspondence may be accidental.

The text of 14^{22} appears to contain an indication of the language in which the book was written, but it is not easy to interpret. 'Moreover this was not enough for them that they erred in the knowledge of God; but whereas they live in a great war of ignorance, they call such great evils peace' (*τὰ τοσαῦτα κακὰ εἰρήνην προσαγορεύουσιν*). It is certain that the Greek word *εἰρήνη* is not a name for any idolatrous system; but the Hebrew phrase 'to call peace to' (ויקראו להם שלום, Jg 21^{13}; cf. Dt 20^{10}) means not to designate by the name 'peace,' but to invite to peace, or offer friendship to; and this is what the phrase appears to signify in the passage cited, since the justification of the proposition in what follows is that the idolaters keep on perpetrating various atrocities. The thought is then somewhat like 1^{16}.

The fact of the work being a translation accounts for the infelicity of many passages, in some of which the underlying Hebrew can be restored with certainty, *e.g.* 4^{18}, *ὄψονται καὶ ἐξουθενήσουσιν*, 'they shall see and despise,' where the context requires 'they shall see and pine away'; the original ימאסו, which signifies both, can be restored with certainty from Ps 112^{10}; in 13^{10}, 'or a useless stone, the work of an ancient hand,' 'useless' is the new-Hebrew sense of פסול, which should have been rendered 'carved.' The word 'hand' should probably have been 'monument,' which is another sense of the Hebrew word for 'hand.' In 3^{13}, *ἥτις οὐκ ἔγνω κοίτην ἐν παραπτώματι*, the last words probably stand for Hebrew בעול (as in Ezk 3^{20}, 18^{26}) and should have been rendered *γαμικήν*. In 12^{22}, *ἡμᾶς οὖν παιδεύων τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ἡμῶν ἐν μυριότητι μαστιγοῖς*, the sense required by the argument is 'in order to teach us Thou dost chastise our enemies with leniency'; *ἐν μυριότητι*, 'in ten-thousand-ness,' is apparently a mistranslation of some Hebrew word which seemed to be an abstract noun from רבוא or רבבה, but it is not clear what; possibly מרפא read מרבא, since these letters are confused in many scripts. In 19^{9} (of the Israelites in the bed of the Red Sea), *ὡς γὰρ ἵπποι ἐνεμήθησαν καὶ ὡς ἀμνοὶ διεσκίρτησαν*, 'they fed like horses and skipped like lambs,' the author clearly did not intend 'fed'; from Is 63^{13} as explained by Kimchi it would seem that the original had רצו, 'they ran' (used of horses in Jl 2^{4}, Am 6^{12}), misread רעו. Kimchi's words are, 'just like the horse which runs (הרץ) in the desert where there is no stone nor mud whereon he can stumble, so the Israelites were able to run (לרוץ) on that sea-bed.'

In many cases, however, the phrase employed shows clear signs of mistranslation, but restoration of the original is difficult; examples are 1^{16b} 'thinking him a friend they melted,' where the sense requires something like 'they summoned him'; 7^{4} 'I was reared in swaddling-clothes and cares'; 4^{19a} 'for he will break them voiceless prone'; 5^{7} 'we were filled (*ἐνεπλήσθημεν*) with the paths of lawlessness and destruction'; 12^{24b} 'thinking gods the despicable even among the beasts of the enemies'; 18^{3c} *ἥλιον δὲ ἀβλαβῆ φιλοτίμου ξενιτείας παρέσχες*. These last words are in any case a paraphrase of Ex 13^{22} 'and by night a pillar of fire to give light to them'; but by what process this has become 'a harmless sun of ambitious peregrination,' which appears to be an absolutely meaningless combination of words, is exceedingly obscure.

The notion that Greek is the original language of the book is probably due to its containing paragraphs which, both in style and in content, bear little resemblance to the OT. Against this we must set the fact that it is replete with Hebraisms (*e.g.* 9^{5} 'I am thy slave and the son of thine handmaid,' v.^{9} 'knowing what is pleasing in thine eyes, and straight [הישר] in thy commandments,' v.^{10b} 'send her from the throne of thy glory' [כסא כבודך, Jer 14^{21}], v.^{11c} 'and she shall guard me in her glory' [apparently a confusion of חדרה, 'her chamber,' with הדרה as in Sir 14^{27}]). It is most improbable that so ambitious a stylist as the person responsible for the Greek of this book would have admitted these idioms had his hands been free; but as a translator he could avoid them only with the greatest difficulty. Sometimes he takes the trouble, *e.g.* 5^{14d}, where *μνεία καταλύτου μονοημέρου* probably stands for Jeremiah's נטה ללון כארח (14^{8}) or something equally simple.

The general elaboration of the Greek makes it probable that the translation is far from faithful; and in a few cases references to Greek authors can be identified. In 18^{16} the Almighty Word which slew the first-born of the Egyptians is said to have 'touched heaven, while standing upon the earth,' *καὶ οὐρανοῦ μὲν ἥπτετο, βεβήκει δ' ἐπὶ γῆς*; the original of the phrase seems to be found in 1 Ch 21^{16}, where the destroying angel 'stands between heaven and earth'; yet the Greek of Wisdom may be influenced by the description of Strife in *Il.* iv. 443, *οὐρανῷ ἐστήριξε κάρη, καὶ ἐπὶ χθονὶ βαίνει.* The fragment preserved in the Oral Tradition indicates that the original did not exhibit the phenomenon which characterizes the Greek—complete absence of proper names. Thus in the latter the patriarchs and others are designated by such epithets as 'the just one,' 'the servant of the Lord,' 'the refugee from his brother's wrath,' the nearest approach to a proper name being the Red Sea, and Pentapolis, used of the cities of the Plain. The proper names Noah, Moses, Jacob, etc., are usually supplied by the Syriac version, which is (at any rate in the main) made from the Greek. The most probable explanation of their omission in the latter is a stylistic objection to the use of barbarous words in a Hellenic text. Josephus resorts where possible to such expedients as substituting 'Ægisthe' for 'Haggith,' 'Chalkeus' for 'Calcol,' in order to deal with this difficulty. Plato (*Critias*, 113A) explains how in his narrative Egyptians come to have Hellenic names; Solon had translated them! Even in the *Iliad* the Trojans with rare exceptions have Greek names owing to this sentiment.

3. Date and authorship.—The date of the Greek text can be fixed only by its relation to other books. There can be little doubt that it is quoted in the Pauline Epistles; yet this would not necessarily imply that it was earlier than Philo, to whose language and even style it occasionally shows some resemblance. So late a date, however, seems to be excluded by the fact that it appears to have been used by the LXX translator of Isaiah; for the rendering of Is 3[10], 'say of the righteous that it is well,' by *δήσωμεν τὸν δίκαιον ὅτι δύσχρηστος ἡμῖν ἐστιν*, 'let us bind the righteous because he is disagreeable to us,' is most easily explained as a reminiscence of Wis 2[12], *ἐνεδρεύσωμεν τὸν δίκαιον ὅτι δύσχρηστος ἡμῖν ἐστιν*, since on the one hand the adjective belongs to the choice vocabulary of the latter rather than to that of the Greek Isaiah, and on the other the substitution of the 1st for the 2nd person seems to require this explanation; for if אמרו had been merely misread אמרו, the 2nd person would have been retained. The same account is probably to be given of LXX Is 44[20] compared with Wis 15[10], while in 11[22] of the latter the substitution of 'a drop of morning dew descending to the earth' for 'a drop of a bucket' (Is 40[15]) makes it improbable that the Greek of Wisdom is borrowing from that of Isaiah. Since the LXX translation of Isaiah cannot well be later than 150 B.C., that of Wisdom should be somewhat earlier than that date.

On the other hand, it is probably later than the LXX translation of the Pentateuch, since it exhibits certain technicalities which are likely to have been introduced by that work, *e.g.* *ὁλοκαύτωμα*, *ποδήρης*, *ἐξιλασμός*, *χειροποίητον* for אליל, *βδελύγματα* for תועבת, etc. Yet where passages of the Pentateuch are reproduced the translator of Wisdom did not always consult the LXX, *e.g.* 18[6], *ἐκείνη ἡ νὺξ προεγνώσθη πατράσιν ἡμῶν* represents Ex 12[42], ליל שמורים הוא, where the LXX renders the words differently. In 16[21] the unintelligible *ἡ μὲν γὰρ ὑπόστασίς σου τὴν σὴν πρὸς τέκνα γλυκύτητα ἐνεφάνιζε* appears to treat the word לבן, 'white,' in Ex 16[31] as the Hebrew for 'to a son,' where the LXX renders the word correctly.

The character of the language is probably in agreement with the date thus indicated, *i.e.* about 200 B.C.

The relation of the original work to the books of the OT is very much more difficult to determine. Except for the statement of the author that he had been commanded by God to build the Temple in imitation of the Tabernacle (9[8]), wherein he clearly claims to be Solomon, its historical information scarcely goes beyond Numbers, the last event narrated being the plague described in Nu 17[9-15] (18[23]). There are, indeed, numerous cases in which the matter contained in Wisdom is parallel to passages in the other books of the OT; in some of these, if we could trust the canon that the author of a passage is the person who understands it best, we should certainly assign the priority to Wisdom. Thus in Dt 8[3] the lesson of the manna is said to have been 'that man does not live by bread alone, but by every utterance of the mouth of God'—an obscure proposition, since the manna is repeatedly called 'bread'; and even if it be admitted that the Deuteronomist does not allow it that title (29[6]), the 'utterance of the mouth of God' is far from clear. In Wis 16[26] the lesson is worded 'that the fruits which grow do not feed the man, but Thy word maintains them that trust in Thee,' and it is inferred from the fact that the nutritive power of the manna was dependent on the observation of certain precepts: collected in the morning, it would resist the heat of the oven; but the heat of the sun would melt it, etc. Hence the nutritive power must have lain in the observation of the precepts, not in the substance itself. Were there no other facts to be considered, we should naturally regard the text of Deuteronomy as a mis-statement of the passage of Wisdom.

Much the same is to be said of the description of the making of wooden images: Is 44[13-19] 40[20], compared with Wis 13[11-16]. In the latter the carpenter selects suitable timber * for some article of furniture, uses the chippings to cook his food, and, if some crooked and knotty piece remain which is of no use for either purpose, fashions it in his leisure into a god. In the account in Isaiah, 'half of it he burneth in the fire; on half of it he eateth flesh, he roasteth roast and is satisfied; yea he warmeth himself; and the residue thereof he maketh a god,' wherein apparently two parts of the timber are employed as firewood, and the remainder used for the idol—the important matter, that the primary object was a piece of furniture, the secondary firewood, being forgotten by the prophet, yet very clearly somehow in his mind. The fact that the idol so fashioned has then to be secured by a nail appears in its right place in Wis 13[15], whereas in Is 41[7] it is remembered, but is out of its right place; further, Is 41[6. 7] gives the appearance of being a confused reminiscence of Wis 15[9], where the potter is shown to be the most contemptible of all idol-makers, for, instead of reflecting that he is clay himself, he tries to rival the goldsmith and the worker in bronze.

Similarly, whereas, according to the author of the Book of Kings, Solomon was told in a dream to make a wish and chose wisdom, the account of the matter in this book is much less fantastic; he was, he says, a lad of great talent, and pursued the study with all his might, employing among other expedients prayer. In the prayer (9[7]) he says: 'Thou hast chosen me to be king of thy people, and judge of thy sons and daughters'; in Kings, in lieu of this modest description of his subjects, he calls them (1 K 3[8]) 'a great people, that cannot be numbered nor counted for multitude,' which in the Chronicles (2 Ch 1[9]) is improved to 'a people like the dust of the earth in multitude.' Here too sobriety is on the side of Wisdom.

Internal evidence then, at least to some extent, would be in favour of making Wisdom older than the OT books which contain these parallels; nor is it easy to charge the writer—on the supposition that the work is pseudonymous—with any actual anachronism; thus, whereas Philo gives as the list of his own accomplishments ('the handmaids of Wisdom,' ed. Mangey, i. 530) grammar, geometry, and music, those claimed for Solomon (7[17-20]) are 'to know how the world was made and the operation of the elements, the beginning, ending, and midst of the times (*i.e.* probably ancient, modern, and mediæval history), the alterations of the turnings (of the sun) and the change of seasons, the circuits of years and the position of stars, the natures of living creatures and the dispositions of beasts, the forces of the winds and the reasonings of men, the diversities of plants and the virtues of roots'—a list which shows little sign of Greek influence, but is much more suggestive of the learning of Egypt, Phœnicia, and Arabia. It may be observed that 'the operation of the elements,' *i.e.* the use to which substances can be put, is thought by many to be what is meant by knowledge of good and evil in Gn 3[5]. The most decided Hellenism in the book appears to be the Platonic tetrad of the virtues in 8[7], which, however, is likely (cf. the Syriac version) to be an introduction of the Greek editor. And, with regard to those ideas which are peculiarly Jewish, too little is known of the real history of the Israelitish mind to permit of any certain chronology of its products.

Besides this, it seems surprising that an author of such marked ability should employ a pseudonym, and in particular adopt the mask of Solomon, in whose mouth the fierce condemnation of idolatry is peculiarly inappropriate, whilst the attack on unlawful unions and their fruit is scarcely tolerable. On the other hand, it is undoubtedly true that the tone and style of many sections are suggestive of a date many centuries later than Solomon; side by side with passages which in sublimity are equal to the most striking parts of the prophecies and the Psalms, there are some which resemble the subtleties of the Midrash and the mechanical rhetoric of Philo. There is, however, the greatest difficulty in assigning any date to matters which come in these categories. Thus with regard to the definition of fear in 17^{12}, 'fear is nothing but the betrayal of the succours provided by the reasoning,' Goodrick (*ad loc.*) says: 'This sententious statement is probably direct from the lips of some Greek teacher in the schools of Alexandria.' He is, however, unable to quote any definition by Greek philosophers which remotely resembles it, and no author can be charged with borrowing until his source has been indicated. The sentence which follows in the Greek is so mistranslated as to be unintelligible.

---

* *εὐκίνητον φυτόν*, of which the original seems to be עץ נאה; *Exodus Rabba*, 15, in a similar context, misread נעה. The Armenian has this right, *phait geghetsik*.

It would seem then that, without a longer specimen of the original than the fragment preserved in the Midrash, location of the work is impossible.

4. Contents.—The work falls into three main divisions: (1) 1–6^{12}, addressed to rulers who are warned against tyranny on the ground of future judgment; this portion is entirely in verse of the Hebrew style; (2) 6^{12}–8^{21}, definitions of Wisdom and a brief autobiography; (3) 9–end, containing the author's prayer to the Divine Being, into which homilies on the early biblical history are inserted. In the two last sections verse and prose are mixed.

In all three parts the author expresses some remarkable views. The first is noteworthy for the account of the conspiracy to kill the Just Man by a shameful death, whose resurrection, however, brings confusion on the conspirators, who are now convinced that His claim to be the Son of God was no idle boast. This passage (2^{12}–5^{23}) seems closely related to Is 53, while some of the traits resemble the description of the fate of the Just Man in Plato's *Republic*, bk. ii.; it is, however, far nearer the Christian conception of the Passion than either of those passages, and appears to have been of great importance in the formation of that conception. When in Mt 27^{54} those who watch the portents that arose at the Crucifixion infer that 'this was the Son of God,' Wis 5^{17-23} would seem to furnish the argument.

In the second section the author gives an account of Wisdom so worded that the Greeks would without hesitation have identified her with their goddess Athene, who in the Homeric poems, as the early commentators observed, is the forethought, skill, and virtue of the characters. By entering from generation to generation into holy souls she reproduces friends of God and prophets. His theory, then, of prophecy is that afterwards formulated by Maximus of Tyre (*Dissert.* 13), according to whom it is an intensified form of knowledge; the person whose knowledge of the conditions is most thorough will best be able to foretell the result. Thus Wisdom is 'a radiation of eternal light, a stainless mirror of the divine activity, and an image of His goodness' (7^{26}). His idea of this 'radiation' is materialistic; it is a substance so fine as to be able to penetrate all other things, which it also excels in rapidity. In the long list of epithets whereby he endeavours to describe it (7^{22-24}), it is probable that each was intended to convey some feature, but, if the passage be a translation, we cannot always be sure that the sense has been given faithfully.

In the third section the author applies his theory of Wisdom to the national records, and is doubtless to some extent a rationalist; if, *e.g.*, Wisdom enabled Noah to save the human race from the Flood, the meaning is evidently that Noah possessed the knowledge which enabled him to foretell the catastrophe and devise means to escape it. And, indeed, when he asserts that Wisdom became a shade in the day and a star-flame at night (10^{17}) and brought 'them' through the Red Sea (v.^{18}), he very probably implies some Euhemeristic interpretation of the miracles. On the other hand, while apparently accepting the miraculous narratives, he endeavours to show the Divine wisdom which they involved. Comparison between the treatment meted out to the Canaanites and the Egyptians leads him to discuss pagan worships, which he attributes to intellectual feebleness; the most excusable are to his mind the various forms of nature-worship, the least excusable the cult of clay images. To idolatry he attributes all the vices, and dwells especially on its connexion with sexual immorality and infanticide. The work ends with powerful descriptions of various scenes of the Exodus, wherein the appropriateness of the punishments is especially emphasized.

5. Value of the work.—From the point of view of intellectual ability the work is incomparably superior to the rest of the Apocrypha; besides containing many brilliant aphorisms it displays a capacity for continuous and consistent thinking which is rare in Semitic products. As an expounder of Scripture the author exhibits great ability. We may notice his proof of man's potential immortality from the fact that in the story of creation everything is commanded 'to be'; there is no mention of a death-plant (whereas there is of a tree of life), and the sovereignty of the earth is given not to Hades but to man ($1^{13.\,14}$). The work was probably of the greatest importance in securing the early progress of Christianity. Of Scriptures showing 'that Christ ought to have suffered these things and enter into his glory' (Lk 24^{26}) there is none comparable in clearness with Wis 2–5, and the potency of this weapon in the hands of such controversialists as Hippolytus is probably what occasioned the loss of the book to the Synagogue. The Resurrection and the Final Judgment are taught with a clearness and certainty to which the OT offers no parallel. Further, Christian controversy with pagans would seem to have been directed by the discussion of idolatry which occupies chs. 13–15. In St. Paul's address to the Athenians the words (Ac 17^{27}) *ζητεῖν τὸν θεὸν εἰ ἄρα γε ψηλαφήσειαν αὐτὸν καὶ εὕροιεν* seem to be a reminiscence of *θεὸν ζητοῦντες καὶ θέλοντες εὑρεῖν* in the same context in Wis 13^{6}, and the words which follow in the address, *χρυσῷ ἢ ἀργύρῳ ἢ λίθῳ, χαράγματι τέχνης καὶ ἐνθυμήσεως ἀνθρώπου*, paraphrase what follows in Wisdom (13^{10}), *ἔργα χειρῶν ἀνθρώπων χρυσὸν καὶ ἄργυρον, τέχνης ἐμμελέτημα.* Further, the list of crimes which in Ro 1^{25-31} is said to be the result of idolatry appears to be a rearrangement of Wis 14^{23-28}. The notion of a spiritual Israel which is found in the Pauline Epistles is to some extent anticipated by, even if it be not actually based on, the theory of Wisdom that the righteous are the sons of God, and Israel are the righteous.

6. The text.—The variants of the Greek MSS are for the most part of slight importance, but in a few cases they suggest revision from a Hebrew original; so 10^{1} *ἐξείλατο*, MS 68 *ἐξέτεινεν*, perhaps הושיעה and הושיטה; 14^{16} *ἐφυλάχθη*, MSS 106, 261 *ὠνομάσθη*, perhaps נשמרה and נרשמה; 9^{9} *ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς*, MS 248 *ἐνώπιον*. Where the Greek is obscure, it is often difficult to decide whether this is due to mistranslation or corruption; such a case is 15^{18}, *καὶ τὰ ζῷα δὲ τὰ ἔχθιστα σέβονται· ἀνοίᾳ γὰρ συγκρινόμενα τῶν ἄλλων ἐστὶ χείρονα.*

Of the ancient versions the Peshitta Syriac, the Latin, and the Armenian are of some importance for the criticism of the text. The first of these appears to be made from the Greek, which it often seriously mistranslates; there are, however, passages where it offers what seems to be the sense intended by the author, where the Greek text misrepresents it—*e.g.* 8^{6}, for *εἰ δὲ φρόνησις ἐργάζεται* the Syriac offers 'if a man desires to do handicraft,' which is certainly more like what was meant. It seems doubtful whether in any case these varieties can convincingly be ascribed to the use of a Hebrew original. The Latin seems to have preserved a line lost in the Greek copies, 2^{8b}; in some places it shows curious agreement with the Syriac—*e.g.* 9^{17} 14^{19}, 'qui se assumpsit' for *τῷ κρατοῦντι*, which in Syriac is naturally represented in this way. The Armenian has some noteworthy renderings—*e.g.* 15^{7}, 'on the [potter's] wheel' for *ἐπίμοχθον*, which appears to be what was intended. The source of these is obscure.

LITERATURE.—The Commentary of A. T. S. Goodrick, London, 1913, in the *Oxford Church Bible Commentary*, supersedes its predecessors. See also E. Schürer, *HJP* II. iii. [Edinburgh, 1886] 230 ff.; F. Susemihl, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit*, Leipzig, 1891, ii. 621; W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutest. Zeitalter*^{2}, Berlin, 1906.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

WITCHCRAFT.—See DIVINATION.

WITNESS.—In confirmation of the gospel message the NT appeals to two kinds of witness, in themselves distinct, but serving the same end.

1. The human witness to Christ.—The primary business of the Apostles was to testify as eyewitnesses to the facts of the earthly life of Christ and above all to His resurrection. The ability to do this was the qualification demanded in the successor to Judas (Ac 1^{22}), and the ground on which the Apostles justified their claim to preach Jesus (Ac 2^{32} 3^{15} 5^{32} 10^{39}) and to speak with authority in the Church (1 P 5^{1}). This witness could be borne only by those who had been specially chosen to do so, and had been trained by personal communion with the risen Christ (Ac 10^{41}, 1 Jn 1^{2} 4^{14}). It is noticeable that St. Paul is careful to show that he had experienced this, though not in the same way as that in which it had been granted to the older apostles (Ac 22^{15}, 1 Co 9^{1}). It soon became clear that this witness must be given at the risk of liberty and life, and, though in the NT *μάρτυς* does not pass absolutely into the sense of 'martyr' (see MARTYR), yet in Rev. the *μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ*, in nearly every case, is connected with suffering (*e.g.* 1^{9} 6^{9} 20^{4}). In 1 Ti 6^{13} a like connexion of ideas is applied to our Lord Himself, who is said to have 'witnessed the good confession' before Pontius Pilate. A similar sense may attach to *μαρτύρων* in He 12^{1} if we regard the 'cloud of witnesses' as consisting of those who have already sealed their faith by suffering. But the word may here mean no more than interested onlookers watching those engaged in the warfare which they themselves have already accomplished.

2. The Divine Witness.—Throughout the apostolic writings runs the conviction that God is constantly witnessing in various ways to the truth of the gospel. In Ac 14^{3} 15^{8} miracles are taken to be the means by which the preaching of Christ among the Gentiles is so attested (cf. Gal 3^{5}). But it is chiefly through the work of the Holy Spirit that this witness is borne. This work is seen in the individual and in the Church. The hope that Christ has made us sons of God is converted into a certainty by the voice of the Divine Spirit speaking within us (Ro 8^{16}). In 1 Jn 5$^{6-11}$ the meaning of this witness is drawn out in fuller detail. Christ's coming was by water (baptism) and blood (the Cross). But these historic facts must be brought into personal relation with every life, or they have no reality for that life. It is the Holy Ghost who does this. He teaches every man to know that new life has come to him because Christ accepted His mission and died upon Calvary. 'There are three who bear witness, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood' (v.^{8}). This witness is Divine (v.^{9}); every one can test it in his own heart (v.^{10}); and it consists of the possession of eternal life through the Son (v.^{11}). But the witness of the Holy Spirit to Christ is not confined to this inward conviction. It appears also in the bestowal of charismatic gifts on the faithful (He 2^{4}), especially that of preaching, which exists only to testify to Jesus (Rev 19^{10}), and in the fulfilment by Christ of Scriptures in which the Spirit has spoken of Him (He 10^{15}; cf. 1 P 1^{11}).

The consistency with which the NT writers dwell upon this varied testimony of the Holy Spirit to Christ is remarkable. Modern preaching has not yet fully recovered this note, but there is an increasing sense of the need of it, and the results of evangelistic work, especially in the foreign mission field, are daily illustrating its meaning in the life of the Church.

LITERATURE.—H. B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the NT*, London, 1909; D. W. Forrest, *The Authority of Christ*, Edinburgh, 1906, ch. vii.

C. T. DIMONT.

WOE.—The word *οὐαί* (LXX equivalent for אוֹי and הוֹי) occurs freely in the LXX, in the *Book of Enoch* (esp. xciv., c.), and in the Gospels, but is found only twice in the Epistles (1 Co 9^{16}—'Woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel,' and Jude ^{11}, where a reference is made to the false teachers in the Church—'Woe unto them! for they went in the way of Cain,' *i.e.* as men in the wrong, entertaining a murderous hostility towards the lovers of truth. The idiom here is the familiar one of prophetic denunciation—'Woe be to.' The sense in 1 Co 9^{16} is 'Woe is mine,' *i.e.* 'Divine penalty awaits me').

In the Apocalypse, the word is used followed by the accusative in Rev 8^{13}. The solitary eagle flying across the sky cries with a great voice, 'Woe, woe, woe, for them that dwell on the earth' (the three-fold woe possibly corresponding to the three plagues yet to fall upon the earth). The idea here is hardly that of denunciation, but of ominous announcement. Similarly in Rev 12^{12} (where the accusative instead of the dative is again used)—'Alas for the earth and for the sea.' *οὐαί* introduces each section of the three-fold dirge of lamentation uttered by the mourners of fallen Babylon (Rev 18$^{10.\ 16.\ 19}$) and is followed by the nominative—the broken construction suggesting the emotion of the mourners.

οὐαί is used in Rev 9^{12} 11^{14} as a feminine substantive ('woe,' 'calamity') indicating the disasters following the blowing of the last three of the seven trumpets. The first woe is the plague of tormenting locusts; the second is the slaughter wrought by the fiery horses and their angel riders; the last is apparently the final overthrow of Satan and the completed destruction of the wicked in the drama of 12–20.

H. BULCOCK.

WOMAN.—The position of woman in any section or period of society is a recognized test of the contemporary level of morality and general enlightenment. Apostolic Christianity need not fear this test. In fact, the exaltation of womanhood is justly claimed as one of the best examples of what Christianity has done for the world. Doubtless this feature of its influence has often been exaggerated, either by painting too darkly the vices of paganism or by neglecting the actual limitations of historical Christianity. We must certainly beware lest we take the sixth Satire of Juvenal as descriptive of the character and conduct of women in general in the 1st cent. of the Roman Empire. 'At the worst, these vices infected only a comparatively small class, idle, luxurious, enervated by the slave system, depraved by the example of a vicious court. . . . Both the literature and the inscriptions of that age make us acquainted with a very different kind of woman' (S. Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*^{2}, p. 87). Nor must we forget that the just rights of married women were much more fully recognized by Roman law than by the ecclesiastical law which replaced it: 'it is by the tendency of their doctrines to keep alive and consolidate the former [proprietary disabilities of married females], that the expositors of the Canon Law have deeply injured civilisation' (H. S. Maine, *Ancient Law*, new ed., 1907, p. 163; cf. *EBr*^{11} xxviii. 783). J. Donaldson (one of the editors of the *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*) indeed went so far as to say that 'in the first three centuries I have not been able to see that Christianity had any favourable effect on the position of women, but, on the contrary, that it tended to lower their character and contract the range of their activity' (*CR* lvi. [1889] 433). So far as this somewhat questionable judgment is sound, it relates to the asceticism of the Church subsequent to the Apostolic Age. The Pauline 'asceticism' springs from a different source, *i.e.* the expectation of a rapidly approaching end to all earthly things. This is an important fact to remember, for the attitude of apostolic Christianity to woman is largely due to the interaction of two distinct principles—the fundamental Christian assertion of the intrinsic worth of human personality, and the eschatological foreshortening of the time, which could not fail to hinder the social application of the former principle.

1. The religious equality of woman with man before God is clearly asserted by Paul: 'as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ. There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus' (Gal 3$^{27.28}$). The mutual dependence of man and woman, and their common origin in God, teach that the male has no exclusive place 'in the Lord' (1 Co 11$^{11.12}$). This result of the evangelical evaluation of human nature (see art. MAN) lifts the Christian idea of woman clearly above that of the contemporary Judaism, which in several noticeable ways differentiated woman religiously from man (cf. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums*^{2}, p. 490 f.). The morning service of Judaism still retains the ancient thanksgiving: 'Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast not made me a woman' (*Authorised Daily Prayer Book*, p. 6). We naturally think of the 'Court of the Women' in the Temple, beyond which no woman might pass. 'Her work is to send her children to be taught in the synagogue: to attend to domestic concerns, and leave her husband free to study in the schools; to keep house for him till he returns' (C. Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*^{2}, Cambridge, 1897, p. 15). If such significant limitations as these are found in contemporary Judaism, notwithstanding the general humanity of its relationships and the intensity of the national religion, it need not surprise us to find no effective assertion of the religious equality of woman emanating from Roman patriotism or Greek philosophy. Plato, it is true, had argued that the *differentiæ* of sex ought not to constitute any barrier to the exercise of a woman's personal powers: 'None of the occupations which comprehend the ordering of a state belong to woman as woman, nor yet to man as man; but natural gifts are to be found here and there, in both sexes alike; and, so far as her nature is concerned, the woman is admissible to all pursuits as well as the man; though in all of them the woman is weaker than the man' (*Republic*, 455, Eng. tr.^{3} by J. Ll. Davies and D. J. Vaughan, London, 1906, p. 161 f.). But this theoretical judgment relates to social, not religious, equality. Probably the nearest parallel to the welcome given to woman in Christian worship could be found in the cults of Isis and Magna Mater, which became so popular in the early Christian centuries (not to be found in Mithraism; cf. F. Cumont, *Les Mystères de Mithra*^{3}, Brussels, 1913, p. 183). To the welcome which those cults gave to woman they owed no small measure of their success; by its deeper satisfaction of woman's needs Christianity was helped to win its victory over them. That there is much in the gospel of the Cross to appeal to the peculiar nature and temperament of woman needs no argument. There is some measure of truth in the assertion that 'the change from the heroic to the saintly ideal, from the ideal of Paganism to the ideal of Christianity, was a change from a type which was essentially male to one which was essentially feminine' (Lecky, *History of European Morals*^{8}, vol. ii. p. 362). But the full truth is seen rather in the perfect humanity of Christ; as F. W. Robertson has well said (*Sermons*, 2nd ser., London, 1875, p. 231): 'His heart had in it the blended qualities of both sexes. Our humanity is a whole made up of two opposite poles of character—the manly and the feminine.'

2. A larger life of social fellowship and service was thrown open to women by apostolic Christianity. The story of the primitive Church significantly begins with the inclusion of women in the apostolic meetings for prayer (Ac 1^{14}). Their presence and activity are clearly illustrated by the references to Tabitha (9^{36}), Mary the mother of John Mark (12^{12}), Lydia (16^{14}), Damaris (17^{34}), Priscilla (18^2). The story of Sapphira (5$^{7f.}$) implies the comparatively independent membership and responsibility of women within the Christian community. Priscilla illustrates their active evangelism (18^{26}). Attention is expressly called to the 'multitudes' of women converts added to the Church (5^{14}). The story of Thekla (*Acts of Paul and Thekla*, in F. C. Conybeare's *Monuments of Early Christianity*^{2}, London, 1896, pp. 61–88) doubtless rests on some historic basis. 'Thekla became the type of the female Christian teacher, preacher, and baptiser, and her story was quoted as early as the second century as a justification of the right of women to teach and to baptise' (W. M. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, London, 1893, p. 375). Clement of Rome, at the end of the century, refers to the sufferings endured by women under the Neronian persecution (*Ep. ad Cor.* i. 6). The spread of Christianity amongst women of high rank is probably exemplified in Pomponia Græcina (Tacitus, *Annals*, xiii. 32), the wife of Plautius, the conqueror of Britain. Another probable example is supplied by Domitilla (banished in A.D. 96), the niece of the Emperor Domitian (Dio Cassius, lxvii. 14).

The details of Church life which we gather from the Pauline Epistles, particularly as to the Church at Corinth, amply confirm what has been said (*e.g.* Ph 4$^{2.3}$, 1 Co 1^{11}; the numerous salutations to women in Ro 16). Paul speaks of Phœbe as a 'deaconess' of the Church at Cenchreæ (Ro 16^1), in terms that suggest her ability and will to give generous help to poorer Christians. The deaconesses of whom Pliny speaks, early in the 2nd cent. (*Ep.* x. 96), were slave girls. It is clear that women equally with men could be regarded as the organs of the prophetic spirit in the Corinthian Church (cf. Priscilla and Maximilla among the Montanists), since Paul desires that every woman praying or prophesying shall have her head veiled (1 Co 11^5). This is a corollary from the admission of women into the Church, since Christian fellowship is essentially constituted by the gift of the Spirit (Ro 8^{14}). To this proof of woman's religious equality with man there seems to be no necessary contradiction in the fact that Paul a little later (1 Co 14^{34}) forbids women to speak (λαλεῖν) in the churches (see, however, the Commentaries on this disputed passage); the contrast simply shows that the Spirit could over-ride ordinary social conventions (cf. the prophesying of the four daughters of Philip the evangelist, Ac 21^9; the virginity of these, as of the daughters named in 1 Co 7^{36}, does not yet constitute an 'order'). In the Pastoral Epistles we find a regular roll of 'widows' (see art. WIDOWS), who have provision made for them by the Church (1 Ti 5$^{3f.}$; cf. Ac 6^1 9$^{39.41}$). Thus Christianity met the physical needs of a class specially likely to suffer (cf. E. Renan, *Les Apôtres*, Paris, 1866, p. 122), as it met the spiritual needs of women in general.

3. The place of women in marriage gained a higher interpretation. The Greek world is characterized by the practical absence of family life in the best sense; the Greek wife lived in seclusion and ignorance. 'The courtesan was the one free woman of Athens' (Lecky, *op. cit.*, ii. 293). The Roman matron had indeed held a high place in the ancient Roman home, though she passed into the absolute legal power of her husband by the older type of religious marriage. Under the early Roman Empire, the position of married women was often one of social and legal independence (Friedländer, *Roman Life and Manners*, Eng. tr., i. 236), but this was the outcome of the newer type of marriage as a civil contract; its laxity of divorce and the break-up of the older family life show its peculiar perils. Roman morality, in fact, broke down, here as elsewhere, because it had not found its reinforcement and transfiguration in religion (cf. W. Warde Fowler, *The Religious Experience of the Roman People*, London, 1911, p. 466). It was in the identification of morality and religion that the strength of Judaism lay. The Jewish wife, it is true, held a legal position decidedly inferior to that of the husband. But the relationship was redeemed by the quality of the humanity which was so typical a product of the OT religion. Consequently, the family life of the Hebrew-Jewish people, in some measure, prepared for the applications of the principle of woman's religious equality made by apostolic Christianity (cf. the fine portrait of the 'virtuous woman' in Pr 31$^{10f.}$). What these were may be seen from Paul's statement of the mutual relationship of husband and wife (Eph 5$^{22-33}$). Not only is the spirit of that relationship to be the new law of love, but the relationship itself is made sacramental by its comparison with that existing between Christ and the Church. We can hardly exaggerate the gulf that separates this idea of marriage from that in which the relationship is primarily physical. Indeed, the religious disabilities of women seem to rest, at least in part, on primitive sexual tabus (cf. W. Robertson Smith, *The Religion of the Semites*^{2}, London, 1894, pp. 299 n., 379 n.; A. E. Crawley, *The Mystic Rose*, London, 1902, p. 52). Christianity, in principle, if not always in practice, has lifted woman above the sexual level, at which her chief *raison d'être* is the gratification of man's passions, and has joined her personality to his, as contributory to a common social life. Marriage is to be held in honour among all (He 13^4; cf. 1 Ti 4^3). Paul, indeed, prefers celibacy because of the peculiar conditions of the time (*i.e.* on eschatological grounds). But he recognizes both the innocence of the sexual tie and the equal claims of the man and the woman in regard to it (1 Co 7$^{3f.}$)—surely a disproof of any 'asceticism' in the ordinary sense of the word. The emphasis on chastity (6$^{13f.}$, Eph 5^3), so characteristic of early Christian ethics, is based on the principle that the body is the temple of the Holy Spirit (1 Co 6^{19}); the condemnation of extra-marital sexual relationships is the natural complement of the attitude to marriage itself (1 Th 4^4). The moral tie that unites the Christian even to an unbelieving partner is fully recognized (1 Co 7$^{12f.}$); the unbelieving husband may be won by the conduct of the Christian wife (1 P 3^1), which is a better adornment than that of outward apparel (v.$^{3f.}$; cf. 1 Ti 2^9). The ideals of Christianity in the 1st cent. in regard to womanly conduct are well summarized in the exhortation of Clement of Rome: 'Let us guide our women toward that which is good: let them show forth their lovely disposition of purity; let them prove their sincere affection of gentleness; let them make manifest the moderation of their tongue through their silence; let them show their love, not in factious preferences but without partiality towards all them that fear God, in holiness' (*ad Cor.* xxi. 7, *The Apostolic Fathers*, tr. J. B. Lightfoot, London, 1891; cf. Tit 2$^{3f.}$).

4. The limitations of apostolic Christianity in regard to women were such as were inevitable from its historical origin and eschatological outlook. The Jewish training of Paul, for example, accounts for much in his attitude, such as the argument that women should be veiled 'because of the angels' (1 Co 11^{10}). The expectation of a speedy end largely explains his preference of celibacy to marriage (7^7; cf. Rev 14^4), which is certainly not due to his Judaism (cf. Bousset, *op. cit.*, p. 493). The asceticism of Paul must be ascribed to a cause different from and more innocent than the dualistic (Greek) asceticism of the later Church. Naturally, some of the premisses in the NT arguments for woman's subjection to man no longer appeal to us, even if the conclusion does (*e.g.* 1 Ti 2$^{12f.}$). Westermarck's criticism of this ultimately Jewish emphasis on woman's subjection to man, as being 'agreeable to the selfishness of men' (*Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, i. 654), ignores the atmosphere which redeems it, *i.e.* its moral and religious interpretation in the Christianity of the NT. We should rather recognize, as Dobschütz does (*Christian Life in the Primitive Church*, p. 377) in regard to Paul's asceticism, that 'Christ triumphs in him over the spirit of the age.'

LITERATURE.—L. Friedländer, *Sittengeschichte Roms*^{8}, Leipzig, 1910, *Roman Life and Manners*, Eng. tr. of 7th ed., 3 vols., London, 1908–09, vol. i. ch. v.; W. E. H. Lecky, *History of European Morals*^{8}, 2 vols., do., 1888, ii. 275–372; C. L. Brace, *Gesta Christi*, do., 1882, bk. i. chs. iii., iv.; R. S. Storrs, *The Divine Origin of Christianity*, do., 1885, pp. 146 f., 466 f.; C. von Weizsäcker, *Das apostolische Zeitalter der christlichen Kirche*, Freiburg i. B., 1886, Eng. tr., *The Apostolic Age*, 2 vols., London, 1895, bk. v. ch. iii. § 7; J. Donaldson, 'The Position of Women among the Early Christians,' *CR* lvi. [1889] 433; J. Gottschick, 'Ehe, christliche,' in *PRE*^{3} v. 182 f.; W. F. Adeney, art. 'Woman,' in *HDB* iv. 933–936; E. von Dobschütz, *Die urchristliehe Gemeinde*, Leipzig, 1902, Eng. tr., *Christian Life in the Primitive Church*, London, 1904; A. Harnack, *Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums*^{2}, Leipzig, 1906, Eng. tr., *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity*^{2}, 2 vols., London, 1908, vol. ii. ch. ii. § 4 (best survey of the data); S. Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*^{2}, do., 1905; J. McCabe, *The Religion of Woman*, do., 1905 (attacks the Christian claims); W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutest. Zeitalter*^{2}, Berlin, 1906; E. Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, i. [London, 1906] ch. xxvi., ii. [do., 1908] ch. xl.; T. G. Tucker, *Life in the Roman World of Nero and St. Paul*, do., 1910, ch. xvi.; A. Robertson and A

Plummer, *ICC*, '1 Corinthians,' Edinburgh, 1911, pp. 130–162, 230–236, 324–328; C. Clemen, *Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources*, Edinburgh, 1912, Index, *s.v.* 'Woman'; W. M. Ramsay, *The Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day*, London, 1913, sect. xlv., 'The Family in the Teaching of Paul.'

H. WHEELER ROBINSON.

WONDER.—See MIRACLES, SIGN.

WOOL (ἔριον).—The two passages in which wool is mentioned in the NT (He 9^{19}, Rev 1^{14}) call for little comment. In He 9^{19} the writer alludes to the symbolic and ceremonial use of scarlet wool in the Mosaic ritual, while in Rev 1^{14} the hair of the Son of Man is compared to white wool. White wool, here as elsewhere (cf. Ps 147^{16}, Is 1^{18}, Dn 7^{9}), is the emblem of purity. St. John clearly has in view the *locus classicus*, Dn 7^{9}, where, however, the white hair belongs to the Ancient of Days. The transference of the metaphor to the Son of Man is noteworthy, in view of the strict adherence to Daniel's account in the Apocrypha (cf. *Enoch*, xlvi. 1).

Wool has always been an important article of commerce in Syria. In early days the sole measure of a man's wealth was the number of flocks and herds in his possession. Among these the sheep was the most important and was valued especially for its wool. At a time when silk was unknown and flax was scarce and hardly obtainable out of Egypt, wool formed the principal material for clothing. The region of Gilead, Moab, and Ammon was pre-eminently the land of sheep-pasture as it is to-day.

LITERATURE.—H. B. Tristram, *Natural History of the Bible*^{10}, London, 1911, p. 133 ff.; W. M. Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, new ed., do., 1910, p. 313; J. C. Geikie, *The Holy Land and the Bible*, do., 1903, pp. 12, 81–84; R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, Oxford, 1893, p. 127; B. F. Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*^{2}, London, 1892, p. 267 f.; H. B. Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*^{2}, do., 1907, p. 16; *SDB*, p. 977; *HDB* iv. 937; *EBi* iv. 5353.

P. S. P. HANDCOCK.

WORD.—The English substantive 'word' is used in the RV to translate two Greek originals, λόγος and ῥῆμα. Of these λόγος is by far the more common, occurring 194 times in the NT, excluding the Gospels. In 153 of these it is translated 'word'; in the remainder it has a rather wider significance, *e.g.* 'treatise' (Ac 1^{1}), 'matter,' 'reason,' or 'account' (Ac 8^{21} 10^{29} 15^{6} 18^{14} $19^{38.\ 40}$ 20^{24}, Ro 14^{12}, Ph $4^{15.\ 17}$, He 4^{12} 13^{7}, 1 P 3^{15} 4^{5}). It is used generally to mean 'speech' or 'utterance' (Ac 14^{12} 20^{2}, 1 Co 1^{5} $2^{1.\ 4}$ 14^{9}, 2 Co 8^{7} 10^{10} 11^{6}, Eph 4^{29} 6^{19}, Col 4^{6}). In Ac 11^{22} it is translated 'report,' in Col 2^{23} 'show' (*i.e.* 'pretext'). In Ac 6^{5} 7^{29}, 1 Co 15^{54}, 1 Ti 1^{15} 3^{1} 4^{9}, 2 Ti 2^{11}, Tit 3^{8} it is translated 'saying.' In the last five of these passages the phrase is the same, 'faithful is the saying' (πιστὸς ὁ λόγος), which seems to refer to a quotation from a Christian hymn or from some recognized liturgical formula.

Clement uses λόγος 11 times. In 9 of the passages it is simply equivalent to 'word' in the ordinary sense. But he twice introduces a quotation from the OT with the phrase 'For the holy λόγος says' (*ad Cor.* 13, 56), and there the sense seems to approach closely to that attached to the word in the quotations from the Pastoral Epistles given above, *i.e.* a statement of recognized authority.

λόγος is found three times in the *Didache* and twice in the *Epistle of Barnabas*. But in neither of these writings is it employed in any way which cannot be paralleled from the NT.

Ignatius has it three times (*Magn.* viii., *Rom.* ii., *Smyrn.* inscr.). In the first of these he refers to our Lord as the Word of God; in the second he calls himself a 'Word of God,' meaning that his life and death are a testimony which is not to be interfered with by his friends. He greets the church of Smyrna as being 'in the Word of God,' where the λόγος is conceived as the inward monitor which directs the Christian's life (cf. J. B. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, pt. ii. [1889] vol. ii. p. 288).

Outside the Gospels ῥῆμα is found only in 29 passages of the NT, 14 of these being in Acts. It is always translated 'word' in the RV except in Ac 5^{32} ('things') and 10^{37} ('saying'). Of the 15 passages in which it occurs elsewhere six are quotations from the OT. It is used once by Clement (*ad Cor.* 30) in a quotation from Job $11^{2.\ 3}$. It is not found in the *Didache*, *Ep. Barn.*, or Ignatius. There is nothing in its use by the NT writers which calls for special comment.

In many passages of the NT no special significance attaches to λόγος. It means simply 'that which is said.' But 'the Word,' or 'the Word of God,' or 'the Word of the Lord' is frequently used in a semi-technical sense for the content of the message which the Church is charged to deliver. Thus in Ac 4^{29} the infant Church prays for courage to speak 'thy word' with boldness in the face of persecution. In Ac 6^{2} the apostles refuse to forsake 'the word of God' to serve tables. After the appointment of the deacons 'the word of God increased.' It is unnecessary to multiply examples of this usage. In Ac 16^{36} λόγος is used of the message sent by the magistrates at Philippi to St. Paul's jailer. We find it combined with a number of different substantives: *e.g.* 'grace' (Ac 14^{3} 20^{32}), 'exhortation' (Ac 13^{15}, He 13^{22}), 'salvation' (Ac 13^{26}), 'promise' (Ro 9^{9}), 'the Cross,' *i.e.* the gospel of the Crucified Saviour (1 Co 1^{18}), 'wisdom and knowledge' (1 Co 12^{8}), 'truth' (2 Co 6^{7}, Eph 1^{13}, Col 1^{5}, 2 Ti 2^{15}, Ja 1^{18}), 'the word of Christ' (Col 3^{16}), 'life' (Ph 2^{16}, 1 Jn 1^{1}), 'hearing' (He 4^{2}), 'righteousness' (5^{13}), 'oath' (7^{28}), 'prophecy' (Rev 1^{3} $22^{7.\ 9.\ 10.\ 18.\ 19}$; cf. the προφητικὸς λόγος of 2 P 1^{19}), 'patience' (Rev 3^{10}), 'testimony' (12^{11}). 'Word' is contrasted with 'power' or 'reality' in 1 Co 4^{20}, 2 Co 10^{11}, Col 3^{17}, 1 Th 1^{5}, 1 Jn 3^{18}. This distinction is common in writers of the classical period, *e.g.* Thucydides.

In most of these passages the meaning is a spoken message. The content is not precisely defined, and might vary a good deal from time to time. But λόγος is also applied to written documents. Thus the mention of the 'word of promise' in Ro 9^{9} is followed by a quotation of the angels' pledge to Abraham (Gn 18^{10}). In 2 P 1^{19} the whole corpus of the prophetic writings is summed up as the prophetic λόγος. In Gal 5^{14} the whole Law is said to be summed up in one λόγος, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' In 2 Ti 1^{13} the 'pattern of sound words' which the Apostle exhorts Timothy to hold may be presumed to be some definite doctrinal statement, of the nature of a creed. In Rev 22 the phrase 'the words of the prophecy of this book' occurs 4 times, 'the words of this book' once, meaning the exact text which the writer has just completed. Thus as a rule 'word' in the NT means rather more than in current English. But the meaning is sometimes narrowed to the one customary among ourselves.

λόγος is personal in two passages in the apostolic writings: 1 Jn 1^{1}, where the author speaks of having seen and handled the Word of life; and Rev 19^{13}, where it is said that the name of the crowned heavenly horseman 'is called The Word of God.' But any discussion of the Johannine Logos-doctrine lies outside the scope of this article.

In He 4^{12} ('For the word of God is living, and active,' etc.) there is perhaps a slight approach towards a personification of the spoken or written Word. There is a somewhat similar metaphorical use of ῥῆμα in Eph 6^{17} ('Take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God').

R. H. MALDEN.

WORK.—This article deals with the special sense in which the word is employed in the NT of the office of the preacher of the gospel. (For other senses see BUSINESS, LABOUR.) Popular opinion tends to regard spiritual ministry as the spontaneous activity of a certain temperament requiring no particular effort. The teaching of the NT directly contradicts this notion. It declares that it is only by systematic and severe labour that we can win men for God. This is borne out by the terms used in the apostolic writings. In the Fourth Gospel we hear the Lord speaking of the fulfilling of the 'work' which He had been sent to accomplish (Jn 17^4). This word (ἔργον) was taken up by the Church and applied to the task set before its evangelists. The mission entrusted to Saul and Barnabas is described as 'the work' to which they received a vocation from the Holy Spirit (Ac 13^2; cf. 14^{26}).

In the Pauline Epistles this work is said to be 'the work of the Lord,' *i.e.* the definite service which Christ lays upon believers of proclaiming the gospel. All the faithful are called to this. The special charismata of some are bestowed in order that they may be used for 'the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering' (Eph 4^{12}). Abundant activity in this office follows a firm belief in the Resurrection (1 Co 15^{58}). In 1 Co 3^{10-17} the 'work' is likened to a building which must be built so as to stand the test of the fire of judgment. It is therefore natural to speak of the Christian minister as the *ἐργάτης* whose ideal is to produce nothing which will shame him (2 Ti 2^{15}). The dignity of his vocation is expressed in the highest terms when he is named a 'fellow-worker with God' (1 Co 3^9, 2 Co 6^1; cf. 1 Th 3^2 RVm). The spirit in which the work is to be done is denoted by another word, *κόπος*, which is 'almost a technical word for Christian work' (H. B. Swete, *Apocalypse*, London, 1907, p. 25), and signifies the weariness which attends the effort required of those who undertake this work. It suggests the idea of an athlete undergoing great fatigue (see J. B. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, London, 1891, p. 161). With its cognate verb St. Paul uses it in this connexion some twenty times. The leaders of the Church are distinguished by it (1 Th 5^{12}). It must be endured by those who would be teachers of the Word (1 Ti 5^{17}). The Apostle himself had experienced it to the full (1 Co 15^{10}, 2 Co 11^{23}).

LITERATURE.—A. W. Robinson, *Co-operation with God*, London, 1908.

C. T. DIMONT.

WORLD.—The conception of the world in the apostolic writings is one of much complexity. Its content is derived partly from the OT, partly from later Judaism; but it has also assimilated an important element from Greek thought, and the peculiar experience of early Christianity has added to it a sinister significance of its own. Thus the various synonyms by which it is expressed reveal so many narrowly differentiated senses in each, and also shade off into each other in such a way, that a delicate problem for exact exegesis is often created. The three terms chiefly to be considered are *η οἰκουμένη*, *ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος*, and *ὁ κόσμος*, which in their proper significance denote the world respectively as a place, a period, and a system.

1. The spatial conception of the world.—The spatial conception of the world as the *orbis terrarum*, the comprehensive abode of man and scene of human life, is rendered in the OT by אֶרֶץ and its more poetical synonym תֵּבֵל, which in the LXX are translated, the former by *γῆ*, the latter by *οἰκουμένη* (*vice versa* in a few passages in Isaiah). In the apostolic writings *γῆ* is retained in this sense in quotations from the LXX (*e.g.* Ac 2^{19}, Ro 9^{17}, He 1^{10}), also in Ac 17^{26}, Ja 5^5, and frequently in the Apocalypse ($1^{5.7}$ 3^{10}; etc.). The more distinctive term is *ἡ οἰκουμένη* (*sc. γῆ*). Originally it was used, with racial self-consciousness, to signify the territorial extent of Greek life and civilization (Herod. iv. 110); but after the conquests of Alexander, and in consequence of the same unifying influences as those by which the Greek dialects were merged in the *κοινή*, it came to express a view and feeling of the inhabited world as overpassing all national distinctions and boundaries. Later, when the rule of the Cæsars seemed to be practically co-extensive with the habitable earth, it acquired a more special sense—the Empire as a territorial unity (*e.g.* Lk 2^1); but in the apostolic writings it has the larger significance, the world-wide abode of man (Ac 11^{28} 17^6, and 19^{27} by passionate exaggeration, 24^5, Ro 10^{18}, Rev 3^{10} 16^{14}), or, by a natural transition, mankind (Ac 17^{31}, Rev 12^9). As an example of the elasticity which characterizes the use of these terms, it may be noted that to express the same thought of the world-wide field for the dissemination of the gospel St. Paul prefers *κόσμος* (Ro 1^8, Col 1^6); and that, on the contrary, the writer of Hebrews gives to *οἰκουμένη* the proper significance both of *κόσμος*, the 'terrestrial order' (1^6), and of *αἰών* (cf. the unique *τὴν μέλλουσαν οἰκουμένην* of 2^5 and *μέλλοντος αἰῶνος*, 6^5).

2. The temporal conception of the world.—The temporal conception of the world as a *sæculum*, a cycle of history, complete within itself yet related to a before and an after, is distinctively expressed by *αἰών*, or in contrast with the 'world to come,' as actually it always is, by *ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος* (1 Co 1^{20} $2^{6.7.8}$ 3^{18}, 2 Co 4^4, Eph 1^{21}; variants, *ὁ ἐνεστὼς αἰών*, Gal 1^4; *ὁ αἰὼν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*, Eph 2^2; *ὁ νῦν αἰών*, 1 Ti 6^{17}, 2 Ti 4^{10}, Tit 2^{12}; *ὁ νῦν καιρός*, Ro 3^{26} 8^{18}).

The use of עוֹלָם in this sense, as denoting the present order of existence, does not occur in the OT (Ec 3^{11}?), but is characteristic of later Hebraism, the contrast between the two 'æons' (עוֹלָם הַזֶּה, עוֹלָם הַבָּא) being an essential feature in the Apocalyptic view of history. Dalman remarks upon the absence of evidence for this form of expression in any extant pre-Christian writing (*Words of Jesus*, p. 148); it occurs chiefly in the later parts of the *Baruch Apocalypse*, in *4 Ezra* (*e.g.* vi. 9, vii. 12, 13, viii. 1, 52), and the *Slavonic Enoch*. In Rabbinism (Dalman, p. 150) the earliest witnesses for the expression are Hillel and Jochanan ben Zakkai (fl. *c.* A.D. 80). The idea, however, is vouched for by earlier documents, *Enoch*, *Jubilees*, *Assumption of Moses* (see on the whole subject Bousset's *Religion des Judentums*^{2}, p. 278 ff.), and the frequency of its occurrence in the NT, with the assumption of its familiarity, seems to imply its popular currency (contrariwise, Dalman—'the expressions characterised the language of the learned rather than that of the people' [p. 151]).

But while *αἰὼν οὗτος* is primarily a time-concept, this world-age in contrast with the future age of the 'regeneration,' the temporal element tends to become secondary. The notion of a period of time (emphatic in 1 Co 7^{31}) is always implied; but the ruling idea approximates to that which properly belongs to the *κόσμος*, the organic system of terrestrial existence (*e.g.* in 1 Co 1^{20} *ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος* and *ὁ κόσμος* are parallel and synonymous). The opposition between the two 'æons' is qualitative even more than temporal: the one is 'evil' (Gal 1^4), under the dominion of the Devil (2 Co 4^4) and kindred spirits (1 Co $2^{6.8}$), a world of sin and death in contrast with that other eternal world of righteousness (2 P 3^{13}) and life. The two, indeed, are thought of as in a sense contemporaneous; the 'world to come' projects itself into the present; its 'powers' are already experienced by all in whom the Spirit of God dwells and the work of spiritual quickening and transformation is begun (He 6^5).

3. The world as an organic system.—The world as an organic system, a universe, is distinctively *ὁ κόσμος*.

The idea which underlies all the various uses of *κόσμος* is that of order or arrangement (as in the common Homeric phrases, *κατὰ κόσμον*='in an orderly manner'; *κατὰ κόσμον* *καθίζειν*=‘to sit in order’), and since the strongest impression of unvarying and reliable order in nature is given by the movement of the heavenly bodies, it was probably to this that the term was first applied in a more special sense. In classical Greek, while it is sometimes used with reference to the firmament above, and its sense is not anywhere restricted to the earth, so also in the LXX it translates צָבָא, the ‘host’ of heaven (in *Enoch* also, *κόσμος τῶν φωστήρων*, xx. 4), and elsewhere appears only in the sense of ‘ornament.’ Pythagoras is credited with having been the first to employ the word to express the philosophical conception of an ordered universe of being (Plutarch, *de Plac. Phil.* 886 B); and from the Pythagoræans it passed into the common vocabulary of philosophic poetry and speculation. Plato (*Gorgias*, 508 A) defines *κόσμος* in its widest extent, *οὐρανὸν καὶ γῆν καὶ θεοὺς καὶ ἀνθρώπους τὴν κοινωνίαν συνέχειν καὶ φιλίαν καὶ κοσμιότητα καὶ σωφροσύνην καὶ δικαιότητα, καὶ τὸ ὅλον τοῦτο διὰ ταῦτα κόσμον καλοῦσιν . . . οὐκ ἀκοσμίαν, οὐδὲ ἀκολασίαν.* In Stoicism the idea was further developed in a mystical and pantheistic fashion. The universe, the macrocosm, was conceived after the analogy of the microcosm, man. It was a *ζῷον ἔμψυχον καὶ λογικόν*; and as the human organism consists of a body and an animating soul, so God was the eternal world-soul animating and ruling the imperishable world-body. Through the influence especially of Posidonius, this conception of the Cosmos became widely influential in the Græco-Roman world (see P. Wendland, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur*, Tübingen, 1907, p. 84 ff.). In the OT there is neither term nor conception corresponding to the Hellenic *κόσμος* (yet cf. הַכֹּל, Jer 10^{16}, Ec 11^{5}); it is in Hellenistic compositions such as 2 Maccabees and the Book of Wisdom that they first appear in Judaism. In the latter the idea of the Cosmos is specially prominent. *ἡ σύστασις κόσμου* is formed by the word of God out of formless matter (1^{14} 7^{17} 11^{17}) and the ever-living Spirit of God is active in all things (12^{1}); Divine wisdom and beauty pervade the world in all its diverse parts, establishing all things by number, measure, and weight (7^{24} 8^{1} 11^{20}), and at the same time giving to human intelligence its power to apprehend the Divine ordering of all things ($7^{17\text{-}23}$ 8^{8}), a striking anticipation of Ro 1^{20}. In the same book there is another anticipation of NT usage, the employment, unknown to classical Greek, of *κόσμος* for the world of mankind, the human race as a unity. Thus Adam is described as *πρωτόπλαστος πατὴρ κόσμου* (10^{1}); a multitude of wise men is the salvation of the world (6^{24}), as the family of Noah was its hope (14^{6}).

Such indications of the penetration of Hellenic influences into Jewish thought explain, from a historical point of view, the use of *κόσμος*, both as term and as concept, in the apostolic writings. (*a*) Primarily the Cosmos is the *rerum natura*, the sum of terrestrial things, without moral reference. Occasionally the conception is simply this (1 Co 8^{4}, there is no such thing as an idol, *ἐν κόσμῳ*; 14^{10}, there are various kinds of sounds in it); but normally the thought of God as Creator of the Cosmos is expressed or implied (*e.g.* Ac 17^{24}, Ro 1^{20}, Eph 1^{4}, He 4^{3}).

The simple pictorial phrase, ‘the heaven and the earth,’ by which the OT expresses the idea of the visible creation as contrasted with the Creator, is still retained in the liturgical and rhetorical style (Ac 4^{24} 14^{15} 17^{24}), and for the sake of special emphasis (Eph 1^{10}, Ph 2^{10}, Col $1^{16.\,20}$, Rev 20^{11} 21^{1}). To the same effect Paul uses *ἡ κτίσις* (Ro $8^{19.\,20.\,21.\,22}$, Col 1^{15}; cf. 2 P 3^{4}, Rev 3^{14}), but more frequently *τὰ πάντα* (Ro 9^{5} 11^{36}, 1 Co 8^{6} 15^{28}, etc.; cf. He 1^{3} $2^{8.\,10}$ 3^{4}, Rev 4^{11}).

And when the Cosmos is defined as the ‘terrestrial order’ it is to be remembered that in the apostolic cosmology this includes the heavens with their inhabitants as well as the earth and mankind. The world created in the *πρωτότοκος* includes ‘all things in the heavens and upon the earth, visible and invisible’ (Col 1^{16}). ‘Heaven,’ in the popular sense of the word, the sphere of God’s immediate self-manifestation, the place of His Throne and Majesty on high (Col 3^{1}, He 1^{3}), the sphere from which Christ comes (1 Co 15^{47}) and to which He returns (Col 3^{1}), the kingdom of eternal light in which believers already have an inheritance (2 Co 5^{1}, Ph 3^{20}, Col 1^{12}), is ‘above all heavens’ (Eph 4^{10}). It does not belong to ‘this world’ or to ‘this age’. All else does. The heavens and the spiritual beings that dwell therein belong naturally and morally to the same cosmic system as the earth and its inhabitants (1 Co $2^{6.\,8}$ 4^{9} $6^{2.\,3}$ 11^{10}, Eph 2^{2} 6^{12}, Col $1^{16.\,20}$ $2^{8.\,20}$).

(*b*) Yet the immediate interest in the Cosmos lies in its relation to man as the physical environment of his life, and thus it naturally acquires the more limited significance of the terrestrial order in association with mankind—the world of human existence, into which sin comes (Ro $5^{12.\,13}$), into which Christ comes (1 Ti 1^{15}, He 10^{5}, 1 Jn 4^{9}), where He is believed on (1 Ti 3^{16}). (For Jewish parallels see Dalman, p. 173.) Hence also it easily comes to mean (as already in *Enoch* [see above]) mankind in general (1 Co 4^{13}, He 11^{38}); and, by further natural transitions, worldly possessions (1 Jn 3^{17}), and the whole complex of man’s secular activities and relationships (1 Co $7^{29\text{-}33}$).

More characteristically the word is used with moral implications more or less strong. In the majority of its occurrences the idea is coloured by the dark significance of the *αἰὼν οὗτος*. It is the present material order together with its inhabitants, both demonic and human, as lying under the power of evil, destitute of God’s Spirit and insensible to Divine influence—not merely profane and unchristian humanity, but the whole organism of existence which is alienated from God by sin. It has a spirit of its own (1 Co 2^{12}) which is antagonistic to the Spirit of God; a wisdom of its own ($1^{20.\,21}$) which is foolishness with God (3^{19}); a sorrow of its own (2 Co 7^{10}) which is opposite in character and effect to godly sorrow; its moral life is governed by the ‘prince of the power of the air’ (Eph 2^{12}; cf. 2 Co 4^{4}); physically it lies directly under the dominion of elemental powers (*στοιχεῖα*) hostile to man (Col $2^{8.\,20}$, Gal 4^{3}); the Christian is redeemed from it and inwardly no longer belongs to it (Gal 6^{14}, Col 2^{20}); its kingdoms finally become the Kingdom of God and of His Christ (Rev 11^{15}; cf. 1 Co 15^{28}, Eph 1^{10}, Col 1^{20}) in the new Cosmos which arises in its place (Rev 21^{1}).

But here, again, since the primary interest is in man and his salvation, the Cosmos naturally comes to mean the *human race* as under sin, and as the object of Christ’s redeeming and reconciling work (Ro $3^{10\text{-}19}$, 2 Co 5^{19}, 1 Jn 2^{2} 4^{14}). In the later apostolic writings, especially the Johannine, it takes on a still darker hue. It is not only the world of fallen sinful humanity; it is that portion of society, Jewish or Gentile, with its opinions, sentiments, and influences, which is definitely antagonistic to the Church and the Christian cause. It hates the people of Christ as Cain hated Abel (1 Jn $3^{12.\,13}$); its character and conduct are dominated by the ‘lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the vainglory of life’ (1 Jn 2^{16}), and are morally polluted (Ja 1^{27}, 2 P 2^{20}); it offers a fruitful field to anti-Christian teaching (1 Jn $4^{1.\,7}$, 2 Jn ^{7}); its friendship is incompatible with loyalty to God (Ja 4^{4}, 1 Jn 2^{15}).

For the sake of clearness the various uses of *κόσμος* may be thus tabulated, with the proviso that at certain points classification cannot be more than tentative.

(*a*) *κόσμος*=adornment (1 P 3^{3}).

(*b*)=(metaphorically) a universe (Ja 3^{6}).

(*c*)=*οἰκουμένη*, the world-wide abode of mankind (Ro 1^{8}, Col 1^{6}, 1 P 5^{9}).

(*d*)=the Gentile world in contrast with the elect people (Ro 4^{13} $11^{12.\,15}$).

(*e*)=the terrestrial order, without moral implication: simply as such (1 Co 8^{4} 14^{10}, Eph 2^{12} [?]), as related to the Creator (Ac 17^{24}, Ro 1^{20}, 1 Co 3^{22}, Eph 1^{4}, He 4^{3} 9^{26}, 1 P 1^{20}, 2 P 2^{5} 3^{6}, Rev 13^{8} 17^{8}).

(*f*)=the terrestrial order without moral reference, but as especially associated with humankind (Ro $5^{12.\,13}$, 1 Ti 1^{15} 3^{16} 6^{7}, He 10^{5}, 1 Jn 4^{9}), as associated with men and angels (1 Co 4^{9}), with the secular activities and relationships of men (1 Co $7^{31\text{-}34}$, 2 Co 1^{12} [?]).

(*g*)=mankind in general (1 Co 4^{13}, He 11^{38}).

(*h*)=material possessions (1 Jn 3^{17}).

(*i*)=the terrestrial order, together with its inhabitants as lying under the power of evil (1 Co $1^{20.\,21.\,27.\,28}$ 2^{12} 3^{19} 5^{10} 6^{2} 11^{32}, 2 Co 7^{10}, Gal 4^{3} 6^{14}, Eph 2^{2}, Col $2^{8.\,20}$, Ja 2^{5}, 1 Jn 4^{17}, Rev 11^{15}).

(*j*)=the human race as sinful and needing redemption (Ro $3^{6.\,19}$, 2 Co 5^{19}, 1 Jn 2^{2} 4^{14}).

(*k*)=human society as definitely hostile to Christ, the gospel, and the Church (He 11^{7}, Ja 1^{27} 4^{4}, 2 P 1^{4} 2^{20}, 1 Jn $2^{15.\,16.\,17}$ $3^{1.\,13}$ $4^{1.\,3.\,4.\,5.\,17}$ $5^{4.\,5.\,19}$, 2 Jn ^{7}).

To sum up, the world is an organic whole of being, a system (*συνέστηκεν*, Col 1^{17}) in which there is a complete interrelation of parts; having a transitory existence, beginning in time and in time coming to an end, an 'æon' within an encircling eternity; not self-originating but created; in the most ultimate sense God's world, because not only created but continually upheld and animated by Him (Ac 17^{28}); and not only God's world but Christ's, who mediatorially is the source of its existence and the active principle of its unity (*q.v.*). But while necessarily retaining its creaturely dependence on God and its natural unity, it has fallen as a whole under the dominion of moral and consequently of physical evil. Sin and death entered into the human Cosmos through the disobedience of our first father (Ro 5^{12}, 1 Co 15^{22}), but anterior to this, and in some causal relation to it, sin was existent in the angelic Cosmos (2 Co 11^{3}, 1 Ti 2^{14}, 2 P 2^{4}, 1 Jn 3^{8}), and from this source human sin is still inspired (2 Co 4^{4}, Eph 2^{2}, etc.). Into the speculative question of the origin of evil apostolic thought does not enter. It is enough that sin is not inherent in the Cosmos, but entered into it, and that therefore its presence there may come to an end. Christ has come into the Cosmos, directly into the world of mankind, and God is in Him reconciling it unto Himself. But the scope of Christ's redeeming work is destined to include the whole Cosmos in both its physical and its spiritual elements (Ro 8^{21}, Eph 1^{10}, Col 1^{20}, 1 Co 15^{24-28}). Yet this ultimate consummation will not be attained within the present æon. That must pass away through the fires of Divine judgment, before Christ is universally triumphant, and God is all in all.

This scheme of the world and its history inevitably leaves vast questions shrouded in mystery, and in its conception of the intermediate process by which nature is operated and governed it moves in regions of ideas which are remote from those of the modern mind. Yet essentially all that it endeavours to express in the terms of contemporary thought—that man is God's creature and child; that, therefore, the existing condition of human life is radically abnormal and sinfully wrong, yet is salvable by the sacrificial love of God in Christ; that the world is God's world, and that, therefore, its existing condition also is abnormal and cannot be otherwise regarded than as the correlate of sin; that it is a fruitful source of temptation to the evil tendencies in man but also a school of salutary discipline and a field of moral victory for those who seek the things that are above; and that, finally, a new and perfect environment is destined for the regenerate and perfected life—all this belongs to what is central and abiding in the Christian faith. See, further, art. WORLDLINESS.

LITERATURE.—V. H. Stanton, art. 'World' in *HDB*; A. Ritschl and J. Weiss, art. 'Welt' in *PRE*^{3}; H. Cremer, *Lexicon of NT Greek*^{3}, Edinburgh, 1880; commentaries, esp. J. Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief*^{9}, Tubingen, 1910 (particularly the note on $1^{19.\,20}$), and B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel according to St. John*, 2 vols., London, 1908, i. 64 ff.; W. Beyschlag, *NT Theology*, Eng. tr., 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1895, ii. 100–109; G. Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, Eng. tr., do., 1902, pp. 147–179; W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums*^{2}, Berlin, 1906, pp. 278–286; M. Dibelius, *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus*, Göttingen, 1909.

ROBERT LAW.

WORLDLINESS.—To elucidate the conception of worldliness in the apostolic writings, we must start from the primary truth that the world is God's world, His by creation and sustenance, by sovereign purpose and control (see artt. UNITY and WORLD). There is in those writings no hint of an absolute dualism and, consequently, none of an absolute principle of asceticism. Nothing is unclean of itself (Ro 14^{14}). Physical acts and enjoyments neither lie apart from the sphere of the moral life (as in the Gnostic conception of *τὸ ἀδιαφόρως ζῆν*) nor are they a mere clog and hindrance to it; on the contrary, they have an indispensable part in its development, furnishing occasion in the common daily life for the most effective exercise of the moral nature, in diligence (Eph 4^{28}) and self-restraint (1 Co 9^{25}), in unselfish consideration for others (1 Co 7^{3-5} 8^{13}, etc.), and in the sense of grateful dependence on God (Ro 14^{6}, 1 Co $10^{30.\,31}$, Eph 5^{20}, 1 Ti 4^{4}). Even where St. Paul's utterances, evoked by special emergencies and motives, might plausibly be construed in an opposite sense, his wider ethical doctrine repudiates such interpretation. If in a special situation he seems to deprecate and even disparage marriage and the family-life (1 Co $7^{1.\,7.\,8.\,28.\,40}$), he yet shows unrivalled insight into their ideal significance and their value for spiritual education (Eph 5^{22}-6^{9}). If he dreads anxious absorption in secular activities as incompatible with single-minded devotion to the Christian's spiritual calling (1 Co 7^{29-31}), on the other hand he sees in the earthly calling the sphere within which the spiritual is to be actually accomplished (1 Co 7^{20}, Eph 6^{5-9}, Col 3^{22}-4^{1}) and apart from which it cannot (1 Th $4^{11.\,12}$, Eph 4^{28}, Tit 3^{8}). He steadily asserts that the Christian must recognize the structure of society as based upon Divine purpose and take his place therein accordingly. While he is bound to exclude from intimacy those who are unsympathetic with his inner life (1 Co 5^{9}), he is by no means to hold aloof from ordinary intercourse with all sorts and conditions of men (1 Co 5^{10}), but here also is to find a field for that exercise of Christian principles and virtues (2 Co 1^{12}, Col $4^{5.\,6}$) by which he shall shine as a light in the world (Ph 2^{12}; cf. 1 P 2^{15} 3^{16}). And, though St. Paul waxes indignant at those who sued their fellow-Christians before heathen tribunals (1 Co $6^{1\mathrm{ff.}}$), he strongly maintains the Christian duty of loyal submission to constituted civil authority (Ro 13^{1-7}, 1 Ti 2^{1-3}, Tit 3^{1}; cf. 1 P 2^{13-17}). In a higher sense than to other men the world belongs to the Christian (1 Co 3^{22}), as a system of Divinely appointed duties and opportunities, all subservient to the education and development of Christian character—as that apprenticeship in doing the will of God which is most perfectly adapted to his present capabilities and needs (1 Co 7^{24}). This is not merely an end for which the world may be used, but the end for which it exists. All things are 'of God,' but we are 'unto him' (1 Co 8^{6}). It is not as by afterthought or special manipulation that 'to them that love God all things work together for good, even to them that are called according to his purpose' (Ro 8^{28}; cf. Eph 1^{4}). Christian character is not a by-product of the Cosmos, but its purposed, proper, and eternal end.

But the achievement of this end presupposes devotion to it as the absolute good. It implies that the personality thus environed is dominated by an active faith in God and the spiritual life, by an earnest endeavouring after the 'new man' both for oneself and for others. When these conditions are absent, when life in the world is not inspired by love to God, to the higher self, and to one's neighbour as oneself, it inevitably becomes 'worldly'; and even when these are present, worldliness is a danger still to be guarded against. The terrestrial environment appeals *directly* not to the spiritual but to the psychical and animal nature, and where, as even in the Christian, life is not entirely emancipated from the bias of sin, where higher and lower elements mingle and contend, there is necessarily a tendency for the relatively good to displace the absolutely good; and if this tendency is not counteracted and overcome, the uses and enjoyments of the world—innocent in themselves and capable of being elevated to the higher range of values—become the means of chaining life to the lower.

The single passage in the apostolic writings that suggests a psychology of worldliness is 1 Jn 2^{16}, where its constituents are given as 'the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the vainglory of life.' Here it is seen that the world exerts its downward pull upon human nature principally in two ways: by the desire (ἐπιθυμία) it excites, and by the false confidence (ἀλαζονεία) it inspires.

(*a*) First, there is the desire 'of the flesh,' the appetite for physical gratification. The vulnerability of human nature on this side is strongly accentuated in the apostolic writings. The sensuality of the pagan world is the subject of unsparing indictment (Ro $1^{24ff.}$, 1 Co 6^{9-11}); but also of degenerate professors of the Christian faith St. Paul writes, even with tears, that their 'god is their belly' (Ph 3^{19}). The Epistles are full of warning against the tyranny of the senses and their attendant appetites (*e.g.* Ro 13^{13}, 1 Co $6^{12.13}$, Gal 5^{19-21}, Eph 5^{18}, Col 3^{5}, 1 Th $4^{4.5}$, 2 Ti 2^{22}, 1 P 2^{11}, 2 P 2^{18}). But a subtler appeal is to the desire 'of the eyes,' which brings a higher range of material interests into view. The outstanding example is, of course, the lust of possession—covetousness which is 'idolatry' (Col 3^{5}), a fruitful source of spiritual disaster (1 Ti 6^{9}), a root of all evil (6^{10}), and incompatible with inheritance in the Kingdom of God (Eph 5^{5}). Less widely destructive, yet harmful, are the lust of vain display in apparel and personal adornment (1 P 3^{3}); the lust of idle curiosity, the craving for continual novelty of intellectual sensation (Ac 17^{21}); the lust of pre-eminence (3 Jn ^{9}) and self-assertion, which produces strife and friction, ambitions and envious rivalry (1 Co $1^{10.11}$ $4^{6.7}$, 2 Co 12^{20}, Gal 5^{20}, Ph 2^{3}, Ja $3^{14.16}$ 4^{1-3}).

(*b*) The second chief element in the worldly temper is what St. John calls 'the vainglory of life'—the delusive satisfaction, the baseless sense of security (atheistic) or of superiority (egoistic) which the attainment of worldly desire engenders. Confidence in the stability of material conditions and circumstances and the security thence begotten take the place of trust in the living God and 'the peace that passeth all understanding.' Men presume upon the prolongation of life, and arrange their future without reference to the Divine will on which moment by moment their being depends (Ja 4^{13-15}), and thus more readily come to think of their life-work as the doing of their own will rather than God's. They make riches (1 Ti 6^{17}) their 'strong tower'; they regard the objects of their secular activities as the things that are solid and abiding (1 Co 7^{29-31}, 1 Jn 2^{18}); and thus throw away immortal powers upon what is fugitive and incidental, blind to the truth that the things which are seen and temporal are, in their proper purpose, only the bough that is meant to bear the fruit of things unseen and eternal (2 Co 4^{18}). And no less characteristic of the worldly mind are the uneasiness and distress consequent upon the lack of such sense of security: God-forgetting anxiety, painful and harmful as it is futile (Ph 4^{6}, 1 P 5^{7}); repining over worldly losses and disappointments, the 'sorrow of the world' that 'worketh death' (2 Co 7^{10}), reaching its climax in that sense of instability and vanity in all earthly things which, without its counterpoise of faith in spiritual reality, leads directly to the inverted worldliness of pessimism, and by rebound to cynical hedonism—'let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die' (1 Co 15^{32}).

Again, the 'vainglory of life' exhibits a form which is distinctively egotistical. Successful achievement, the possession of external wealth, or still more of personal gifts and qualities which are an object of desire and envy to others, produce a feeling and attitude of arrogant superiority towards one's fellows, and of self-idolatry in relation to God. The adulation of the populace is fatal to the worldly prince (Ac $12^{22.23}$); the rich are tempted to be 'highminded' (1 Ti 6^{17}); the consciousness of superior insight 'puffeth up' (1 Co 8^{1}) those in whom it is not united with love and a sense of love's responsibilities. Gifts, even of a religious kind (1 Co $1^{5.7}$), unless safeguarded by gratitude, become incitements to arrogance (1 Co $4^{7.8}$). And here also, the self-satisfaction which is produced by the sense of possession has its negative counterpart in the no less egotistical discontent and envy which are excited by the consciousness of defect (1 Ti 6^{4}, Tit 3^{3}, 1 Jn 3^{15}). Finally, this whole view of life, for which spiritual realities are non-existent, finds expression in the 'wisdom of this world' (1 Co 1^{20}, 'fleshly wisdom,' 2 Co 1^{12}), the wisdom whose furthest horizon is that of the present age (1 Co 2^{6}), which moves, however skilfully, only on the plane of material things and interests (τὰ ἐπίγεια φρονοῦντες, Ph 3^{19}), and which therefore inspires much self-sufficiency in men (1 Co 1^{20}), to which the Cross of Christ is foolishness (1 Co 1^{18}) but which is itself foolishness with God (1 Co 3^{19}).

As to the general conception, it would be a grave mistake to suppose that worldliness is due simply to the quick responsiveness of human nature to its terrestrial environment. Its sensitiveness to material stimulus is one element in the case; but the determining factor is its insensitiveness to the Divine. The problem of worldliness runs back into the wider and deeper problem of sin. Thus the NT writers see in human worldliness the replica of a type of mind previously existing in the spirit-world, and attribute it, in part at least, to this superhuman source. St. James describes its 'wisdom' as not only earthly and sensuous, but δαιμονιώδης (3^{15}). St. Paul identifies the 'wisdom of the present age' with the wisdom of its spirit-rulers, who in their blindness compassed the crucifixion of Christ (1 Co $2^{6.8}$), and ascribes to the 'god of this æon' the incapacity of men to perceive His Divine glory (2 Co 4^{4}; cf. 1 Jn 4^{3-6}). And this 'spirit of the world' (1 Co 2^{12}), blind to the truth of Christ and antagonistic to His cause, has its social embodiment in that section of mankind which in a more special sense is 'the world' (see art. WORLD). Hence arises a clear and concrete issue. The sincere Christian cannot love the world (1 Jn 2^{15}). It is the home of all opinions, sentiments, and influences which are most inimical to his convictions and aspirations. The programme it lays down for its devotees is wholly incompatible with self-denying love and holy obedience of the followers of Christ (Tit 2^{12}, 2 P 1^{4}, 1 Jn $2^{15.16}$). Its friendship is enmity with God (Ja 4^{4}).

Worldliness, as depicted in the apostolic writings, is not a natural and naïve materialism; it is the bondage to the material of a being who is essentially spiritual. Made for fellowship in the life that is Divine and eternal, man craves for satisfactions which the natural use and enjoyment of material good cannot yield; and these he therefore seeks in wanton excess and perversions of nature (Ro 1^{21-32}). The covetousness of those who have enough, the excesses of sensuality, the unappeasable hunger of vanity and ambition, the unceasing pursuit of excitement, envy, jealousy, the gnawing hatred of others' good—all show how the soul, deprived of its proper nutriment, vainly flies to the world for a substitute.

And as the root of the evil is man's unresponsiveness to the higher realities, there must the remedy be applied. The apostolic Epistles abound, indeed, in exhortation to the severance of all correspondences with the lower environment that are unnecessary, or are found in experience to be harmful. But always they find the one effectual antidote to worldliness in the quickening of the spiritual life by faith in Christ crucified, risen and victorious, and in the earnest pursuit of positive Christian ideals (Gal 6^{14}, Ro $12^{1.2}$ $13^{13.14}$, 1 Co 10^{31}, Gal 5^{16}, Eph $5^{1.2.18}$, Col $3^{1.2}$, 1 Ti 6^{11}, 1 Jn 5^{4}). ‘This is the victory that hath overcome the world, even our faith’ (1 Jn 5^{4}).

LITERATURE.—H. Bisseker, art. ‘Worldliness’ in *DCG*; A. Ritschl and J. Weiss, art. ‘Welt’ in *PRE*³; A. B. D. Alexander, *The Ethics of St. Paul*, Glasgow, 1910; R. Law, *The Tests of Life*³, Edinburgh, 1914, pp. 145 ff., 275 ff.; W. Alexander, *The Epistles of St. John*, London, 1889, pp. 136 ff., 149 ff.; Phillips Brooks, *Sermons*, do., 1879, p. 353 ff.; J. Foster, *Lectures*³, do., 1853, vol. i. p. 11 ff.; J. M. Gibbon, *Eternal Life*, do., 1890, p. 36 ff.; H. P. Liddon, *Easter in St. Paul's*, do., 1885, p. 253 ff.; A. Maclaren, *After the Resurrection*, do., 1902, p. 142 ff., *A Year's Ministry*, 1st ser., do., 1884, p. 85 ff.; J. Martineau, *Endeavours after the Christian Life*⁶, do., 1876, p. 439 ff.; J. H. Newman, *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, new ed., do., 1868, i. 215 ff.; F. W. Robertson, *Lectures on St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians*, new ed., do., 1873, p. 127 ff., *Sermons*, 3rd ser., new ed., do., 1876, pp. 15 ff., 169 ff.; T. G. Selby, *The Unheeding God*, do., 1899, p. 182 ff.; W. L. Watkinson, *The Blind Spot*, do., 1899, pp. 135 ff., 201 ff.

ROBERT LAW.

WORMWOOD (ἄψινθος).—The only passage in the NT in which ἄψινθος occurs is Rev 8^{11}. Wormwood is referred to several times in the OT, the Heb. word used being לַעֲנָה, but ἄψινθος is nowhere used in the LXX as its Greek equivalent. There is, however, no doubt that ‘wormwood’ is the correct translation of ἄψινθος (cf. Liddell and Scott, *s.v.*). The Heb. לַעֲנָה and its Arabic equivalent are both derived from a root meaning ‘to curse.’ It is nearly always associated with gall, the two together being apt emblems of sorrow and calamity by reason of the bitterness of their taste.

There are, according to Tristram, seven species of the *Artemisia* or wormwood, the *Artemisia absinthium* being the most common. They all have a bitter taste.

In Rev 8^{11} wormwood is not mixed with water but the third part of the water is turned into wormwood. The former operation would not necessarily be destructive of human life, whereas unmixed wormwood is represented as having that effect. Just as the creatures of the sea perished by reason of the burning mass cast into it (v.^{9}) so human life was destroyed by the conversion of the rivers and streams into wormwood.

LITERATURE.—H. B. Tristram, *Natural History of the Bible*¹⁰, London, 1911, p. 493, *Survey of Western Palestine*, do., 1884, p. 331; H. B. Swete, *Apocalypse of St. John*², do., 1907, p. 112; *EBi* iv. 5354 f.; *SDB*, p. 978; *HDB* iv. 940 f.; Murray's *DB*, p. 951.

P. S. P. HANDCOCK.

WORSHIP.—It has been well said that ‘for St. Paul and the members of the early Christian brotherhood the whole of life was a continuous worship, and the one great feature of that worship was prayer.’[*] If we use the word ‘prayer’ in the widest sense, as including praise as well as petition and intercession, the words agree with the opinion of Döllinger: ‘When the attention of a thinking heathen was directed to the new religion which was spreading in the Roman Empire, the thing to strike him as extraordinary would be that a religion of prayer was superseding the religion of ceremonies and invocations of gods; that it encouraged all, even the humblest and the most uneducated, to pray, or, in other words, to meditate and exercise the mind in self-scrutiny and contemplation of God.’[†] In that age many men who showed respect for the externals of worship doubted their efficacy and the very existence of the gods. The calm confidence of Christian believers in their faith, unseared by the superstitions which had brought them to scepticism, could not fail to impress thoughtful men. Inquiry revealed to them forms of worship in the Christian Church austere in their simplicity, but hallowed alike by their association with the sacred traditions of Jewish worship and by the vivid consciousness of the presence of God to whom they could draw near as their Father through Jesus Christ, their Saviour, in the power of His Holy Spirit poured out upon all flesh.

1. History of Christian worship.—The worship of the Apostolic Church followed the precedents both of the Temple and of the Synagogue. At first the Apostles were diligent in their attendance at the Temple (Ac 2^{46}), and the keen desire of St. Paul to keep the Feast at Jerusalem (20^{16}) shows that the services of Christian assemblies were as yet regarded as supplementary to the central worship at the shrine of Jewish devotion. From the Temple came eventually the gradual evolution of the liturgy which summed up in a central service the profound thought of the Epistle to the Hebrews on the sacrifice of Christ as fulfilling all the types of Jewish sacrifice. The visions of the Apocalypse fill in the picture of Christian worship in the Eucharist as the representation on earth of the worship of heaven.

‘These thoughts, though found in these books themselves, did not find expression till a later age.’[*] ‘Clement of Rome has the idea of Christ as “the high-priest of our offerings,” but the ideas of the heavenly Priesthood of our Lord, and the “Lamb standing as slain” of the Apocalypse, found only very isolated expression in liturgical prayers before the 4th century. Irenæus has the “heavenly altar” (iv. 18. 6) and Origen dwells on the High Priesthood of Christ (*de Oratione*, 10), but the Eucharist of pre-Nicene times moved rather in a simpler circle of ideas. It is in Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, and (in the West) Ambrose that we find these ideas developed. The earlier ideas seem derived not from the Temple and its associations but from the primitive idea of the “thankoffering” (*e.g.* εὐχαριστήσας of the Institution and the εὐχαριστία of Ignatius, Clement, and the *Didache*), together with the thought of the One Body of St. Paul; cf. again the *Didache* prayers. The “thankoffering” idea was expanded into the glorious eucharistic prayer found in its largest and fullest range in the liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions*. The idea of the One Body explains the emphasis and concentration of thought in the pre-Nicene prayers on “communion,” as opposed to worship of the Lamb standing as slain, which is the feature of the Greek liturgy from the time of Cyril of Jerusalem. And this “hieratic” element in Christian liturgy is much more marked in Greek-speaking lands than in the West.’

This somewhat lengthy quotation seems necessary to show how the ideas in the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse were eventually expanded. The immediate purpose of the Epistle to the Hebrews was on another line. When the blow fell and the Temple at Jerusalem was destroyed, the mind of the Jewish Christian Church was prepared for the catastrophe. In the meantime, development had taken place in the worship both of Jewish and of Gentile Christians in the house-churches to which their assemblies were of necessity confined.

We can distinguish two lines of development: (i.) meetings for edification; (ii.) for the Supper of the Lord, the breaking of bread, in which, at first, the Eucharist was combined with the Agape or ‘Love Feast’ (Jude ^{12}; cf. also 2 P 2^{13}). But, as Srawley points out, ‘the use of the term Agape, and the distinction between the Agape and the Eucharist, as applied to the conditions described in Acts and 1 Corinthians, are possibly anachronisms. As yet there was no sharp distinction between the two parts of the meal, such as took place when the specially eucharistic features assumed a more developed liturgical form.' *

---

[*] W. Warde Fowler, *The Religious Experience of the Roman People*, London, 1911, p. 468.

[†] J. J. I. Döllinger, *The First Age of Christianity and the Church*, Eng. tr., do., 1906, p. 344.

[*] J. H. Srawley, *The Early History of the Liturgy*, p. 240 ff.

Lindsay has described in a graphic way the meeting for edification in one of the Gentile churches founded by St. Paul.

> 'The brethren fill the body of the hall, the women sitting together, in all probability on the one side, and the men on the other; behind them are the inquirers; and behind them, clustering round the door, unbelievers, whom curiosity or some other motive has attracted, and who are welcomed to this meeting "for the Word."
>
> 'The service, and probably each part of the service, began with the benediction: "Grace be to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ," which was followed by an invocation of Jesus and the confession that He is Lord. One of the brethren began to pray; then another and another; one began the Lord's Prayer, and all joined; each prayer was followed by a hearty and fervent "Amen." Then a hymn was sung; then another and another, for several of the brethren have composed or selected hymns at home which they wish to be sung by the congregation. . . .
>
> 'After the hymns came reading from the Old Testament Scriptures,† and readings or recitations concerning the life and death, the sayings and deeds of Jesus. Then came the "instruction"—sober words for edification, based on what had been read, and coming either from the gift of "wisdom," or from that intuitive power of seeing into the heart of spiritual things which the apostle calls "knowledge." Then came the moment of greatest expectancy. It was the time for the prophets, men who believed themselves and were believed by their brethren to be specially taught by the Holy Spirit, to take part. They started forward, the gifted men, so eager to impart what had been given them, that sometimes two or more rose at once and spoke together;‡ and sometimes when one was speaking the message came to another, and he leapt to his feet,§ increasing the emotion and taking from the edification. When the prophets were silent, first one, then another, and sometimes two at once, began strange ejaculatory prayers, in sentences so rugged and disjointed that the audience for the most part could not understand, and had to wait till some of their number, who could follow the strange utterances, were ready to translate them into intelligible language.‖ Then followed the benediction: "The Grace of the Lord Jesus be with you all"; the "kiss of peace"; and the congregation dispersed. Sometimes during the meeting, at some part of the services, but oftenest when the prophets were speaking, there was a stir at the back of the room, and a heathen, who had been listening in careless curiosity or in barely concealed scorn, suddenly felt the sinful secrets of his own heart revealed to him, and pushing forward fell down at the feet of the speaker and made his confession, while the assembly raised the doxology: "Blessed be God, the Father of the Lord Jesus, for evermore. Amen."' ¶

The elements of such worship—prayer and praise and instruction—combined to make what Duchesne in a happy phrase calls 'a Liturgy of the Holy Ghost after the Liturgy of Christ, a true liturgy with a Real Presence and communion.' ** In one form or another they passed into the later offices, beginning with vigil services, then morning services, which combined to make what was known in later days as the Divine Office. These had their roots in the Synagogue services, but were distinguished by the new fervour which the gift of the Holy Spirit stamped upon them, so that while the keynote of the Synagogue service was instruction the new keynote was praise.

We may trace the same trend of thought in the Epistle to the Ephesians, regarded as a circular letter eminently calculated to raise the whole tone of worship. It is written from a point of view at which the Apostle feels free to pass away from the warnings needed by local churches and to rise into a higher region of emotion and thanksgiving.††

2. The Eucharist.—In 1 Co 11$^{20-34}$ the Eucharist seems to have followed the Agape. St. Paul writes of it as a well-known service (1 Co 10^{16}). Putting together the scattered hints in the Epistles along with the references in Clement of Rome and Justin Martyr, we may suppose that it followed a service such as that described above and that it always included the following elements: a prayer of thanksgiving (Lk 22^{19}, 1 Co 11^{24} 14^{16}, 1 Ti 2^{1}); the blessing of the bread and wine, with the recital of the words of Institution (1 Co 10^{16}, Mt 26$^{26-28}$, Mk 14$^{22-24}$, Lk 22$^{19-20}$, 1 Co 11^{23}); * prayers, remembering Christ's death (Lk 22^{19}, 1 Co 11$^{23.25.26}$); the people eat and drink the consecrated bread and wine (Mt 26$^{26.27}$, Mk 14$^{22.23}$, 1 Co 11$^{26-29}$). The evidence of the *Didache* is still in dispute. Some suppose that it contains prayers for the Agape rather than the Eucharist. In either case they are of interest and may be quoted here.

> 'Every Sunday of the Lord, having assembled together, break bread and give thanks, having confessed your sins, that your sacrifice be pure' (xiv. 1).
>
> 'Concerning the Thanksgiving, give thanks thus. First, for the cup: We give thanks to thee, our Father, for the holy vine of thy servant David, which thou hast shown us through thy servant Jesus. Glory to thee for ever. But for the broken (bread): We give thanks to thee, our Father, for the life and knowledge which thou hast shown us through thy servant Jesus. Glory to thee for ever. As this broken bread was scattered over the mountains, and has been gathered together and made one, so may thy Church be gathered from the ends of the earth into thy kingdom; for thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ for ever. But none is to eat or drink of your Thanksgiving except those who are baptized into the name of the Lord; for because of this the Lord said: Do not give the holy thing to dogs' (ix.).
>
> 'After ye are filled give thanks thus: We give thanks to thee, holy Father, for thy holy name which thou hast made to dwell in our hearts, and for the knowledge and faith and immortality which thou hast shown us through thy servant Jesus. Glory to thee for ever. Thou, Almighty Lord, hast created all things for thy name's sake and thou hast given food and drink to men for enjoyment that they might give thanks to thee. Above all we thank thee because thou art mighty. . . . Glory to thee for ever. Remember, O Lord, thy Church to free her from all evil and make her perfect in thy love; gather her from the four winds and make her holy in thy kingdom which thou hast prepared for her; for thine is the power and the glory for ever. Let grace come and let this world perish. Hosanna to the God of David. If any one be holy let him draw nigh; if any one be not, let him repent. Maran atha. Amen. But let the prophets give thanks as much as they will' (x.).

If the early date is allowed, we find here anticipation of the great thanksgiving of the later liturgies, mention of God's work in creation and in redemption, a thanksgiving after Communion and prayer for the Church with the germ of the act of praise which grew into the *Gloria in excelsis*.

The Epistle of Clement of Rome has references to the order observed for the worship of God, *e.g.* ch. 40:

> 'Now the offerings and ministrations He commanded to be performed with care, and not to be done rashly or in disorder, but at fixed times and seasons.'

It contains also quotations from a wonderful prayer of intercession and thanksgiving (*qq.v.*), and a close parallel to the later *Sanctus*.

> Ch. 34: 'For the Scripture saith; *Ten thousands of ten thousands stood by Him, and thousands of thousands ministered unto Him: and they cried aloud, Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Sabaoth; all creation is full of His glory.* Yea, and let us ourselves then, being gathered together in concord with intentness of heart, cry unto Him as from one mouth earnestly that we may be made partakers of His great and glorious promises.'

The Epistles of Ignatius contain many liturgical phrases but no further hints as to the form of worship beyond the maxim, 'Do nothing without the bishop and the presbyters,' and such general exhortation as the following:

> *ad Magn.* 7: 'And attempt not to think anything right for yourselves apart from others: but let there be one prayer in common, one supplication, one mind, one hope, in love and in joy unblameable, which is Jesus Christ, than whom there is nothing better. Hasten to come together all of you, as to one temple, even God; as to one altar, even to one Jesus Christ, who came forth from One Father, and is with One and departed unto One.'

---

* *Op. cit.*, p. 16.

† St. Paul does not mention the reading of Scripture in his order of worship; but it must have been there. He takes for granted that the OT Scriptures are known and used, in 1 Co 6^{16} 9$^{8-13}$ 14^{21}, 2 Co 6$^{16.18}$ 8^{15} 9^{9}.

‡ 1 Co 14^{31}. § 1 Co 14^{30}. ‖ 1 Co 14$^{27.28}$.

¶ *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries*, p. 44 ff.

** *Christian Worship*, p. 48. †† Eph 1$^{15-23}$ 3$^{14-21}$.

* We may doubt whether there was any definite idea as yet of a 'formula of consecration.' As Srawley has said, 'the "thanksgiving" was regarded as the sanctification of the meal, which in virtue of this thanksgiving pronounced over it became the spiritual food of the faithful' (*op. cit.*, p. 227).

Pliny's letter to the Emperor Trajan, important as it is from other points of view, does not fill in any details for us in the scheme of worship. Pliny asserts that the Christians were 'accustomed on a certain day to meet together before daybreak and to sing a hymn alternately to Christ as a god' (*Ep.* xcvi. 7). He continues that, having bound themselves by an oath to commit no crime, they dispersed but met again to eat food—a hint of the separation of the Agape from the Eucharist.

The testimony of *Justin Martyr* in his *First Apology* is much more definite, and must be quoted in full:

> Ch. 65: 'But we [Christians], after that we have thus washed him who has been convinced and has assented [to our teaching], lead him to the place where those who are called brethren are assembled, in order that we may offer hearty prayers in common for ourselves and for the illuminated [*i.e.* baptized] person, and for all others in every place, that we may be counted worthy, now that we have learned the truth, by our works also to be found good citizens and keepers of the commandments, so that we may be saved with an everlasting salvation. Having ended the prayers, we salute one another with a kiss. Bread and a cup of wine mingled with water are then brought to the president of the brethren: and he, taking them, gives praise and glory to the Father of the Universe, through the Name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and offers thanks at considerable length for our being counted worthy to receive these things at His hands. And when he has concluded the prayer and thanksgivings, all the people present express their assent by saying, "Amen." . . . And when the president has given thanks and all the people have expressed their assent, those who are called by us deacons give each of those present the bread and wine mixed with water, over which the thanksgiving was pronounced, and they carry away a portion to those who are not present.'
>
> 66: 'And this food is called among us the Eucharist, of which no one is allowed to partake but he who believes that the things which we teach are true, and who has been washed with the washing that is for the remission of sins and unto regeneration, and who is so living as Christ hath enjoined. For we do not receive these [elements] as common bread and common drink, but in like manner as Jesus Christ our Saviour, having been made flesh by the word of God, had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so likewise have we been taught that the food which is blessed by the prayer of the word which comes from Him, and from which our blood and flesh are nourished by transmutation, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh.'

Justin goes on to quote the words of Institution from the Gospels, and in ch. 67, repeating his account of the Eucharist, emphasizes the fact that it is celebrated on Sunday, and adds that the Gospels are read 'or the writings of the Prophets, as long as time permits.'

> 'And the well-to-do and the willing give what each person thinks fit, and the collection is deposited with the president, who succours orphans and widows, and those who are in want through sickness or any other cause, and those who are in prison, and the strangers sojourning among us, and, in a word, he takes care of all who are in any need.'

3. Principles.—From these scattered hints, from which we may endeavour to reconstitute the form of worship in the Apostolic Church, we must now turn to the principles. In the evolution of the primitive liturgy we can discern a close adherence to the apostolic combination of prayer and praise with instruction and intercession leading up to the gift of sacramental grace. At the same time we note the constant loyalty to the principle on which Hooker lays such stress—that sacraments are 'not physical but *moral instruments* of salvation, duties of service and worship, which unless we perform as the Author of grace requireth, they are unprofitable.' *

This finds emphasis in the constant teaching of the need of purification for participation in holy rites. This is expressed in He 10[22]: 'Let us draw near with a true heart in fulness of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our body washed with pure water.' In other words, devotion must be sincere and not formal, faith must be enlightened and firmly held. The writer goes on to refer to the confession made at baptism (v.[23]): 'Let us hold fast the confession of our hope that it waver not.' Other references could be multiplied, but it may suffice to quote 1 P 1[16. 17], where the exhortation to holiness of life accompanies reference to 'calling on the Father.' The thought is summarized in the ancient proclamation by the bishop to the people, 'Holy things to holy persons.'

Again we find that the primary characteristic of apostolic worship was to offer to the Lord the honour due unto His name in holy worship (Ps 29[2]). The desire of the Psalmist was fulfilled. The Church met to give as well as to receive.

This thought leads straight up into the high region of speculation entered by Freeman when he traces back the ultimate principle of the Eucharist and of the Divine Office to the fundamental doctrines of the Incarnation and the Perpetual Priesthood of Christ. The Incarnation is linked up with the foundation truth of sacrifice. 'Though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor.' * All Christian worship is enriched by that thought. It is more blessed to give than to receive.

Under the conditions of human sinfulness the incarnate life of Christ was necessarily consecrated by suffering, which found its culmination in the Cross of Calvary, His Passion being the perfecting of His Priesthood. So it is the privilege of the Church in the Eucharist to show the Lord's death till He come, to offer in this memorial sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving 'the one true pure immortal sacrifice.'

The Divine Office of a later age, which traces its roots to the simple congregational meetings for edification, allied, as we have seen, to the Synagogue services, is based on the thought of the Perpetual Priesthood of Christ. Constant reference to the mediation of Christ in the familiar ending of prayers 'through Jesus Christ our Lord' kept this ever in mind.

LITERATURE.—L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship*², Eng. tr., London, 1904; A. Edersheim, *The Temple: its Ministry and Services*, do., 1874; A. Fortescue, *The Mass*, do., 1912; P. Freeman, *The Principles of Divine Service*, Oxford, 1863; T. M. Lindsay, *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries*, London, 1902; J. H. Srawley, *The Early History of the Liturgy*, Cambridge, 1913; F. E. Warren, *Liturgy and Ritual of the Ante-Nicene Church*, London, 1897.

A. E. BURN.

WRATH.—See ANGER.

WRITING.—1. The autographs of the Apostolic Age.—The problem regarding 'writing' and 'book' in the Apostolic Age might be expressed by the following question: With what materials and in what forms were letters and longer works written in the primitive Christian community and the Christian churches of the period between A.D. 30 and *c.* A.D. 100? This question would be easily answered if we still possessed autographs (*αὐτόγραφα, ἀρχέτυπα, ἰδιόχειρα*) from the hands of Christian writers in that period—if, *e.g.*, we had NT Epistles by St. Paul or other writers, Gospels, or, say, the First Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, in the handwriting of the authors or their amanuenses, or even if we had the earliest transcripts of the originals. Unfortunately this is not the case. Down to the present time not the smallest scrap of an autograph from a Christian source in the 1st cent. A.D. has come to light. It is quite conceivable that such an autograph might have withstood the ravages of time until now, for we actually possess MS fragments of considerably earlier origin than the autographs of the NT—a fact which shows the durability of the ancient writing material in cases where the external conditions gave it a fair chance of survival, and, in particular, where the papyrus was protected against damp. Hitherto, however, all reports announcing the discovery of primitive Christian autographs, and all, even the earlier, references to their being in existence at the time, have proved to be utterly valueless. Moreover, even granting it possible that some fragment of a Christian autograph dating from the 1st cent. may yet fall into our hands, we can hardly cherish the hope that in particular the original MSS of the NT will be found. In this connexion we must remember the distinctive character of a large proportion of the NT writings—the fact, namely, that, while they came in time to rank as literature in the highest sense, the majority of them were not originally designed for the general public at all. The Epistles of Paul were certainly not given to the world as books in the sense recognized by the ancient book-trade; on the contrary, they were sent as true letters, letters in the handwriting of the sender or his amanuensis. The one much-handled MS, passing from reader to reader, perhaps from church to church, would undoubtedly suffer damage in the process, and it is hardly likely that in the primitive communities the material upon which such letters and their first transcripts were written would be of the most expensive or most durable kind. Again, as regards the primitive Christian writings that may conceivably have been bought and sold as *books*, it is highly improbable that they were written and preserved with the extreme care that looks to a long future; for, as we know, the mind of the primitive Christian community was for the most part not greatly concerned with the earthly future at all. When Clement of Rome, writing to the Church in Corinth *c.* A.D. 96, says 'Take up (ἀναλάβετε) the letter of the sainted apostle Paul' (ch. 47), his words cannot be reasonably supposed to prove that the autograph of St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians was still in their possession. The disputes of the 2nd cent. regarding certain NT passages are intelligible only on the assumption that the disputants neither possessed the autographs nor knew of their existence. Whether the words of Tertullian in *de Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, 36—'percurre ecclesias apostolicas apud quas ipsæ adhuc cathedræ apostolorum suis locis præsident (præsidentur [?]), apud quas ipsæ authenticæ literæ eorum recitantur, sonantes vocem et repræsentantes faciem unius cuiusque'—are to be taken as implying that Pauline autographs were still extant in many places, as *e.g.* Thessalonica, the present writer cannot definitely say. In view of all the circumstances, therefore, we must endeavour to reconstruct the facts regarding 'writing' and 'book' in Christian circles in the Apostolic Age, our data being sporadic references in the primitive Christian writings themselves, and what we know of the general practice of writing in the period.

---

* *Ecclesiastical Polity*, v. lvii. 4.

* 2 Co 8⁹.

2. Writing materials.—In Goethe's *Faust* the hero offers a wide choice of materials for the document which Mephistopheles demands:

> 'Die Herrschaft führen Wachs und Leder . . .
> Erz, Marmor, Pergament, Papier?
> Soll ich mit Griffel, Meissel, Feder schreiben?'

In the Apostolic Age there was a similar variety of choice. The available materials of that period, however, did not include the modern *paper*—the thin, more or less smooth, white or yellow fabric manufactured from cotton or linen. Such paper seems to have been an invention of the Chinese in very early times, and became known to the Arabs after their conquest of Samarqand in A.D. 704. The Arabs came at length to use it for writing purposes to the exclusion of almost every other material, and it was in this way carried to Sicily and Spain; in all likelihood it reached other Western lands as a result of the Crusades and the consequent growth of intercourse between the eastern and western regions of the Mediterranean. In any case, paper as known to us cannot have been used for the autographs of the Apostolic Age.

According to Lk 1[63], Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, made use of a *writing tablet* (*πινακίδιον, v.l. πινακίς*, of which *πινακίδιον* is a diminutive; cf. Epictetus, *Diss.* iii. 22, 74). The ancient writing tablets, which may be said to survive in our slates, were made of metal or wood, sometimes even of ivory, and were often whitewashed, or covered with a layer of stucco; two or more tablets might be bound together with thread. Frequently, too, the inner part of the tablet was deepened, the edges being allowed to stand out like a frame—a device that gave a better protection to the writing. The hollow part was often smeared with wax; notes could then be entered upon the thin film by the metal *stilus*, and, when these had served their purpose, the wax could be smoothed for fresh use. It was not very easy to write rapidly on the wax, and the script was rather indistinct to the eye. The pointed *stilus* frequently had at its other end a small thin plate with which erasures could be made. As other sorts of writing material were relatively high in price, these tablets had generally to suffice for briefer records. Such a tablet, inscribed with its short message, could be sent by one person to another, somewhat like a post-card, and the receiver could smooth the wax, write his reply, and send back the tablet without delay. By the 1st cent. A.D., however, the wax film was coming to be superseded by a small sheet of parchment. It would probably be safe to say that, in much the same proportion as people carry notebooks at the present day, the Christians of the Apostolic Age who were fairly able to write carried and made use of writing tablets. It is of special importance to note that the folding tablets form a link in the development that resulted in the codex. Nevertheless, as the tablet could carry but little writing—at most perhaps a message about as long as the Third Epistle of John or the Epistle to Philemon—it need hardly be taken into account with reference to the autographs of primitive Christian writings.

The other available materials that might be used for the writings of the Apostolic Age were sheets of papyrus and parchment. Papyrus,* the manufacture of which is described—not indeed altogether clearly or accurately—by Pliny the Elder (*HN* xiii. 21–27), was a product of the papyrus plant, a rush that grew in the Nile Delta. The pith of the plant was cut into thin strips, which were laid horizontally side by side, and covered with a similar layer of strips at right angles. The whole was made to cohere by some glutinous substance, and then pressed, dried, and polished. The side upon which the fibres ran horizontally was latterly regarded as the proper one for writing upon; it was used first, and for the most part the other was left blank. The process of manufacture became at length so highly developed as to yield sheets in which toughness and durability were combined with a remarkable degree of thinness, and which were sometimes so smooth that the steel pen of to-day moves freely over them. The preparation of papyrus in Egypt is a very ancient industry, its beginnings being clearly traceable to the 3rd or 4th millennium B.C.

The use of *leather* as a writing material seems to go back to an equally early time; it is said to have been a very ancient practice in the East (cf. Herod. v. 58; Diod. Sic. ii. 32). Thick leather, however, was hardly a substance adapted for the production of larger works, and only its preparation in the form of the thinner and more delicate *parchment* could make it avail for such a purpose. The invention of parchment has been usually connected with the desire of Eumenes II., king of Pergamum (197–158 B.C.), to institute a great library on the model of that in Alexandria. The kernel of fact in Pliny's statement to that effect (*HN* xiii. 21) may well be that in the first half of the 2nd cent. B.C. Pergamum became a centre for a more frequent use and a more refined preparation of the skins of animals as a writing material. It is probable, however, that prior to this there had been a slow process of development—a process tending towards an increased refinement in the preparation of leather for writing, and at length, in the 2nd cent. B.C., reaching a stage at which even extensive works could be written wholly upon parchment, and still kept within the limits of convenient size.

---

* The pronunciation with the *y* long is probably the correct one.

The notion that the Jews from the first wrote their sacred books upon leather rolls is not confirmed by evidence satisfactory to historical science. As a matter of fact, we know that the use of papyrus reached Phœnicia as early as the 11th cent. B.C., and accordingly the books in roll form referred to in the OT (Jer 36[14ff.], Ezk 2[9] 3[1ff.], Ps 40[7] [cf. He 10[7]], Zec 5[1f.]; cf. also Is 34[4], and the words *ἀναπτύσσειν* [2 K 19[14]] and *εἱλίσσειν* [Rev 6[14]]) might quite well have been formed of papyrus; indeed, the words *χαρτίον* and *χάρτης*, the specific terms for a papyrus sheet, are quite correctly used in LXX Jer 43 (Heb. 36). Characteristically enough, the earliest record of the Jews having transcribed their sacred writings upon rolls of parchment or leather is found in Josephus (*Ant.* XII. ii. 11; the work was finished *c.* A.D. 93–94), and thus dates from an age when the use of parchment had been fairly well established for some time; we shall hardly err in supposing that the transition to the use of that more lasting material reached its term among the Jews not earlier than the last pre-Christian centuries. The Jews would naturally desire to have the most durable substances for the preservation of their sacred writings (cf. Mishna, *Megilla* ii. 2, *Shabb.* viii. 3), and this, again, would be of importance for the use of parchment in Christian circles. It is of course quite possible that Israelites and Jews had long made use of polished leather for records of a shorter kind.

Which of these two substances, then, may we suppose to have been employed for the NT writings? E. Reuss (*Geschichte der heiligen Schriften neuen Testaments*^{3}, Brunswick, 1860) could still write: 'Parchment was certainly not unknown, but too expensive for general use.' The present writer is of opinion, however, that the results of recent research prove the very opposite: papyrus sheets came in course of time to command so high a price that parchment, at once cheaper, more durable, and better adapted for being written upon on both sides, came to be more generally used in quarters where price was a consideration. Among the Greeks, this transition from papyrus to parchment was checked by two material considerations, viz. the lightness and delicacy of the papyrus fabric, and the relief which, in contrast to the glossy and often dazzling parchment, that fabric afforded to the eye of both writer and reader—though the larger characters generally used for writing on the parchment sheet were relatively more legible to weak eyes. From the artistic point of view, moreover, the papyrus roll of the Greeks certainly seemed the most finished and elegant form of book in a reader's hands, and that form was doubtless retained as long as possible. But while the Greeks, from the 5th cent. B.C. to the 4th cent. A.D., mainly employed papyrus as the material vehicle of their literature, they certainly began, as early as the 1st cent. A.D., and, in the first instance, for the use of schools, to transfer the texts written on papyri to the more durable parchment. It is instructive to note that Martial, writing not later than A.D. 84–85, speaks of books in papyrus as being dearer and more valuable than books in parchment; and this is to be explained by the fact that the manufacture of papyrus was almost wholly confined to the Nile Delta, so that an increased consumption, or a poor crop, would naturally tend to advance the price. The date at which the general use of parchment seems definitely to have superseded that of papyrus falls at the earliest in the 4th or 5th cent. A.D., and the intervening period from the 1st cent. must therefore be regarded as a time of transition.

In view of these data it is impossible to maintain absolutely that the autographs of the Apostolic Age—the originals of the primitive Christian writings down to the First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians—must all have been written upon papyrus. That the Christians of that age might use papyrus, that, *e.g.*, St. John, writing perhaps *c.* 85, wrote his Second Epistle on a papyrus sheet, appears from the words (v.[12]): *πολλὰ ἔχων ὑμῖν γράφειν, οὐκ ἠβουλήθην διὰ χάρτου καὶ μέλανος*, but this supplies no evidence as to the material generally used in the Apostolic Age. Somewhat earlier, *c.* A.D. 66 (?), St. Paul (2 Ti 4[13]) writes: *τὸν φαιλόνην ὃν ἀπέλιπον ἐν Τρωάδι παρὰ Κάρπῳ, ἐρχόμενος φέρε, καὶ τὰ βιβλία, μάλιστα [δὲ] τὰς μεμβράνας. ἡ μεμβράνα* is simply the Lat. *membrana*, 'skin,' 'parchment.' That St. Paul here uses the word in the sense of *codex membranaceus*, or 'parchment roll,' cannot be proved; and we can therefore hardly think that it refers to leather rolls of the OT. The *μεμβράνα* was in fact the single sheet, *i.e.* the word denoted the material; thus Horace (*Sat.* ii. 3. 1), writing *c.* 30 B.C., says: 'You write so seldom that you do not require *membranam* four times in a whole year'; the writing material used by the person whom the satirist here describes amounted in all to four sheets of parchment in a year. In all probability, therefore, St. Paul's *membranæ* were sheets of parchment, either blank or containing notes and extracts, and thus not included among the *βιβλία*, *i.e.* his papyrus rolls. According to Quintilian (*Inst. Orat.* X. iii. 31), it was impossible in his day to write with the desired facility on parchment, which clearly had not as yet been brought to the requisite degree of polish, and it was necessary to make use of large letters; this circumstance tended to impede the general employment of parchment. If we may infer from Gal 6[11] (*ἴδετε πηλίκοις ὑμῖν γράμμασιν ἔγραψα τῇ ἐμῇ χειρί*) that St. Paul wrote the whole impassioned Epistle, or at least its conclusion, with his own hand, the 'large letters' might no doubt be taken as indicating a considerable defect of vision, and it would thus be possible and conceivable that the Apostle had here made use of sheets of parchment. That relatively short letter, even if written in characters more than usually large, would not require many such sheets; and, on the whole, the hypothesis must be regarded as a possible one. But the present writer certainly does not believe that longer works of the Apostolic Age were written as yet upon parchment. The fastening together of a number of sheets so as to form a continuous parchment roll, while no doubt it was practised, was certainly attended with difficulties. It would be possible, of course, to employ the form of the *codex* (*i.e.* that of the modern book in folded sheets), in which the prepared skin was folded upon the flesh-side, thus causing flesh-side to face flesh-side and hair-side to face hair-side throughout, so that the front of the sheet, the *recto*, was smooth, and the back, the *verso*, rough; and in point of fact the codex form seems to have originated in the 2nd cent. B.C. in

Asia Minor, and is therefore not to be regarded as a discovery of the first or later Christian centuries. Still, the relatively late appearance of the codex in art, and especially in art of Christian origin, hardly justifies us, the present writer thinks, in assuming that parchment MSS in that form were very numerous in the Apostolic Age and the Apostolic Church, though this argument might doubtless be met by the hypothesis that art, in clinging to the papyrus roll, and continuing to do so even at a time when, as in the 4th and 5th centuries A.D., the codex had become firmly established, and the roll was all but wholly superseded, was simply showing its general tendency to conservatism. On the whole, therefore, while it is absolutely certain that in course of time Christian literature and the NT were transmitted in growing measure by parchment and codex, so that in fact 'parchment codex' and 'Christian literature' are related in the closest way, it may be presumed that this was not the case at first, and there can be little doubt that the great majority of the primitive Christian autographs, as well as of their earliest copies, were written on papyrus.

The *fluid used for writing on papyrus* was a soot-ink, *i.e.* a mixture of pine soot and glue dissolved in water, but, as this mixture did not adhere very well to parchment, a metallic ink of gall-apples was employed for the latter. Gall-apple ink, however, is not mentioned until the 5th cent. A.D.—*c.* 470 (Martianus Capella, iii. 225 [ed. F. Eyssenhardt, Leipzig, 1866, p. 55])—and thus the ink used in the Apostolic Age would probably be the mixture first mentioned, as referred to in 2 Co 3^{3} (*γεγραμμένος μέλανι*), 2 Jn ^{12} (*διὰ χάρτου καὶ μέλανος*), and 3 Jn ^{13} (*διὰ μέλανος καὶ καλάμου*). *Inkstands* were also in use, though they are not mentioned in the Christian writings of the Apostolic Age. In 3 Jn ^{13} we hear also of the *κάλαμος*, the *reed* used for writing. It is probable that originally this was applied like a small brush, but in the period under consideration it was in all likelihood a pen in the proper sense. It was shaped and pointed exactly like the quill pen of later times; the writing accessories of the time included a knife for splitting the reed, and a piece of pumice stone for re-sharpening the point. The best equivalent for *κάλαμος* is therefore 'reed-pen.'

3. Roll and codex.—If we would figure to ourselves the outward structure of one of the longer works written on papyrus in the Apostolic Age—as, *e.g.*, the Gospel according to St. John—we must dismiss from our minds the appearance of a modern book, which in reality preserves the form of the codex. It is true that codices were sometimes made of papyrus (cf. Jerome, *Ep.* lxxi., 'ad Lucinium': 'et descripta vidi in chartaceis codicibus'); and we should probably agree with Schubart in assuming—on the ground of an inscription of Priene, dedicated to Aulus Æmilius Zosimus the town-clerk—that papyrus codices were to be found in Asia Minor as early as the 1st cent. B.C.; but it is hardly likely that this form of book was generally or even frequently resorted to in that age. We may therefore safely infer that, *e.g.*, the Gospel according to St. John was first written upon a roll; in Jn 20^{30} 21^{25}, in fact, it is called *τὸ βιβλίον*. Such a roll was formed of a number of papyrus sheets of equal size carefully joined together in a continuous strip, which may sometimes have been from 20 to 30 ft. — say 7 to 10 metres — long. The writing began with a vertical column at the extreme left, and was continued towards the right in similar columns, though we also find cases where the lines ran at right angles to the length of the roll, and were thus massed in a single column. There was great variation in the size of the sheet, and thus also in the breadth of the roll, which may usually have been some 20–30 cm., but was often only 12–15 cm. in width. The number of lines in a column was likewise far from constant, and the breadth of the upper and lower margins introduced fresh variations; but generally the number of lines would lie between 20 and 30. The breadth of the column did not usually depend on that of the sheets, which were so carefully joined that the pen moved freely over the line of attachment. At its maximum the line was probably about equal in length to the hexameter, comprising some 36 letters, but more commonly it contained 20–25 letters. Hence, taking average measurements—say, a column of 25 lines consisting of 23 letters; each letter with its necessary space 3·5 mm.; lines with spaces between, 7 mm.; upper and lower margins, 3 cm. each; space between columns, 2 cm.—we may estimate that the Gospel according to St. John (1–20), with about 70,000 letters, would fill a papyrus roll 23·5 cm. broad, 12·5 m. long, and containing 122 columns. Similarly, Revelation would fill a strip 8·5 m. in length; Mark, one of 10 m.; Matthew, one of 16 m.; Luke and Acts, each one of some 17 m. (Luke's *δεύτερος λόγος* having probably been written on a roll of the same dimensions as his *πρῶτος λόγος*).

These estimates are of course merely approximate, and are meant to give but a general impression. Moreover, they are made on the assumption that only the *recto* of the roll was used. Occasionally, however, from motives of thrift, lack of space, or the like, the *verso* also—that on which the fibres ran vertically—was written upon; and that this practice was known among the Christians of the Apostolic Age appears from Rev 5^{1}: *καὶ εἶδον ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιὰν τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου βιβλίον γεγραμμένον ἔσωθεν καὶ ὄπισθεν* [the readings *ἔσωθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν* and *ἔμπροσθεν καὶ ὄπισθεν* may be disregarded] *κατεσφραγισμένον σφραγῖσιν ἑπτά*. The 'book' here spoken of is not a codex, but a papyrus roll, which would lie quite securely in the palm of the outstretched hand—a position depicted also in ancient art. The term *ὀπισθόγραφον* was a familiar one (cf. Lucian, *Vitarum Auctio*, 9; Pliny, *Ep.* iii. 5; Juv. *Sat.* i. 6, 'a tergo'; Martial, viii. 62, 'in aversa charta'; LXX Ezk 2^{10}, *ἔμπροσθεν καὶ τὰ ὀπίσω*), and the phrase *ἔσωθεν καὶ ὄπισθεν* in Rev 5^{1} must have been understood by readers of the Apostolic Age as indicating a papyrus roll written upon both sides [but cf. Literature (B) **3** (*a*)]. In this passage, as in Ezk 2^{10}, the circumstance that the book was written on both sides is to be taken as signifying the fullness of the contents.

Other matters of detail, even if not referred to in the apostolic writings, may safely be taken from the general practice of the age. The upper and lower edges of the roll were often trimmed and smoothed, just as modern books are edged, and were probably also coloured; as pieces of the sheet would crumble away through frequent use, repairs were sometimes necessary; in order to protect the material against the ravages of worms, insects, etc., the back of the sheet was often washed with cedar-oil; the first sheet, as most liable to injury, was specially strengthened; the title of the work was inscribed on a small label (*σίττυβος* or *σίλλυβος*) attached to the upper end of the standing roll. Now and then we meet with *ὁ ὀμφαλός*, *umbilicus*, the cylindrical stick (for *κέρας*, the knob, the evidence is doubtful), though not always within the roll; it would appear, however, that the stick was not, as hitherto believed, glued to the last sheet, which was in the middle of the closed roll, but was held in the hand so as to give a better support to the roll, and served as a pivot upon which the portion already read could be rolled by the left hand.

Sometimes the roll seems to have been kept in a leather cover or sheath, like the case now used for university diplomas, etc.; it might also have a cord or a ribbon tied round it, as with letters, and rolls thus kept closed by threads or ribbons could then be sealed upon these. The 'book' of Rev 5^1 is to be thought of as sealed with seven seals in this way; the phrase *ἀνοῖξαι τὸ βιβλίον* (v.^{2})—if the author had a distinct picture in his mind—must signify, not the unfolding of the roll, but simply the loosing of the seals. It is certainly possible that in the author's thought the opening of each separate seal stood for the opening of a distinct portion of the whole work, but the opened book (as found also in Rev 10^2, *βιβλαρίδιον ἠνεῳγμένον*) is simply the unsealed, not the unrolled, volume.

A number of rolls could be fastened together with tape in a parcel, or kept in a case (*κιβωτός*, *κιβώτιον*, *κίστη*; also *τεῦχος*), which was cubical or cylindrical in shape, and made of wood or leather. The present writer does not think it probable that the *φελόνης* (*φαιλόνης*) of 2 Ti 4^{13} denotes such a case or cover, though this interpretation is a very ancient one, being found, indeed, in the Syr. Peshitta; *φελόνης* was doubtless derived from *φενόλης* (Lat. *pænula*) by transposition of consonants; but the latter term is never met with in the sense of a case for rolls, and the former always bears quite a different meaning. The word *pænula* or *φενόλης*, though not the specific term, might of course quite well be applied to the cover of a single roll, but what use could St. Paul have had for a single article of the kind? Thus in all likelihood the *φελόνης* of the passage referred to denotes a traveller's cloak, which he had left behind him and now required in view of the approaching winter (cf. 4^{21}).

The papyrus 'book-roll' here described comes before us in Greek under the general name *βίβλος*, which in the Christian writings of the Apostolic Age is found in the following forms: (1) *ἡ βίβλος* (Mt 1^1, Mk 12^{26}, Lk 3^4 20^{42}, Ac 1^{20} 7^{42} 19^{19}; 1 Clem. xliii. 1; also in the phrase *βίβλος ζωῆς*, for which see art. Book of Life); (2) *τὸ βιβλίον* (Lk $4^{17.\,20}$, Jn 20^{30} 21^{25}, Gal 3^{10}, 2 Ti 4^{13}, He 9^{19}, Rev 1^{11} $5^{1\text{ff.}}$; *Ep. Barn.* xii. 9, Hermas, *Vis.* I. ii. 2, II. iv. 2, 2 Clem. xiv. 2; for *βιβλίον ζωῆς* see art. Book of Life); the fact that the 'bill of divorcement' is called *βιβλίον ἀποστασίου* in Mt 19^7, Mk 10^4, leads us to think first of all of the papyrus material of the document; (3) as a double diminutive *τὸ βιβλαρίδιον* (Rev $10^{2.\,8\text{ff.}}$; cf. also Hermas, *Vis.* II. i. 3, iv. 3; *v.l.* *βιβλιδάριον*, in both Revelation and Herm.), though subsequently *τὸ βιβλίδιον* (already found in Ign. *ad Eph.* xx. 1, Herm. *Vis.* II. i. 3 f., iv. 1). It is difficult to say how far, in each particular case, there was a consciousness of the fact that the word was derived from *βύβλος*, the Egyptian papyrus plant. It would be quite wrong to render the term always by 'book-roll,' since the main reference is very often to the contents of the book.

In the Christian writings of the 1st cent. there is nothing—not even a specific term—to indicate that the *codex*, *i.e.* a construction of parchment or papyrus sheets in the form of a modern book, was the vehicle of the autographs, or the first copies, of the Christian writings. In the *Epistle of Aristeas*, a Jewish work dating from the 2nd cent. B.C., we find the words *ἀνεγνώσθη τὰ τεύχη*, and it has been supposed that they refer to Jewish codices of the LXX; but Birt in his *Die Buchrolle* has effectively shown that the reference is to book-rolls. When we bear in mind, however, that the codex was in fact the book of the common people, and that the NT Epistles were written, not as books or literary works, but as actual letters, in rolls, or (in the case of a few shorter compositions) on wax tablets, or, again, frequently on parchment sheets,—which we may perhaps think of as having been single leaves,—we must regard it as at least possible that at the time when the Christian books began to be transcribed and collected, the codex form was the recognized one in Christian circles. Nor does it seem impossible, in view of the history of the codex as a whole, that Christianity, with its earliest literature, gave an important and powerful impetus to the transition from the roll to the codex. The course of this development in the literary and artistic products of the period from the 2nd to the 5th cent. presents a fascinating subject of study.

4. Writing and reading.—Birt emphatically asserts that the Greeks and Romans never used a table as a support in the act of writing (*γράφειν*, *ἀναγράφειν* [in Hermas], *ἀναγραφή* [1 Clem.], *καταγράφειν*, *ἐγγράφειν*, etc.), but generally wrote in a squatting or sitting position, and either simply upon a tablet held in the hand or, where a papyrus roll was used, upon this supported by the raised knee or the left fore-arm. Birt takes his stand upon the representations of ancient art, which undoubtedly lend colour to his contention; but the use of something in the nature of a table or board is so natural that we are almost forced to regard the data of art as defective at this point.

While it is possible that in general the Christian authors of the Apostolic Age wrote their books and epistles with their own hands, we know that St. Paul frequently dictated his letters—as was the practice more especially among people of wealth or rank—but added the closing salutation in his own hand (cf. 1 Co 16^{21}, Col 4^{18}, 2 Th 3^{17}; in Ro 16^{22} his amanuensis, Tertius, is mentioned by name). The Epistle to the Galatians, or at least its concluding paragraph, was penned by the Apostle himself. As regards the First Epistle of Peter, the question depends upon the interpretation of 5^{12} (*διὰ Σιλουανοῦ ὑμῖν τοῦ πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, ὡς λογίζομαι, δι᾽ ὀλίγων ἔγραψα*), where we may either, with Zahn (*Einleitung*, ii.^{2}, p. 10 f.), regard Silvanus as the real author of the letter or suppose that, as the present writer thinks, he wrote it to St. Peter's dictation. In course of time it came to be a very common practice in Christian circles to employ tachygraphers and secretaries.

As regards the reading (*ἀναγιγνώσκειν*, a word of very frequent occurrence) of the papyrus roll, Birt has brought before us such a profusion of excellent data that we can quite well picture to ourselves how the people of the Apostolic Age would read, say, the Epistles of St. Paul. The most vivid representation of the act is given by the Attic sepulchral relief in the Abbey of Grottaferata (see A. Conze, *Die attischen Grabreliefs*, Berlin, 1890, ii. plate 121, no. 622; Birt, *op. cit.*, pl. 157, fig. 90), which shows the reader holding the roll, with its text arranged in columns, before him, his left hand rolling up the portion already read, while his right unrolls the portion still to be read. Just as *volumen*, from *volvere*, is the Lat. term for the papyrus strip that could be formed into a roll, so we have in Greek—somewhat rarely, it is true—the term *ἐνείλημα* (first in Jos. *Ant.* XII. ii. 11), from *ἐλίσσω* (*εἰλίσσω*) 'turn,' 'wind,' 'roll round'; the special sense of the verb appears also in Rev 6^{14}, where the departing heavens are compared to a scroll being folded up, *ὡς βιβλίον ἐλισσόμενον* (similarly in the *Apocalypse of Peter* [beginning of 2nd cent.], ed. E. Preuschen, *Antilegomena*^{2}, Giessen, 1905, p. 88). In Lk 4^{17} we find the correlative term *ἀναπτύσσειν* used to denote the unfolding of the roll; the reading *ἀνοίξας* which appears in a number of codices is probably not original here; as we saw above, in connexion with Rev $5^{1\text{ff.}}$, *ἀνοίγω* is the technical term for loosing the seal, and was only subsequently, by association of ideas, transferred to the opening of the codex.

5. Letters; signs to the reader.—As minuscule MSS first emerge about the end of the 7th cent. A.D., we must assume that the autographs of the NT were written in a majuscule script, and without doubt in the Greek capitals known to us. But we must here distinguish between the literary or book form of writing on the one hand and the form used in everyday life on the other. The distinction between the two corresponds very much to that between manuscript and print at the present day. The cursive hand arose, of course, from the desire to write rapidly and, where possible, continuously and without breaks. As most of the NT writings were not in the first instance produced as literary works—not being designed for the public at large—we may assume that the NT Epistles at least, and probably also the first transcripts of the other books, were written in a cursive hand and in capitals, as found in various papyri of the 1st century.

Devices to indicate pauses (*paragraphus*, double dot, larger and smaller spaces) were in use by the 1st cent. B.C., but as a rule were not used at all, or used but sparingly, in the Christian papyri of the 1st cent. A.D.—a circumstance that naturally brought in its train numberless possibilities of misreading and of making false combinations among the words.

LITERATURE.—(A) GENERAL.—T. Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen*, Berlin, 1882; L. Mitteis and U. Wilcken, *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde*, 4 vols., Leipzig, 1912; E. Nestle, *Einführung in das griechische NT*^{3}, Göttingen, 1909; T. Birt, *Die Buchrolle in der Kunst* (with 190 illustrations), Leipzig, 1907; W. Schubart, *Das Buch bei den Griechen und Römern* (with 14 illustrations), Berlin, 1907; K. Dziatzko, artt. 'Buch,' 'Byblos' in Pauly-Wissowa^{2}, iii.; A. Gercke, 'Das antike Buch,' in *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft*, Leipzig, 1910, i. 1-26; A. Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*^{3}, Tübingen, 1909, Eng. tr., *Light from the Ancient East*, London, 1911; also the Introductions to the NT by T. Zahn (Eng. tr., 3 vols., Edinburgh, 1909), etc.; the older literature is given in E. Reuss, *Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften neuen Testaments*^{3}, Brunswick, 1860, p. 340 ff.

(B) SPECIAL.—To 1. On the roll in Ignatius, *ad Philadelphenos*, viii. (ἐν τοῖς ἀρχείοις), see Zahn, in *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera*, ed. O. von Gebhardt, A. Harnack, T. Zahn, ii. [Leipzig, 1876] 77 ff., and on the passage in Tertullian, cf. T. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutest. Kanons*, i. [do., 1889] 652; I. E. I. Walch, *De Apostolorum Litteris Authenticis a Tertulliano Commemoratis*, Jena, 1753. On the Gospel of Matthew found in the tomb of Barnabas, cf. Theodorus Lector in Migne, *PG*, vol. lxxxvi. col. 189; Severus of Antioch, in J. S. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, Rome, 1719-28, ii. 8; *Vitæ omnium XIII Apostolorum*, ed. A. Theme in *ZWT* xxix. [1886] 453. On the supposed existence of the autograph of John's Gospel in Ephesus, see *Chronicon Paschale* (7th cent. A.D.): καθὼς τὰ ἀκριβῆ βιβλία περιέχει αὐτό τε τὸ ἰδιόχειρον τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ, ἅπερ μέχρι τοῦ νῦν πεφύλακται χάριτι θεοῦ ἐν τῇ Ἐφεσίων ἁγιωτάτῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν πιστῶν ἐκεῖσε προσκυνεῖται; cf. also Petrus Alexandrinus, *De Paschale* (cf. G. Stosch, *De Canone NT*, p. 44), Philostorgius, vii. 14, Nicephorus Callistus, x. 33. On the alleged autograph of Mark in Venice and Prague, cf. J. Dobrowski, *Fragmentum Pragense Evang. S. Marci, vulgo autographi*, Prague, 1778. For a supposed Heb. autograph of Peter, P. de Lagarde, *Aus dem deutschen Gelehrtenleben*, Göttingen, 1880, p. 117 f. C. Simonides, *Facsimiles of Certain Portions of St. Matthew and of the Epistles of St. James and Jude, written on Papyrus in the 1st Century*, London, 1862, is a forgery. Most of the older literature on the question of autograph shows a certain prejudice in the interests of dogma: J. G. Berger, *De autographis veterum*, Wittenberg, 1723; G. Stosch, *De Epistolis Apostolorum idiographis*, Guelf, 1751; J. F. Mayer, *Utrum autographa biblica hodie extent*, Hamburg, 1692; B. G. Clauswitz, *De autographorum iactura rei christ. et innoxia et utili*, Halle, 1743. The reader will gain some idea of the appearance of the autographs from J. R. Harris, *NT Autographs* (Supplement to the *AJPh* xii. [1891]), Baltimore, 1892, pp. 54, with 3 plates, but still better from F. G. Kenyon, *The Palæography of Greek Papyri*, Oxford, 1899, the plates of which exhibit papyri from the Apostolic Age (A.D. 15 and 72–73). What is probably the earliest known fragment of a NT MS, a transcript of Mt 1^{1-12}, dating from the 3rd cent., is shown in B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, i. [1898] pl. i., and in E. Nestle, *op. cit.* pl. 11. No Christian text as yet discovered can be assigned with certainty to a date earlier than the beginning of the 3rd cent.; cf. L. Mitteis and U. Wilcken, *Grundzüge der Papyruskunde*, I. i. 130 f.

To 2. (*a*) Paper: G. F. Wekos, *Vom Papier, den vor der Erfindung derselben üblichen Schreibmassen u. anderm Schreibmaterial*, Halle, 1789, with *Supplementum*, Hanover, 1790; Lalande, *L'Art de faire le papier*, Paris, n.d.; E. Egger, *Le Papier dans l'antiquité et dans les temps modernes*, do., 1867; W. Wattenbach, *Das Schriftwesen im Mittelalter*^{2}, Leipzig, 1876, p. 114 ff.; V. Gardthausen, *Griechische Paläographie*, do., 1879, pp. 48–51; E. Kirchner, *Das Papier*, 3 vols., Biberach, 1897–99. (*b*) The writing tablet: A. Socin, in H. Guthe's *Kurzes Bibelwörterbuch*, Tübingen, 1903, p. 590; W. Schubart, *op. cit.* pp. 16–19. (*c*) The manufacture of papyrus: Fortia d'Urban, *Essai sur l'origine de l'écriture*, Paris, 1832; T. Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen, Die Buchrolle*, p. 4 ff.; K. Dziatzko, *Untersuchungen über ausgewählte Kapitel des antiken Buchwesens*, Leipzig, 1900; A. Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, p. 15 ff., Eng. tr., p. 23 ff.; V. Gardthausen, *op. cit.* p. 29 ff.; F. Woenig, *Die Pflanzen in alten Ägypten*, Leipzig, 1886; U. Wilcken, 'Recto und Verso,' in *Hermes* xxii. [1887] 487–492. (*d*) The papyri in general: C. Haeberlin, *Griechische Papyri*, Leipzig, 1897; F. G. Kenyon, *op. cit.* (with 20 facsimiles), art. 'Papyri' in *HDB* v. 352–357; A. Deissmann, art. 'Papyri' in *EBi* iii. 3556–3563 and art. 'Papyrus und Papyri' in *PRE*^{3} xiv. 667–675. (*e*) The use of parchment and papyrus among the Hebrews: H. L. Strack, in *PRE*^{3} xvii. 768; L. Blau, *Studien zum althebräischen Buchwesen*, Strassburg, 1902; L. Löw, *Graphische Requisite und Erzeugnisse*, i. [1870]. (*f*) Comparative prices of parchment and papyrus: Birt, *Buchrolle*, p. 24 ff.; Kenyon, *op. cit.* p. 113. (*g*) The 'parchments' of St. Paul: T. Zahn, 'Bücher und Pergamente des Paulus,' *Geschichte des neutest. Kanons*, ii. 2 [Leipsig, 1892], 938-942; Birt, *Buchwesen*, p. 88 f., *Buchrolle*, p. 21, note; W. Weinberger, in *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift*, xxiv. [1904] 1107 f. (*h*) NT passages written on papyri: Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, p. 21 ff., *EBi*, *loc. cit.*, *PRE*^{3}, *loc. cit.*; cf. also Mitteis and Wilcken, *Grundzüge der Papyruskunde*, i. (*i*) Ink: Gardthausen, *op. cit.* p. 76 ff. (*j*) The reed: E. C. A. Riehm, *Handwörterbuch des biblischen Altertums*, ed. F. Baethgen, Bielefeld, 1893, ii. 1400–1402 (art. 'Schilf und Rohr'); the writer's penknife is mentioned in Jer 36^{23}.

To 3. (*a*) Exegesis of Rev $5^{1\mathrm{ff.}}$: T. Zahn, *Einleitung in das NT*, ii^{2}. [Leipzig, 1900] 599 f. (Zahn regards 'the book on the hand of God' as a *codex*, and interprets the adjectival phrase thus—'written within and sealed without,' so taking ὄπισθεν with κατεσφραγισμένον); cf., as against this, Birt, *Buchrolle*, p. 85 f. (*b*) Sealing: E. Huschke, *Das Buch mit sieben Siegeln*, Dresden, 1860; Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii.^{2} 600; A. Erman, in *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, i. [Leipzig, 1900] 75. (*c*) φελόνη: Birt, *Buchwesen*, p. 65; Zahn, *Gesch. des Kanons*, ii. 939, note 2. (*d*) The Letter of Aristeas: Birt, *Buchrolle*, p. 32. (*e*) Roll and codex in the Christian Church during the 2nd–5th cent.: V. Schultze, 'Rolle und Codex,' in *Greifswalder Studien*, Gütersloh, 1895, pp. 147–158. (*f*) Book-boxes, libraries, book-trade, multiplication of books, etc.: Birt, *Buchwesen*; Schubart, *op. cit.* pp. 133–154.

To 5. Of special importance here is the thoroughgoing *Palæography* of F. G. Kenyon (20 facsimiles); C. Wessely, *Papyrorum scripturæ græcæ specimina isagogica*, Leipzig, 1900 (with documents of 1st cent. A.D. in autograph form); W. Schubart, *Papyri græcæ Berolinenses*, Bonn, 1911 (with 50 plates); Gardthausen, *op. cit.*; W. Wattenbach, *Anleitung zur griechischen Paläographie*^{3}, Leipzig, 1895; E. M. Thompson, *Handbook of Greek and Latin Palæography*, London, 1893, *Facsimiles of Biblical Manuscripts in the British Museum*, do., 1900; B. de Montfaucon, *Palæographia græca*, Paris, 1708, otherwise a most creditable work, supplies but little material for a reconstruction of primitive Christian autographs.

H. JORDAN.

Y

YEAR.—See TIME.

YOKEFELLOW.—See SYNZYGUS.

YOUNG MEN.—Several Greek words, with little difference of meaning, are thus translated in Acts and the Epistles. (1) νεανίας: 'laid down their garments at the feet of a young man' (Ac 7^{58}, also 20^{9} 23^{17}, etc.). (2) παῖς: 'they brought the young man (RV 'lad') alive' (Ac 20^{12} AV). This word has often the significance of servant. (3) νεανίσκος: 'the young men came in and found her dead' (Ac 5^{10}, 1 Jn 2^{13}, etc.). The termination has a diminutive force. (4) νεώτερος: 'the younger men arose and . . . carried him out' (Ac 5^{6} [RVm], 1 Ti 5^{1}, Tit 2^{6}, 1 P 5^{5}); also younger women (1 Ti 5^{2}), widows (1 Ti $5^{11.14}$). A well-marked distinction between old and young was a characteristic feature of the life of the ascetic communities in Palestine (Hatch, p. 63), of the *θίασοι* of the Greeks (Weizsäcker, ii. 331 f.), and apparently also of the Apostolic Church. Age was regarded as a title to honour, and one of the qualifications for office. Submission and reverence were the duty of the young. Age and rank or office are so closely related, as in the word *πρεσβύτερος*, that it is not easy to distinguish whether a writer in the Epistles is speaking of age or of office. This ambiguity is also found in the *Epistle of Clement of Rome* (Hatch).

Interest attaches to the question whether young men (*νεώτεροι*) held any office in the Church. The relative texts are 1 Ti 5^{1}, 1 P 5^{5}, and Ac $5^{6.10}$. In the first two instances the context has to be taken into consideration. 'Rebuke not an elder (*πρεσβυτέρῳ*) but exhort him as a father; the younger men as brethren: . . . the younger (women) as sisters' (1 Ti $5^{1.2}$). Here it is evident that the words 'elder,' 'younger' have nothing to do with office but refer to age (Hart, White, *EGT in locc.*). The passage in Peter runs: 'The elders therefore among you I exhort, who am a fellow-elder. . . . Likewise, ye younger (*νεώτεροι*), be subject unto the elder' (*πρεσβυτέροις*). If *πρεσβύτερος* in v.^{1} is official, it would be natural to conclude that it has the same significance in v.^{5}, and that *νεώτερος* is also official. But *πρεσβύτερος* in v.^{1} is unexpectedly qualified by the words 'among you,' as if indicating a class more numerous than the official elders, and Peter can scarcely be regarded as referring to office when he speaks of himself as a 'fellow-elder' (*συνπρεσβύτερος*). Had he been referring to his official position, he would have said 'an apostle' (1^{1}). He appears to be giving injunctions to the older and more experienced members of the Christian community to 'tend the flock of God,' and does so, not on his authority as an apostle, but as one who was, like themselves, advanced in age and experience. Accordingly, it seems best to conclude that *νεώτερος* has not an official significance in this passage. In Ac 5^{6}, 'the younger men arose . . . and carried him out' (RVm), *νεώτερος* is taken by some as indicating regular servants of the Church (Meyer, Lindsay, etc.), but against that view is the fact that the young men are described as *νεανίσκοι* in v.^{10} (Knowling, Neander, Lechler, etc.). The absence in the NT of any clear reference to them as officials is also an objection. Most probably they are simply distinguished as a class in the Christian community, in accordance with Eastern custom. The distinction between 'elder' and 'younger' was not confined strictly to difference of age. It also included difference of experience and length of connexion with the Church (Weizsäcker, Hatch).

LITERATURE.—*Comm. on Acts* by R. J. Knowling (*EGT*, 1900), T. M. Lindsay (1884–85), H. A. W. Meyer (Eng. tr., 1877), *in loc.*; C. von Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age*, ii. [1895] 331 f.; E. Hatch, *Organization of the Early Christian Churches*, 1881, p. 63 f.; J. H. A. Hart, '1 Peter,' in *EGT*, 1910, *in loc.*; N. J. D. White, '1 Timothy,' in *ib.*, *in loc.*; C. Bigg, *ICC*, 'St. Peter and St. Jude,' 1901, *in loc.*; A. C. McGiffert, *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, 1897, pp. 288, 663.

JOHN REID.

Z

ZEAL.—Zeal is always in the NT the tr. of the same word, *ζῆλος*, *ζηλωτής*, and always in a good sense; the bad sense is translated by 'envy.' As a desirable quality in the Christian, the word is almost peculiar to St. Paul's letters and speeches. Its contemporary use was chiefly in a bad sense; it stood for envy, and as a proper noun it furnished the party name that covered a very pernicious patriotism (Ζηλωταί). St. Paul converted the word, as he converted the quality in himself, kept its force, and rightly directed its aim. (Cf. the redemption of the word 'enthusiasm' in the last century.)

1. Zeal of God for man.—Both OT and NT insist on the zeal of God for man, the direct opposite of the Epicurean idea. 'The zeal of the Lord of Hosts' (2 K 19^{31}, Is 37^{32}) is for man's love, man's righteousness, for man to be sensible with himself and regard his own permanent interests (Dt 30^{20}), and make it possible for God to continue His abundant liberality (Ps 81^{13-16}); for the welfare and vigour of the Chosen People, the hope of mankind; at least a working remnant shall be preserved. Men may appeal to the zeal by intercession (Is 33^{15}). God's 'jealousy' is love demanding love, not satisfied with toleration or occasional faithfulness. To remember God's zeal frees His ever-presence from all savour of spying (Ps 139), and His commandments from the nature of arbitrary exactions (Dt 32^{47}, Ezk 18^{23}). In the NT God's zeal for man is the motive of the Incarnation (Jn 3^{16}), and is set forth in parables, such as the Lost Sheep and the Wicked Husbandman. God's zeal is burning love in action through boundless sacrifice.

2. Zeal for God in man.—Zeal for God in man is commanded and commended—even consuming zeal (Ps 69^{9}, approved by being quoted of the Christian's zeal, Jn 2^{17}). Language of strong reproof is addressed to the sluggard about his own character, the lukewarm in works of love, to those neither hot nor cold (Rev 3^{15}, 1 Co 14^{12}). Such faith cannot save (Ja 2^{14-18}). Christians are to be 'a peculiar people, zealous of good works' (Tit 2^{14}), 'not weary in well-doing' (Gal 6^{9}), with zeal making light of hardship, like a soldier's (2 Ti 2^{3}). Phinehas received a reward as 'zealous for his God' (Nu 25^{13}). Elijah, out of zeal for God's honour as much as fear, could not remain among a people whose daily life was blasphemous against Him. 1 Cor. is filled with practical solutions needed by Christian zeal if it was not to drive men out of the world, where the most ordinary customs had heathen significance. How far may the zealot for a higher morality and a purer religion seem to compromise with such? May he dine with his heathen relatives? marry them? divorce them if already married? Can slaves continue to serve heathen masters? Also the Christian must have zeal for his own character, develop all his talents for usefulness, have an ambitious morality, and not allow wealth (Mt 19^{21}) or even natural claims (Mt 10^{37}) to hinder consecration to God.

3. Perversion of zeal.—The acquisition in all languages of a bad meaning by words originally denoting true zeal is evidence of universal experience that zeal is liable to dangerous perversion. This occurs through (i.) impatience at God's patience, (ii.) over-devotion to an object subsidiary to the highest, (iii.) intrusion of feelings for self.

From (i.) comes the depression which breaks out in the opening verses of so many Psalms (cf. Ps 22; note the triumphant assurance and renewed zeal of its close). The despair of Elijah is replaced by the calmer zeal of Elisha, ever mindful of the invisible forces at work for good (2 K 6^{16}). Zeal is not the same as haste for results (Is 28^{16}). The latter when powerless leads to depression, when powerful to persecution (2 K 10^{16}, 2 S 21^{2}). (ii.) The Pharisees had a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge. The over-exaltation of legal observance and of national independence led them to the axiom that Jesus was a foe, to be consistently opposed whatever He said or did, and to be silenced some way or other (Jn 11$^{47-50}$). Their zeal thus leads almost to blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, and to the Crucifixion. From (iii.) come spiritual conceit, the idea that we have 'whereof to glory' (Ro 4^{2}) even toward God; the showy religionism of the Pharisees (Mt 23^{5}); the love 'to have the pre-eminence' (3 Jn ^{9}), and that envy which is 'the rottenness of the bones' (Pr 14^{30}). It is also a basal motive of *σχίσματα*, zealous preference for a truth, leading to the abandonment of a society in which satisfactory prominence is not given to this special object of enthusiasm.

4. Zeal in man against God.—There is a final perversion of zeal possible, the zeal in man against God. Compare the fierce activity and watchfulness of Judas with the sluggishness of the most zealous apostle, Peter. STACY WADDY.

ZEBULUN.—See TRIBES.

ZENAS.—In Tit 3^{13} Titus is urged to 'set forward (*πρόπεμψον*) Zenas the lawyer and Apollos on their journey diligently (*σπουδαίως*), that nothing be wanting unto them.' We gather that Zenas and Apollos were fellow-travellers who had come to Crete and were contemplating going elsewhere. Perhaps they were travelling preachers; or Zenas may have been the travelling companion of the eloquent Apollos. Anyhow, Paul asks for them a 'send-off' worthy of devoted Christian workers. Zenas is described as a 'lawyer' (*νομικός*). It is likely, therefore, that he was a convert from the ranks of Jewish lawyers—men skilled in the Jewish law. It is significant that he is found in the company of Apollos, whose preaching had a Jewish tinge (cf. art. APOLLOS). Though a convert to Christianity, and evidently a valued worker, he did not shake off his legalism completely; he favoured the Apollos type of preaching rather than the Pauline. It has been suggested that Zenas and Apollos were the bearers of the Epistle. May it be that these men were chosen as messengers to Crete because they were known to have influence amongst Jewish converts from whom the troubles in Crete seem to have chiefly arisen (cf. 3^{9})?

LITERATURE.—A. C. Headlam, art. 'Zenas' in *HDB* iv.; W. Lock, art. 'Titus,' *ib.*, p. 782^{b}; J. E. Roberts, art. 'Apollos' in *DAC*; W. B. Jones, art. 'Zenas' in Smith's *DB* iii. (for tradition); *Exp*, 8th ser., v. [1913] 329. J. E. ROBERTS.

ZEUS.—See JUPITER.

ZION (Gr. *Σιών*).—Zion was one of the hills or ridges (probably the east) on which Jerusalem was built. On this mount the Temple was built, and hence Zion was spoken of as the dwelling-place of Jahweh. Latterly it was synonymous with 'Jerusalem,' and 'daughter of Zion' became a prophetic designation for the whole nation. In the NT the expression 'Mount Zion' is spiritualized. Hebrews (12$^{18ff.}$) contrasts it with Mount Sinai, comparing the fear of the Old Covenant with the freedom of the New. Revelation (14^{1}) names the city of God which is above, 'Mount Zion,' recalling the phrase in Hebrews 'the heavenly Jerusalem.'

J. W. DUNCAN.

INDEXES

I. INDEX OF SUBJECTS

Aaron, i. 1^a.
Aaron's Rod, i. 1^b.
Abaddon, i. 2^a, 294^a, 545^a.
Abba, i. 2^a.
Abel, i. 3^a.
Abiding, i. 3^a.
Abomination, i. 3^b.
Abounding, i. 4^a.
Abraham, i. 4^b.
Abstinence, i. 6^a.
Abuse, Abusers, i. 11^a.
Abyss, i. 11^b, 545^a, 681^a.
Acceptance, i. 12^a.
Access, i. 13^a.
Account, i. 14^a.
Accursed, i. 55^b.
Aceldama, i. 47^a.
Achaia, i. 14^a.
Achaicus, i. 14^b.
Acts of the Apostles, i. 15^a, 281^b, 402^b; ii. 138^b.
Acts of the Apostles (Apocryphal), i. 29^b.
Adam, i. 39^b, 394^a ff.
Adjuration, ii. 98^b.
Administration, i. 41^a.
Admonition, i. 41^a, 174^a.
Adoption, i. 41^b, 175^a, 510^a, 698^a.
Adorning, i. 43^a, 520^b.
Adramyttium, i. 43^b.
Adria, i. 43^b.
Adultery, i. 417^a; ii. 16^a.
Advent, ii. 123^b [Parousia].
Adversary, i. 44^a.
Advocate, ii. 121^a [Paraclete].
Æneas, i. 44^b.
Æon, i. 44^b, 454^a; ii. 580^b.
Affliction, ii. 533^b [Suffering].
Agabus, i. 45^b.
Agape, i. 300^b f., 717^a; ii. 134^b.
Age, i. 46^a.
Aged, i. 46^b.
Ages, ii. 580^b.
Agriculture, i. 94^a.
Agrippa I., i. 564^b f., 26^b, 275^a, 278^b, 638^b f.
Agrippa II., i. 565^a, 277^a, 278^b, 639^a.
Air, i. 46^b.
Akeldama, i. 47^a.
Alexander, i. 47^a.
Alexandria, i. 47^b.
Alexandrians, i. 49^a.
Alien, ii. 530^b.
Allegory, i. 50^a.
Allotment, i. 712^b.
Almighty, i. 458^b.
Alms, i. 50^a, 7^b, 449^b.
Alpha and Omega, i. 50^b, 185^b.
Altar, i. 51^a.
Ambassador, i. 52^a, 46^b.
Amen, i. 52^b.
Amethyst, i. 54^a.
Amomum, i. 54^a.
Amphipolis, i. 54^a.
Amplias, i. 54^b.
Ampliatus, i. 54^b.
Ananias, i. 54^b.
Anathema, i. 55^b.
Anchor, i. 56^b; ii. 475^b.
Andrew, Acts of, i. 36^b.
Andronicus, i. 57^a, 83^b.
Angels, i. 57^b, 61^b, 101^a, 229$^{a,\,b}$, 230$^{a,\,b}$, 287^b, 340^b; ii. 273^a, 523^a.
Angels of the Seven Churches, i. 61^b, 60^a.
Anger, i. 62^b.
Annas, i. 65^b.
Anointing, i. 65^b, 129^a.
Answer, i. 66^b.
Antichrist, i. 67^a, 101^a, 145^a, 146^a, 360^a, 361^a; ii. 7^a.
Antinomianism, i. 685^a [Law].
Antioch, i. 69^a, 199^b, 280^a.
Antipas, i. 71^a.
Antipas (Herod), i. 564^b, 278^b.
Antipatris, i. 71^b.
Antitype, ii. 623^b.
Antonia, i. 170^b, 637^b.
Anxiety, i. 169^b.
Apelles, i. 71^b.
  Gospel of, i. 498^b.
Apocalypse, i. 71^b; ii. 625^a f.
Apollonia, i. 81^a.
Apollos, i. 81^a, 255^a.
Apollyon, i. 2^a.
Apostasy, i. 82^b.
Apostle, i. 82^b, 582^a.
Apostolic Church Ordinance, i. 298^b.
Apostolic Constitutions and Canons, i. 84^b, 298^b.
Apostolic Creed, i. 238^a.
Appeal, ii. 615^b f.; i. 164^b.
Appearing, ii. 123^b [Parousia].
Apphia, i. 86^b.
Appii Forum, i. 86^b.
Appius, Market of, i. 86^b.
Aprons, i. 87^a.
Aquila and Priscilla, i. 87^a; ii. 408^b.
Arabia, i. 88^a.
Archangel, ii. 35^b.
Archippus, i. 89^a, 400^a.
Areopagite, Areopagus, i. 89^b.
Aretas, i. 90^b, 275^a.
Aristarchus, i. 91^a.
Aristobulus, i. 91^b, 399^b, 565^b.
Ark, i. 91^b.
Armageddon, i. 524^a.
Armour, i. 92^a.
Army, i. 93^a; ii. 662^b ff.
Artemas, i. 93^b.
Artemis, i. 295^a.
Arts, i. 94^a.
Ascension of Isaiah, i. 99^a.
Ascension of Jesus Christ, i. 95^b, 222$^{a,\,b}$, 385^b, 638^b.
Asceticism, i. 6^b.
Asia, i. 102^a.
Asiarch, i. 102^b, 332^b.
Asmodæus, i. 2^a, 294^a.
Asp, i. 103^a.
Assassins, i. 103^b.
Assembly, i. 104^a.
Assos, i. 104 .
Assumption of Moses, i. 105^a.
Assurance, i. 107^b.
Asyncritus, i. 109^a.
Athens, i. 109^b.
Atonement of Jesus Christ, i. 110^b; ii. 260^b.
Attalia, i. 123^b.
Augustan Band, i. 123^b.

Augustus, i. 124^{a}.
Author and Finisher, i. 125^{b}.
Authorities, i. 125^{b}.
Authority, i. 126^{a}.
Avenging, ii. 635^{b} [Vengeance].
Azotus, i. 126^{b}.

Baal, i. 126^{a}.
Babbler, i. 126^{b}.
Babblings, i. 127^{a}.
Babylon, i. 524^{a}.
Backbiters, i. 381^{a}.
Balaam, i. 127^{b}.
Balak, i. 127^{b}.
Band, i. 127^{b}.
Bankers, ii. 602^{a}.
Baptism, i. 128^{a}, 43^{a}, 247^{b}, 300^{b}, 333^{a}, 364^{b}, 461^{b}, 599^{b}; ii. 73^{a}, 425^{a}, 589^{a}.
  for the Dead, i. 128^{b}.
Barak, i. 136^{b}.
Barbarian, i. 137^{a}; ii. 462^{b}.
Bar-Jesus, i. 137^{a}.
Barnabas, i. 138^{a}; ii. 117^{a}.
  Epistle of, i. 139^{a}, 298^{a}.
Barsabbas (Joseph), surnamed Justus, i. 649^{a}.
  (Judas), i. 656^{b}.
Bartholomew, Gospel of, i. 502^{b}.
Baruch, Apocalypse of, i. 142^{a}.
Basilides, Gospel of, i. 498^{a}.
Basket, i. 144^{b}.
Beast, i. 145^{a}, 74^{b}.
Beating, i. 145^{a}.
Beautiful Gate, i. 311^{a}, 443^{a}; ii. 556^{b}.
Bed, i. 145^{b}, 588^{a}; ii. 524^{a}.
Beginning and End, i. 50[illegible] [Alpha and Omega], 185^{b}.
Belial, Beliar, i. 146^{a}, 67^{b}, 100^{b}.
Belief, i. 389^{a} [Faith].
Believers, Bodily Resurrection of, ii. 355^{b}.
  Priesthood of, ii. 271^{a}.
Beloved, i. 146^{b}.
Benediction, i. 146^{b}.
Beor, i. 148^{b}.
Berenice, Bernice, i. 148^{b}.
Berœa, i. 148^{b}.
Beryl, i. 149^{a}.
Biblical Greek, i. 551^{b}.
Bigamy, ii. 14^{a}.
Bills, ii. 601^{b}.
Binding and Loosing, i. 381^{b}, 382^{a}.
Birthright, i. 410^{b}.
Bishop, i. 149^{b}, 598^{b}; ii. 588^{b}.
Bithynia, i. 151^{a}.
Bitterness, i. 151^{a}.
Black, i. 231^{b}.
Blasphemy, i. 151^{b}; ii. 71^{a}.
Blastus, i. 152^{a}, 173^{a}.
Blessedness, i. 152^{a}.
Blessing, i. 146^{b}, 210^{b}.
Blindness, i. 152^{b}.
Blood, i. 153^{a}.
Bloody Flux, i. 315^{b}.
Boanerges, i. 626^{a}.
Boasting, i. 154^{a}.
Boat, ii. 474^{b} [Ship].
Body, i. 154^{b}, 518^{a}, 528^{a}.
  Spiritual, ii. 325^{a} f., 347^{b} f., 357^{b} f.
Boldness, i. 156^{b}.
Bond, i. 157^{a}; ii. 602^{a}.
Bondage, i. 157^{b}.
Bonds, i. 173^{a}.
Book, ii. 699^{b}.
  of Life, i. 158^{a}, 699^{a}.
  with the Seven Seals, i. 159^{a}, 158^{a}.
Bosor, i. 148^{b}.
Bottomless Pit, i. 11^{b}.
Bowl, i. 159^{b}.
Bread, ii. 605^{a}.
  Breaking of, i. 373^{b}, 717^{b}; ii. 134^{b}, 426^{a}.
Breastplate, i. 92^{b}.
Brethren, i. 159^{b}, 424^{a}.
  of the Lord, i. 628^{b}, 658^{b}.
Bride and Bridegroom, i. 398^{b}; ii. 13^{a}.
Brimstone, i. 160^{a}.
Brother, i. 399^{b} f.
Brotherhood, i. 160^{a}, 184^{a}, 405^{b} [Fellowship].
Brotherly Love, i. 160^{b}, 246^{a}, 526^{b}.
Buffet, i. 162^{b}.
Building, i. 162^{b}, 94^{b}; ii. 608^{b}.
Burial, ii. 469^{a}.
Business, i. 163^{b}.

Cæsar, i. 164^{a}.
Cæsar's Household, i. 164^{b}, 399^{b}; ii. 223^{a}.
Cæsarea, i. 165^{a}.
Cæsarism, i. 330^{a} [Emperor-worship].
Caiaphas, i. 165^{b}.
Cain, i. 3^{a}.
Cainites, i. 165^{b}.
Calf, i. 166^{b}.
Caligula, i. 166^{b}.
Call, Called, Calling, i. 167^{b}; ii. 188^{b}.
Calvin, ii. 183^{a}.
Canaan, i. 168^{b}.
Candace, i. 168^{b}.
Candle, i. 683^{a}.
Candlestick, i. 683^{a}, 588^{b}.
Canker, i. 442^{b}.
Cappadocia, i. 168^{b}.
Captain of the Temple, i. 169^{a}; ii. 422^{a}.
Captivity, i. 157^{b} [Bondage].
Care, Careful, i. 169^{a}.
Care of the Person, i. 94^{b}.
Carnal, i. 169^{b}, 412^{a}.
Carpus, i. 170^{a}.
Castaway, i. 170^{b}.
Castle, i. 170^{b}.
Castor and Pollux, i. 302^{b}.
Catechumens, i. 130^{a}.
Catholic Epistles, i. 171^{a}.
Cauda, i. 171^{b}.
Celibacy, i. 8^{a}, 385^{b}; ii. 11^{b}, 555^{b}.
Cenchreæ, i. 171^{b}.
Censer, i. 172^{a}.
Centurion, i. 93^{a}.
Cephas, ii. 191^{a}.
Cephas-party, i. 255^{a}; ii. 198^{a}.
Cerinthianism, i. 646^{a}.
Cerinthus, i. 172^{b}.
Certainty, i. 107^{b} [Assurance].
Chain, i. 173^{a}.
Chalcedony, i. 173^{a}.
Chamberlain, i. 173^{a}.
Chanaan, i. 168^{b}.
Charaan, i. 521^{b}.
Charismata, i. 450^{a}, 320^{b}, 357^{b}, 383^{b}; ii. 116^{b}.
Charity, i. 50^{a} [Alms], 713^{b} [Love].
Charity, Feast of, i. 717^{a} [Love-feast].
Chastisement, i. 173^{b}.
Cheerfulness, i. 174^{a}.
Cherubim, i. 174^{b}.
Chief Priests, ii. 269^{a}.
Child, Children, i. 398^{b}.
Children of God, Sons of God, i. 174^{b}.
Chiliasm, i. 358^{a}, 359^{b}.
Chios, i. 176^{b}.
Chloe, i. 177^{a}.
Christ.—See Jesus Christ.
Christianity, i. 80^{b}, 331^{b}; ii. 17^{b}, 211^{a,b}, 213^{b}, 407^{a}, 440^{a}, 511^{a}, 528^{a}.
Christian Life, i. 200^{b}, 9^{b}, 538^{a}, 697^{b}; ii. 589^{b}.
Christians, i. 199^{a}, 392^{b}, 639^{b}; ii. 17^{b}, 173^{a} ff., 440^{b}, 531^{b}, 662^{b}.
Christology, i. 177^{a}.
  Acts of the Apostles, i. 28^{a}.
  Barnabas, Epistle of, i. 140^{b}.
  Clement of Rome, i. 218^{b}.
  Ephesians, i. 347^{b}.
  Galatians, i. 432^{b}.
  Gnostic, i. 454^{a}.
  Hebrews, i. 536^{b}.
  Ignatius, i. 601^{b}.
  James, i. 185^{a}.
  Philippians, ii. 226^{a}.
  Thessalonians, ii. 571^{a}.
Christ-party, i. 255^{b}, 308^{b}; ii. 198^{a}, 338^{a}.
Chronology, i. 274^{a} [Dates].
Chrysolite, i. 203^{b}.
Chrysoprase, i. 203^{b}.
Church, i. 203^{b}, 101^{b}, 239^{b}, 256^{b}, 346^{b}, 399^{b}, 578^{b}.
  Attitude to War, ii. 660^{b}.
  Condition, ii. 586^{b}.
  Discipline, i. 259^{a}, 303^{b}.

Church—
  Doctrine, i. 563^{b}.
  Government, i. 209^{b}.
  Organization, i. 259^{a}, 563^{a}, 598^{a}, 640^{a}; ii. 588^{a}.
  Worship, ii. 697^{a}, 588^{a}.
Cilicia, i. 211^{a}.
Cinnamon, i. 211^{b}.
Circumcision, i. 211^{b}.
Cis, i. 678^{b}.
Citizenship, i. 212^{b}, 696^{b}; ii. 406^{b}.
Clauda, i. 171^{b}.
Claudia, i. 213^{b}.
Claudius, i. 214^{a}, 276^{b}.
Claudius Lysias, i. 728^{a}.
Clay, i. 95^{a}; ii. 254^{b}.
Clean, i. 215^{a}.
Clement, i. 215^{b}.
Clement of Rome, Epistle of, i. 216^{a}, 250^{a}.
Cloke, i. 221^{a}.
Clothes, Clothing, i. 221^{a}, 94^{b}; ii. 607^{b}.
Cloud, i. 222^{a}.
Cnidus, i. 222^{b}.
Coals, i. 223^{a}.
Coat, i. 223^{a}.
Codex, ii. 462^{a}, 701^{b}, 702^{a}.
Cohort, i. 93^{b}, 127^{b}, 170^{b}, 623$^{a, b}$.
Coins, ii. 601^{b}.
Collection, i. 223^{b}.
Colony, i. 225^{b}, 213^{a}; ii. 406^{b}, 472^{a}.
Colossæ, i. 226^{a}.
  Church of, i. 226^{b}, 342^{a}.
Colossian Heresy, i. 228^{b}.
Colossians, Epistle to the, i. 227^{a}, 281^{b}; ii. 143^{a}.
Colours, i. 231^{a}.
Comfort, Comforter, i. 232^{a}.
Coming, ii. 123^{b} [Parousia].
Commandment, i. 233^{a}.
Commendation, i. 234^{a}.
Commerce, ii. 600^{b}.
Common, i. 215^{a}.
Communion, i. 234^{b}.
Community of Goods, i. 235^{b}, 368^{a}.
Compassion, ii. 240^{a}, 29^{b}.
Concision, i. 212^{b}.
Concupiscence, i. 723^{b}.
Condemnation, i. 236^{b}.
Confession, i. 237^{a}; ii. 278^{b}.
Confidence, i. 239^{a}.
Confirmation, i. 239^{a}, 133^{a}.
Congregation, i. 239^{b}.
Conscience, i. 239^{b}, 529^{a}, 697^{a}.
Consecrate, Consecration, i. 242^{a}.
Consolation, i. 232^{a}.
Conspiracy, i. 243^{a}.
Constraint, i. 244^{a}.
Contentment, i. 244^{a}.
Contribution, i. 245^{b}.
Conversation, i. 246^{a}.
Conversion, i. 246^{b}.
Conveyances, ii. 394^{a}.
Coppersmith, i. 248^{b}.
Core, i. 680^{b}.
Corinth, i. 248^{b}.
  Church of, i. 216^{a}, 225^{a}.
Corinthians, Epistles to the, i. 250^{b}, 281^{a}; ii. 141^{b}.
Cornelius, i. 259^{b}, 623^{a}, 656^{a}.
Corner, i. 260^{a}.
Corner-stone, i. 260^{a}, 418^{b}.
Cos, i. 260^{b}.
Cosmetics, ii. 608^{b}.
Couch, i. 145^{b}, 588^{b}.
Council, ii. 454^{a} [Sanhedrin].
Council House, i. 638^{a}.
Courage, i. 156^{b}.
Courts, ii. 613^{b} [Trial-at-Law].
Courtyard, i. 587^{b}.
Covenant, i. 261^{a}, 535^{b}, 536^{a}.
Covetousness, i. 263^{a}.
Crafts, i. 94^{a}.
Creation, i. 263^{b}.
Crescens, i. 265^{a}.
Crete, Cretans, i. 265^{b}.
Crispus, i. 266^{a}.
Cross, i. 266^{a}, 256^{b}.
Crown, i. 269^{a}, 221^{b}.
Crucifixion, i. 266^{a}, 274^{b}.
Crystal, i. 269^{b}.
Cubit, i. 269^{b}.
Cup, i. 270^{a}.
Curse, i. 270^{b}.
Custom, i. 271^{a}.
Customs Dues, ii. 603^{a}.
Cymbal, i. 271^{b}; ii. 256^{b}.
Cyprus, i. 272^{a}.
Cyrene, Cyrenians, i. 272^{b}.

Dalmatia, i. 273^{a}, 606^{a}.
Damaris, i. 273^{a}, 398^{a}.
Damascus, Damascenes, i. 273^{b}.
Damnation, i. 661^{b}.
Darkness, i. 700^{b}, 545^{b}.
Dates, i. 274^{a}.
David, i. 283^{a}.
Day, ii. 582^{a}.
  and Night (Figurative), i. 283^{b}.
  of the Lord, ii. 123^{b} [Parousia].
  of Repentance, i. 107^{a}.
  of Wrath, i. 65^{a}.
Day-star, i. 284^{a}.
Deacon, Deaconess, i. 284^{b}; ii. 589^{a}.
Dearth, i. 401^{a}.
Death, i. 699^{b}, 393^{b} [Fall]; ii. 501^{a}, 512^{b}.
  of Jesus Christ, i. 181^{a}, 267^{b}, 385^{b}, 537^{b}; ii. 260^{b}, 303^{b} ff., 351^{a}, 437^{b}, 445^{b}.
  Second, i. 545^{b}, 681^{b}, 700^{a}.
Debt, Debtor, i. 285^{a}.
Decree, i. 286^{a}.
Deliverance, ii. 444^{a} f.
Deliverer, i. 286^{a}.
Deluge, i. 412^{b} [Flood].
Demas, i. 286^{b}.
Demetrius, i. 287^{a}, 647^{b}.
Demon, i. 287^{b}; ii. 249^{a}.
Dependents, i. 398^{b}.
Deputy, i. 288^{b}.
Derbe, i. 288^{b}.
Descent into Hades, i. 289^{a}, 664^{b}.
Desert, i. 292^{a}.
Destruction, i. 292^{b}, 236^{b}; ii. 165^{a}.
Devil, i. 293^{a}; ii. 472^{a}.
Diadem, i. 269^{a}.
Diana, i. 295^{a}.
Diaspora, i. 304^{b}, 549^{b}.
Didache, i. 296^{a}.
Didascalia, i. 298^{b}.
Digamy, ii. 14^{b}.
Dionysius, i. 89^{b}.
Dioscuri, i. 302^{b}.
Diotrephes, i. 302^{b}, 647^{b}.
Disciple, i. 302^{b}.
Discipline, i. 303^{a}, 173^{b}.
Disobedience, ii. 628^{a}.
Dispersion, i. 304^{b}.
Divination, i. 306^{b}.
Divisions, i. 308^{b}.
Divorce, ii. 15^{b}; i. 523^{b}.
Docetism, i. 645^{b}.
Doctor, i. 308^{b}.
Doctrine, ii. 552^{a}.
Dog, i. 309^{a}.
Dominion, i. 309^{a}.
Domitian, i. 309^{b}; ii. 179^{a}.
Door, i. 311^{a}, 443^{a}, 587^{b}.
Dorcas, i. 311^{b}.
Doxology, i. 312^{a}; ii. 256^{a}.
Dragon, i. 313^{a}, 293^{b}, 546^{b}.
Dream, i. 313^{b}.
Dress, i. 221^{a} [Clothes].
Drunkenness, i. 314^{a}.
Drusilla, i. 315^{b}, 277^{a}.
Dyeing, ii. 607^{a}.
Dysentery, i. 315^{b}.

Eagle, i. 315^{a}.
Ear, i. 316^{b}.
Earnest, i. 317^{a}.
Earth, Earthen, Earthy, Earthly, i. 317^{b}.
Earthquake, i. 317^{b}.
Easter, ii. 132^{b}, 135^{a}.
Ebionism, i. 318^{a}, 369^{a}; ii. 79^{a}.
Ebionites, Gospel of the, i. 494^{a}.
Ecclesiasticus, ii. 503^{b}.
Eclecta, i. 647^{b}.
Ecstasy, ii. 299^{a}.
Edification, i. 320^{a}.
Education, i. 321^{a}.
Egypt, i. 325^{a}.
Egyptian, The, i. 103^{b}.
Egyptians, Gospel of the, i. 495^{a}.
Eight, ii. 94^{b}.
Elamites, i. 325^{b}.

Elder, i. 325^b, 149^b, 210^b, 211^a; ii. 585^a.
Elect lady, i. 647^b.
Election, i. 326^a, 510^a; ii. 262^a.
Elements, i. 328^a.
Elijah, i. 329^b; ii. 169^b.
Elkesaites, i. 320^a, 369^a.
Elymas, i. 137^b.
Emerald, i. 330^a.
Emperor, i. 124^a [Augustus].
Emperor-worship, i. 330^a, 593^b, 706^b.
Emulation, i. 341^b.
Enlightenment, i. 332^b, 679^a.
Enmity, i. 333^b.
Enoch, i. 334^a.
  Book of, i. 334^b.
Envy, i. 341^a.
Epænetus, i. 341^b.
Epaphras, i. 342^a.
Epaphroditus, i. 342^b; ii. 217^a.
Ephesians, Epistle to the, i. 343^a, 281^b; ii. 143^a.
Ephesus, i. 349^b, 280^b.
Epicureans, i. 351^a.
Epicurus, i. 351^b.
Epistle, i. 353^a, 694^b.
Era, ii. 581^a.
Erastus, i. 353^b, 173^b.
Esau, i. 354^a.
Eschatology, i. 354^b, 257^b, 454^b; ii. 322^a [Resurrection], 379^b, 571^b, 573^a.
Esdras, The Second Book of, i. 365^b.
Essenes, i. 367^a.
Eternal, Everlasting, i. 369^b.
  Fire, i. 409^b.
  Life, i. 370^a, 610^b, 698^b; ii. 5^b, 188^b.
Ethics, i. 370^b; ii. 451^b.
Ethiopians, i. 372^b.
Ethiopian Eunuch, i. 373^a.
Ethnarch, i. 373^a.
Eubulus, i. 373^b.
Eucharist, i. 373^b, 257^a, 300^b f., 364^b, 365^a, 599^b f., 717^b; ii. 134^a, 425^a ff., 698^a.
Eunice, i. 377^b, 704^b.
Eunuch, i. 173^b, 373^a, 385^b.
Euodia, Euodias, i. 377^b; ii. 218^a.
Euphrates, i. 378^a.
Euraquilo, i. 378^b.
Euroclydon, i. 378^b.
Eutychus, i. 378^b.
Evangelist, i. 379^a.
Eve, i. 379^b.
  Gospel of, i. 504^b.
Everlasting, i. 369^b.
Evil, i. 380^a, 264^b.
Evil-speaking, i. 381^a.
Excommunication, i. 381^b.
Exhortation, i. 383^a.
Exorcism, i. 383^b; ii. 71^a.
Expediency, i. 385^a.
Expiation, i. 110^b [Atonement]; ii. 281^b [Propitiation], 431^b [Sacrifice].
Eye, i. 387^b.

Fable, i. 388^a.
Faction, i. 388^b.
Fair Havens, i. 389^a.
Fairs, ii. 603^a.
Faith, i. 389^a, 538^a, 540^a, 578^a, 667^b; ii. 259^a, 383^a, 589^b.
  and Works, i. 432^a, 434^a, 669^a; ii. 384^a.
Faithfulness, i. 392^a.
Fall, i. 393^b.
False Prophet, i. 68^b.
False Teachers, i. 60^b, 600^a, 645^a, 659^a, 727^b; ii. 550^b, 586^a.
Family, i. 397^b.
Famine, i. 401^a.
Fast, The, i. 401^b.
Fasting, i. 6^b, 132^a, 300^b; ii. 116^b.
Father, i. 398^a.
Fatherhood of God, i. 175^b, 347^b, 399^b, 459^b.
Fathom, i. 402^b.
Fear, i. 402^b.
Feasting, i. 403^b.
Feasts, ii. 581^b.
Feet, i. 405^a.
Felix, i. 405^a, 276^a.
Fellowship, i. 405^b, 234^b, 246^a; ii. 188^a, 224^a.
  Right Hand of, i. 521^a.
Festus, i. 406^b, 276^a.
Fever, i. 407^a.
Field of Blood, i. 47^a.
Fig, Fig-tree, i. 407^a.
Final Destinies, i. 356^b, 363^b; ii. 351^b.
Finisher, i. 125^b.
Fire, i. 407^b.
  Coals of, i. 223^a.
First and Last, i. 50^b [Alpha and Omega].
First-born, First-begotten, i. 410^b.
First-fruit, i. 411^a; ii. 134^a.
Fish, ii. 606^a.
Flesh, i. 411^b, 578^a, 689^a, 724^b; ii. 500^a.
Flock, i. 412^b.
Flood, i. 412^b.
Flute, ii. 239^a, 256^b.
Food, ii. 605^a.
Fool, i. 413^a.
Footwear, ii. 476^b.
Forbearance, i. 704^b [Long-suffering].
Foreigner, ii. 530^b.
Foreknowledge, i. 413^b.
Foreordination, ii. 262^a.
Forerunner, i. 414^b.
Forgiveness, i. 414^b.
Form, i. 415^b.
Formalism, i. 416^a.
Fornication, i. 417^a, 523^b; ii. 16^a.
Fortunatus, i. 418^b.
Foundation, i. 418^b, 587^a.
Four, ii. 94^b.
Fragments of Uncanonical Gospels—
  Coptic, i. 505^a.
  Fayyûm, i. 506^b.
  Oxyrhynchite, i. 499^a.
  Sahidic, i. 500^a.
  Unidentified, i. 489^a, 506^b.
Frankincense, i. 420^a.
Freedom, i. 420^a [Freedom of the Will], 696^b [Liberty].
Freedom of the Will, i. 420^a, 522^a; ii. 289^b, 452^a.
Friends, Friendship, i. 424^a.
Fruit, i. 424^b; ii. 605^b.
Fulling, ii. 606^b.
Fulness, i. 425^b.
Future Life, i. 354^b [Eschatology], 584^b, 608^b.

Gaius, i. 427^a, 582^a.
Galatia, i. 427^a.
Galatians, i. 427^b.
Galatians, Epistle to the, i. 430^b, 281^a; ii. 140^b.
Galba, i. 437^a.
Galilee, i. 437^b.
Gallio, i. 439^b, 26^b, 275^b.
Gamaliel, i. 440^a; ii. 174^a, 460^b.
  Gospel of, i. 504^a.
Games, i. 441^a, 322^a; ii. 276^a.
Gangrene, i. 442^b.
Garden of Eden, ii. 123^a.
Garlands, i. 442^b.
Garments, i. 221^a.
Gate, i. 443^a, 587^b.
Gaul, i. 430^a.
Gaza, i. 443^a.
Gehenna, i. 544^b, 107^b.
Genealogies, i. 443^b.
Generation, i. 444^b.
Gentiles, i. 445^a, 529^a; ii. 156^a, 211^a, 415^b.
Gentleness, ii. 27^a [Meekness].
Gideon, i. 449^a.
Gift, i. 449^a.
  of the Spirit, i. 29^a, 132^b, 135^b, 184^a, 511^a, 574^a; ii. 353^a.
  of Tongues, ii. 598^b, and see Glossolalia.
Gifts of the Spirit, i. 450^a, 320^b, 357^b, 383^b; ii. 116^b, 550^a.
Girdle, i. 451^b.
Glass, i. 587^b; ii. 42^b.
Glory, i. 451^b.
Glossolalia, i. 18^a, 183^b, 320^b, 581^a; ii. 162^b, 598^b.
Gnosticism, i. 453^a, 259^b, 320^a, 369^a, 645^b; ii. 153^a, 220^a.
Goad, i. 457^a.
Goat, i. 457^a.

God, i. 457^{b}, 33^{b}, 218^{b}; ii. 571^{a}.
  Faithfulness, i. 392^{a}.
  Fatherhood, i. 175^{b}, 347^{b}, 399^{b}, 459^{b}.
  Grace, ii. 152^{a}, 390^{a}.
  Kingship, i. 675^{b}.
  Love, ii. 389^{b}.
  Presence, ii. 267^{a}.
  Revelation in Nature, ii. 77^{b}.
  Righteousness, ii. 376^{a}, 152^{a}, 282^{b} f., 389^{b}, 390^{a}.
  Sovereignty, ii. 186^{b}.
  Unity, ii. 632^{a}.
  Voice, ii. 644^{a}.
  Will, ii. 187^{a}.
  Wrath, i. 63^{b}, 567^{b}; ii. 389^{b}.
Godliness, i. 467^{a}; ii. 590^{a}.
Gog and Magog, i. 467^{b}; ii. 462^{b}.
Gold, i. 468^{a}.
Gomorrah, ii. 517^{b}.
Good, i. 468^{b}.
Goodness, i. 470^{a}.
Goods, ii. 608^{b}.
Gospel, i. 471^{b}; ii. 224^{a} f.
Gospels, i. 474^{a}, 79^{b}, 282^{a}.
Gospels (Uncanonical), i. 478$^{a,\,b}$.
Government, Governor, i. 506^{b}.
Governments, i. 507^{a}.
Grace, i. 507^{a}; ii. 78^{a}.
Grafting, i. 513^{a}.
Grave, Gravity, i. 513^{b}.
Grecians, Greeks, i. 514^{b}.
Greece, i. 515^{a}.
Greek, Hellenistic and Biblical, i. 551^{b}.
Grief, i. 516^{b}.
Groaning, i. 517^{a}.
Growth, i. 517^{b}.
Guard, i. 518^{a}.
Guardian, ii. 623^{a}.
Guardian Angels, i. 60^{a}.
Guile, i. 519^{a}.
Guilt, ii. 450^{a}, 499^{a}, 500^{b}.
Gymnastics, i. 95^{b}, 323^{b}.

Hades, i. 519^{a}, 340^{b}, 544^{b}, 681^{a}.
  Descent into, i. 289^{a}, 664^{b}.
Hagar, i. 519^{b}.
Hail, i. 520^{a}.
Hair, i. 520^{b}; ii. 608^{b}.
Hallelujah, i. 520^{b}.
Hamor, ii. 474^{a}.
Hand, i. 521^{a}.
Handkerchief, i. 521^{b}.
Hands, Laying on of, i. 132^{a}, 210^{b}, 521^{a}; ii. 115^{a}.
Handwriting, i. 157^{a}; ii. 699^{b}.
Haran, i. 521^{b}.
Hardening, i. 521^{b}.
Harlot, i. 523^{a}.
Har-Magedon, i. 524^{a}.
Harp, i. 524^{b}; ii. 256^{b}.
Harvest, i. 525^{b}.
Hatred, i. 526^{b}.
Head, i. 527^{a}.
Head-dress, i. 221^{b}.
Healing, i. 450^{b}.
Heart, i. 528^{b}.
Heathen, i. 529^{a}.
Heaven, i. 530^{a}.
Hebrews, i. 533^{b}.
Hebrews, Epistle to the, i. 534^{b}, 88^{a}, 282^{a}.
Heifer, i. 542^{b}.
Heir, i. 543^{a}.
Hell, i. 544^{b}.
Hellas, i. 515^{a}.
Hellenism, i. 547^{b}.
Hellenistic and Biblical Greek, i. 551^{b}.
Helmet, i. 92^{b}.
Helps, i. 560^{a}.
Heresy, i. 560^{b}.
Heritage, i. 543^{a}.
Hermas, i. 561^{a}, 298^{a}.
  Shepherd of, i. 561^{a}.
Hermes, i. 564^{a}; ii. 29^{a}.
Hermogenes, ii. 234^{b}.
Herod, i. 564^{b}.
Herodion, i. 565^{b}.
Hetairai, i. 417^{b}.
Hierapolis, i. 565^{b}.
High Priest, ii. 269^{a}.
Hinnom, Valley of, i. 681^{a}.
History of Joseph the Carpenter, i. 489^{a}.
Holiness, i. 566^{a}; ii. 451^{b}.
Holy Day, i. 571^{b}.
Holy Ghost.—See Holy Spirit.
Holy of Holies, ii. 453^{b}.
Holy Mount, ii. 46^{b}.
Holy Place, ii. 453^{b}.
Holy Spirit, i. 573^{a}, 218^{b}, 348^{a}, 432^{b}, 465^{a}, 614^{b}; ii. 121^{a}, 162^{b}, and see Gift of the Spirit.
Home, i. 581^{b}.
Honest, i. 582^{a}.
Honey, i. 582^{b}.
Honour, i. 583^{a}.
Hope, i. 583^{b}.
Horn, i. 585^{a}.
Horse, i. 585^{b}.
Hosea, i. 586^{a}.
Hospitality, i. 586^{a}, 582^{a}.
Hour, ii. 582^{a}.
  (Figurative), i. 586^{b}.
House, i. 586^{b}.
Humility, i. 588^{b}.
Husband, i. 398^{a}; ii. 11^{a} [Marriage].
Hyacinth, i. 624^{a}.
Hymenæus, i. 589^{b}.
Hymns, i. 590^{a}.
Hypocrisy, i. 591^{b}.
Hypostasis, ii. 533^{a}.
Hyssop, i. 592^{b}.

Iconium, i. 592^{a}.
Idolatry, i. 593^{a}, 215^{b}, 606^{a}.
Idol-meats, i. 258^{a}, 418^{a}, 593^{b}; ii. 412^{a}.
Ignatius, i. 594^{a}.
Ignorance, i. 605^{a}.
Illumination, i. 332^{b}, 679^{a}.
Illyricum, i. 605^{b}.
Image, i. 606^{a}.
Immersion, i. 131^{b}.
Immortality, i. 607^{b}; ii. 351^{b}.
Incarnation, i. 177^{a} ff., 536^{b}; ii. 226^{a} f.
Incense, i. 611^{b}.
Incorruption, ii. 628^{b}.
Increase, i. 517^{b}.
Infant Baptism, i. 136^{a}.
Inheritance, i. 543^{a}.
Inns, ii. 395^{a}.
Inspiration and Revelation, i. 612^{a}.
Intercession, i. 618^{a}, 97^{a}.
Intermediate State, i. 356^{a}, 363^{a}.
Interpretation, i. 619^{b}.
Iron, i. 620^{b}.
Isaac, i. 620^{b}.
Isaiah, i. 621^{a}.
Ishmael, i. 620^{b}.
Israel, i. 622^{a}, 533^{b}.
  (=Jacob), 625^{a}.
Israelite, i. 623^{a}.
Italian Band, i. 623^{a}.
Italy, i. 623^{b}.
Ivory, i. 624^{b}.

Jacinth, i. 624^{a}.
Jacob, i. 624^{a}.
Jaffa, i. 648^{b}.
Jailor, i. 625^{a}.
Jambres, i. 633^{a}.
James and John, the Sons of Zebedee, i. 625^{b}, 280$^{a,\,b}$; ii. 18^{a}.
James, the Lord's Brother, the Just, i. 628^{b}, 83^{b}, 201^{b}, 280^{a}, 368^{a}, 638^{a}, 640^{a}; ii. 81^{b}, 557^{b}.
James, Epistle of, i. 629^{a}, 280^{b}.
Jannes and Jambres, i. 633^{a}.
Jason, i. 633^{b}.
Jasper, i. 633^{b}.
Jealousy, i. 633^{b}.
Jephthah, i. 633^{b}.
Jericho, i. 634^{a}.
Jerusalem, i. 634^{a}.
Jesse, i. 640^{b}.
Jesting, i. 640^{b}.
Jesus, i. 641^{a}.
  (=Joshua), i. 653^{b}.
Jesus Christ, i. 177^{a}.
  Appearances, ii. 333^{b} ff., 340^{b} ff.
  Ascension, i. 95^{b}, 222$^{a,\,b}$, 385^{b}, 638^{b}.
  Atonement, i. 110^{b}; ii. 260^{b}.
  Attitude to War, ii. 647^{a}.
  Blasphemy, ii. 172^{b}.
  Burial, ii. 470^{b}.

Jesus Christ—
  Death, i. 181^a, 267^b, 385^b, 537^b; ii. 260^b, 303^b ff., 351^a, 437^b, 445^b.
  Divine Attributes, i. 464^a.
  Divinity, i. 462^a; ii. 349^a.
  Exaltation, i. 96^a; ii. 352^b.
  Faithfulness, i. 392^b.
  Glorified, i. 188^b; ii. 349^b.
  Headship, i. 528^a.
  Historic, i. 183^a, 192^a, 197^a.
  Humanity, i. 465^a.
  Incarnation, i. 177^a ff., 536^b; ii. 226^a f.
  Institution of Sacraments, ii. 427^b.
  Judge, i. 180^b, 198^b, 355^b.
  King, i. 97^b, 674^b, 676^b.
  Logos, i. 198^b.
  Lord, i. 178^b, 180^a, 187^b, 188^b, 462^b, 705^b; ii. 349^b, 352^b f.
  Mediator, ii. 21^a.
  Messiah, i. 178^a ff., 355^a, 573^b; ii. 173^b, 260^a, 348^b.
  Mysticism, ii. 64^a.
  Name, i. 130^a; ii. 67^a, 72^a.
  Nazaræan, i. 178^b.
  Naziritism, ii. 81^b.
  'Our Passover,' ii. 134^a.
  Paraclete, ii. 121^a.
  Passion, i. 256^b; ii. 445^b.
  Pattern, ii. 187^b.
  Person, i. 177^a [Christ, Christology], 256^a, 359^b, 509^a; ii. 187^b, 571^a.
  Pre-existence, ii. 264^a; i. 193^a, 464^a.
  Presence, ii. 267^a.
  Priest, i. 97^a, 118^b, 196^b, 535^a; ii. 28^a, 269^b.
  Prince, i. 179^b.
  Prophet, i. 97^b.
  Ransom, ii. 298^a, 303^a ff.
  Resurrection, ii. 329^a; i. 112^b, 183^a, 608^b; ii. 260^a, 324^a ff.
  Sacrifice, i. 536^b; ii. 388^b, 435^a.
  and St. Paul, ii. 156^b f.
  Saviour, i. 179^b; ii. 445^a.
  Second Adam, i. 40^a, 190^a; ii. 354^a.
  Servant of God, i. 179^a.
  Session, i. 96^a.
  Son of God, i. 180^a, 189^a, 198^a, 462^a; ii. 113^a, 350^a.
  Son of Man, i. 179^b, 198^a.
  Spirit, i. 189^b.
  and the Stranger, ii. 531^a.
  Sufferings, ii. 534^a.
  Surnames, ii. 539^a.
  Truth, ii. 622^a.
  Union with God, ii. 629^b.
  Victory, ii. 633^a.
  Witness, ii. 689^a.
  Work, i. 256^a, 578^a; ii. 571^a.
Jew, Jewess, i. 641^a, 534^a, 645^a; ii. 170^b, 415^b.
Jewish Christian Gospels, i. 489^b.
Jezebel, i. 642^a.
Job, i. 642^b.
Joel, i. 643^a.
John, the Baptist, ii. 81^b.
John, the Son of Zebedee, i. 625^b.
John, Acts of, i. 35^b.
  Apocalypse of, i. 74^a, 358^b.
  Epistles of, i. 643^b, 282^b.
Joppa, i. 648^b.
Joseph, i. 649^a.
  (=Barnabas), i. 138^a.
  Barsabbas, i. 649^a.
Josephus, i. 649^b.
Joses, i. 138^a.
Joshua, i. 653^b, 641^a.
Joy, i. 654^a.
Judæa, i. 655^a.
Judaism, ii. 315^a.
Judaizing, i. 655^b, 430^b, 432^a; ii. 197^a.
Judas Barsabbas, i. 656^b.
  of Damascus, i. 657^a.
  the Galilæan, i. 657^a.
  Iscariot, i. 657^b.
Judas, Gospel of, i. 504^b.
Jude, the Lord's Brother, i. 658^b.
Jude, Epistle of, i. 658^b, 282^a.
Judge, Judging (Ethical), i. 660^a.
Judgment, i. 661^b, 14^a, 236^b, 340^a, 355^b, 356^a, 363^a, 409$^{a,\,b}$.
Judgment-hall, i. 664^b.
Judgment-seat, i. 664^b.
Julia, i. 665^a.
Julius, i. 665^a.
Junias, Junia, i. 665^a, 83^b.
Jupiter, i. 665^b.
Justice, i. 665^b.
Justification, i. 666^a, 432^a, 510^a; ii. 354^b, 383^b f., 450^a.
Justus, i. 641^a, 649^a; ii. 597^a.

Keeper, i. 518^a.
Key, i. 673^a.
Kindness, i. 673^b.
King, i. 674^b.
King of Kings and Lord of Lords, i. 676^a.
Kingdom, Kingdom of God, i. 676^a; ii. 358^b, 368^b.
Kish, i. 678^b.
Kiss, i. 586^b; ii. 443^a.
  of Peace, i. 132^a.
Kitchen, i. 587^b.
Kleromancy, i. 710^b.
Knowledge, i. 678^b.
Koine, i. 547^b, 551^b ff.; ii. 140^b.
Korah, i. 680^b.
Kyria, i. 647^b.

Labour, i. 680^a.
Lake of Fire, i. 681^a, 410^a, 545^a.
Lamb, i. 681^b.
Lamp, i. 682^b.
Lampstand, i. 682^b, 588^b.
Laodicea, i. 683^a, 722^b.
Lapis Lazuli, ii. 457^b.
Lasciviousness, i. 684^a.
Lasea, i. 685^a.
Last Supper, i. 373^b.
Laver, i. 685^a.
Law, i. 685^a, 114^b, 432^b, 577^b; ii. 381^b.
Lawyer, i. 693^b.
Leather, ii. 608^a, 700^b.
Leaven, i. 693^b.
Legion, i. 93^a.
Leopard, i. 694^a.
Letter, i. 694^b, 353^a; ii. 703^b.
Leucian Acts, i. 29^b.
Leucius, i. 29^b.
Levite, i. 694^b.
Lewd, Lewdness, i. 695^a.
Libertines, i. 695^b; ii. 509^b.
Liberty, i. 696^b.
Libya, i. 698^a.
Lictors, ii. 471^b.
Life and Death, i. 698^a.
Light and Darkness, i. 700^b.
Light of Nature, ii. 78^a.
Lightning, i. 702^a.
Likeness, i. 415^b [Form].
Linen, i. 702^a.
Linus, i. 702^b.
Lion, i. 702^b.
Lips, ii. 47^a.
Living, i. 703^b.
Locust, i. 703^b.
Lois, i. 704^b, 377^b.
Longsuffering, i. 704^b.
Lord, i. 705^b.
  of Lords, i. 676^a.
Lord's Day, i. 707^a, 571^b; ii. 424^a.
Lord's Supper, i. 234^b, 374^b; ii. 535^b.
Lot, i. 710^b.
Lots, i. 710^b.
Love, i. 713^b, 161^a, 526^b.
Love-feast, i. 717^a, 404^b.
Lucas, i. 718^b [Luke].
Lucius, i. 718^b, 273^b.
Luke, i. 718^b, 17^a, 652^b.
Lukewarm, i. 722^b.
Lust, i. 722^b.
Lycaonia, i. 725^b.
Lycia, i. 726^a.
Lydda, i. 726^b.
Lydia, i. 726^b, 378^a, 398^a; ii. 577^b.
Lydia (place), i. 727^a.
Lying, i. 727^b.
Lyre, i. 525^a.
Lysias, i. 728^a.
Lystra, i. 728^b.

Macedonia, ii. 1^a.
Madian, ii. 36^a.
Magic, i. 306^b; ii. 429^b.

Magistrate, ii. 2^a.
Magog, i. 467^b.
Magus, ii. 493^b.
Majesty, ii. 2^b.
Malice, ii. 2^b.
Man, ii. 3^a, 632^b.
Man of Sin, of Lawlessness, ii. 7^a; i. 68^a, 101^a; ii. 572^a f.
Mana, ii. 68^b.
Manaen, ii. 8^a; i. 564^b.
Manna, ii. 8^a.
Man-stealing, ii. 29^a.
Mantle, ii. 8^b.
Maran atha, i. 56^a.
Marble, ii. 8^b.
Marcion, Gospel of, i. 498^b.
Mark (John), ii. 8^b; i. 272^b.
Market of Appius, i. 86^b.
Market-place, ii. 9^b.
Markets, ii. 606^a.
Marks, ii. 10^a.
Marriage, ii. 11^a; i. 8^a, 215^b, 258^a, 569^b; ii. 555^b, 628^b, 641^a, 691^a.
Mars' Hill, i. 89^b.
Martyr, ii. 17^a.
Mary, ii. 19^a.
  Gospel of, i. 502^a.
Master, ii. 19^b.
Masters and Servants, ii. 509^a [Slave, Slavery], 320^a.
Matthew, ii. 19^b.
Matthias, ii. 20^a.
  Gospel of, i. 501^a.
Meat, ii. 606^a.
Medes, ii. 20^b.
Mediation, Mediator, ii. 20^b, 632^b.
Meekness, ii. 27^a.
Megiddo, i. 524^b.
Melchizedek, ii. 27^a; i. 537^a; ii. 623^b, 625^a.
Melita, ii. 28^a.
Menahem, ii. 8^a; i. 657^b.
Men-stealers, ii. 29^a.
Mercurius, ii. 29^a.
Mercury, ii. 29^a.
Mercy, ii. 29^b.
Mercy-seat, ii. 29^b.
Mesopotamia, ii. 30^a.
Messiah, i. 178^a ff., 355^a, 573^b; ii. 173^b, 260^a, 348^b.
Messianism, Militant, ii. 649^b.
Metal-work, i. 94^b; ii. 608^b.
Metaphors, ii. 30^b; i. 441^a; ii. 653^a.
Michael, ii. 35^b; i. 107^a.
Midian, ii. 36^a.
Milestones, ii. 395^a.
Miletus, ii. 36^a.
Millennium, i. 359^b; ii. 88^a.
Millstone, ii. 37^a.
Mind, ii. 37^a.
Minister, Ministry, ii. 37^b; i. 219^a, 256^b, 301^b f.; ii. 114^a [Ordination], 271^b, 584^a.
Ministration, ii. 39^a.
Minstrel, ii. 39^a.
Miracles, ii. 39^a; i. 450^b.
Mirror, ii. 42^b.
Missions, i. 162^b, 206^a.
Mithraism, i. 209^a; ii. 59^a, 426^b.
Mitylene, ii. 43^a.
Mnason, ii. 43^a; i. 272^b.
Moderation, ii. 553^a [Temperance].
Moloch, ii. 43^b.
Money, ii. 674^b [Wealth].
Monogamy, ii. 14^a.
Month, ii. 581^b.
Moon, ii. 43^b.
Morality, i. 370^b [Ethics]; ii. 188^b, 371^b.
Morning-star, i. 284^a.
Mortify, ii. 43^b.
Moses, ii. 44^a.
  Assumption of, i. 105^a.
  Testament of, i. 105^a.
Mother, i. 398^a, 400^a.
Mount, Mountain, ii. 45^b.
Mourning, ii. 46^b.
Mouth, ii. 47^a.
Murder, ii. 47^b.
Murmuring, ii. 48^a.
Music, ii. 256^b.
Myra, ii. 48^b.
Mysia, ii. 48^b.
Mystery, Mysteries, ii. 49^a; i. 235^a, 333^a, 364^a.
Mystery-religions, i. 377^a; ii. 51^a.
Mysticism, ii. 62^b.

Naassenes, Gospel of the, i. 498^b.
Nabatæans, i. 88^b.
Nahor, i. 521^b.
Name, ii. 64^a; i. 130^a.
Napkin, i. 521^b.
Narcissus, ii. 76^a; i. 399^b.
Nation, ii. 76^b.
Natural, ii. 77^a.
Nature, ii. 77^b.
Navigation, ii. 474^b [Ship].
Nazarene, ii. 78^b; i. 318^b f.; ii. 79^b.
Nazareth, ii. 79^b.
Nazirite, ii. 80^a.
Neapolis, ii. 82^a.
Neighbour, ii. 82^b.
Neophyte, ii. 92^b; i. 131^b.
Nereus, ii. 83^a.
Nero, ii. 83^a; i. 75^a; ii. 178^b.
  Redivivus, i. 68^b, 75^a, 101^a, 409^a; ii. 94^b.
Nerva, ii. 84^b.
New Birth, i. 135^a; ii. 5^b, 310^a [Regeneration].
New Covenant, ii. 435^b.
New Jerusalem, ii. 85^b.
New Life, i. 117^b, 371^a; ii. 354^a, 390^a.
New Moon, ii. 89^a.
Nicanor, ii. 90^b.
Nicknames, ii. 65^b.
Nicodemus, Gospel of, i. 504^a.
Nicolaitans, ii. 90^b; i. 456^a.
Nicolas, ii. 91^a.
Nicopolis, ii. 91^a.
Niger, ii. 541^a.
Night (Figurative), i. 283^b.
Noah, ii. 91^b.
  Book of, i. 338^a.
Noble, ii. 92^a.
Novice, ii. 92^b.
Number of the Beast, i. 75^a; ii. 94^a.
Numbers, ii. 92^b.
Nurture, i. 173^b [Chastisement].
Nympha, Nymphas, ii. 96^b.

Oath, ii. 97^a.
Obedience, ii. 99^b; i. 671^b.
Occupation, i. 680^a [Labour]; ii. 693^a [Work].
Odes of Solomon, ii. 100^a; i. 591^a.
Offence, ii. 106^b.
Offering, ii. 431^b [Sacrifice].
Officer, ii. 107^b.
Oil, ii. 107^b.
Ointment, ii. 108^a.
Old Testament, ii. 108^a.
Olive, ii. 111^a; i. 513^a.
Olive-oil, ii. 605^a.
Olives, Mount of, ii. 46^a, 111^b.
Olivet, ii. 111^b.
Olympas, ii. 111^b.
Omega, i. 50^b, 185^b.
One, ii. 95^a.
Onesimus, ii. 112^a.
Onesiphorus, ii. 112^b.
Only-begotten, ii. 112^b.
Oracle, ii. 113^b.
Oracles, Sibylline, ii. 477^a.
Oration, ii. 114^a.
Orator, ii. 559^b [Tertullus].
Ordinance, ii. 114^a.
Ordination, ii. 114^a; i. 210^b f.
Organization, i. 209^b.
Original Sin, i. 395^b; ii. 498^b [Sin].
Ornaments, i. 222^a.
Otho, ii. 118^b.
Overseer, i. 150^b.

Paganism, i. 331^a, 529^b.
Palace, ii. 118^a.
Palestine, i. 526^a, 549^b.
Pallas, i. 276^b.
Palm, ii. 119^b.
Palsy, ii. 120^a.
Pamphylia, ii. 120^a.
Paper, ii. 700^a.
Papyrus, ii. 700^b.
Paphos, ii. 120^b.
Paraclete, ii. 121^a; i. 232^a.

Paradise, ii. 122^{b}.
Parchment, ii. 700^{b}.
Pardon, i. 414^{b} [Forgiveness].
Parents, i. 398^{a}.
Parmenas, ii. 123^{b}.
Parousia, ii. 123^{b}; i. 222^{b}, 257^{b}, 355^{b} ff., 408^{a}; ii. 268^{a}, 571^{b} f.
Parthians, ii. 131^{a}.
Pascha, ii. 131^{b}, 135^{a}.
Passion, Passions, ii. 131^{a}.
Passover, ii. 131^{b}; i. 277^{b}.
Pastor, ii. 135^{b}, 474^{a}.
Pastoral Epistles, ii. 583^{b}; i. 281^{b}; ii. 143^{b}.
Patara, ii. 135^{b}.
Patience, ii. 136^{a}; i. 704^{b}.
Patmos, ii. 137^{a}.
Patriarch, ii. 137^{b}.
Patrobas, ii. 137^{b}.
Pattern, ii. 138^{a}.
Paul, ii. 138^{b}; i. 17^{b}, 32^{a} f., 250^{b} ff., 305^{b}; ii. 117^{a} (Saul), 18^{b}, 63^{a}, 260^{a}, 396^{a}, 413^{b}, 463^{a}, 529^{b}, 557^{b}, 592^{b} f., 620^{a}, 682^{b} f.
  Acts of, i. 32^{a}.
Paulinism, ii. 150^{b}, 153^{a}.
Peace, ii. 159^{a}.
Pearl, ii. 160^{b}.
Pedagogue, i. 399^{a}; ii. 459^{a}.
Pen, ii. 702^{a}.
Penny, ii. 160^{b}.
Pentecost, ii. 160^{b}; i. 112^{b}, 183^{b}, 279^{b}, 574^{a}.
People, ii. 164^{a}.
Perdition, ii. 165^{a}.
Perfect, Perfection, ii. 165^{a}.
Perfection, Gospel of, i. 504^{b}.
Perga, ii. 166^{b}.
Pergamus, Pergamum, ii. 167^{a}.
Persecution, ii. 168^{a}.
Perseverance, ii. 186^{a}.
Persis, ii. 190^{b}.
Personality, ii. 67^{b}; i. 116^{b}.
Peter, ii. 191^{a}; i. 34^{a}, 277^{b}, 280^{a}; ii. 18^{b}.
  Acts of, i. 34^{a}.
  Epistles of, ii. 201^{a}; i. 282^{a}.
  Gospel of, i. 496^{a}; ii. 200^{b}.
Pharaoh, ii. 210^{a}; i. 521^{b} f.
Pharaoh's Daughter, ii. 210^{a}.
Pharisees, ii. 210^{a}, 289^{a}.
Phenice, ii. 232^{b}.
Philadelphia, ii. 211^{b}.
Philemon, ii. 212^{a}.
  Epistle to, ii. 212^{b}; i. 281^{b}; ii. 143^{a}.
Philetus, i. 589^{b}.
Philip (Apostle), i. 566^{a}.
    (Evangelist), ii. 214^{a}.
    (Herod), i. 278^{b}.
  Acts of, i. 39^{b}.
  Gospel of, i. 500^{b}.
Philippi, ii. 215^{a}.
Philippians, Epistle to the, ii. 216^{b}; i. 281^{b}; ii. 143^{b}.
Philo of Alexandria, ii. 227^{b}.
Philologus, ii. 231^{a}; i. 665^{a}.
Philosophy, ii. 231^{a}; i. 680^{a}.
Phinehas, i. 127^{b}.
Phlegon, ii. 231^{b}.
Phœbe, ii. 231^{b}.
Phœnicia, ii. 232^{b}.
Phœnix, ii. 233^{a}.
Phrygia, ii. 233^{b}.
Phygelus, ii. 234^{b}.
Physician, ii. 234^{b}; i. 399^{a}.
Pilate, Pontius, ii. 238^{a}; i. 277^{b}, 638^{b}.
Pilgrim, ii. 530^{b}.
Pillar, ii. 238^{a}.
Pipe, ii. 239^{a}, 256^{b}.
Pisidia, ii. 239^{b}.
Pit, i. 11^{b}.
Pity, ii. 240^{a}.
Place (His own), ii. 241^{a}.
Plague, ii. 241^{b}.
Pleroma, i. 425^{b}.
Plot, i. 243^{a}.
Poets, ii. 293^{b} [Quotations].
Poison, ii. 241^{b}.
Politarch, ii. 2^{b}.
Pollution, ii. 242^{a}.
Pollux, i. 302^{b}.
Polycarp, ii. 242^{a}, 41^{b}.
Polygamy, ii. 14^{a}.
Pontus, ii. 247^{a}.
Poor, ii. 248^{a}.
Poplios, ii. 290^{a}.
Porch, ii. 248^{a}.
Possession, ii. 248^{a}; i. 288^{a}, 383^{b}.
Possessions, ii. 674^{b} [Wealth]; i. 235^{b} [Community of Goods].
Potentate, ii. 254^{a}.
Potter, ii. 254^{b}.
Pottery, i. 95^{a}.
Poverty, ii. 248^{a}.
Power, Powers, ii. 254^{b}, 39^{b}.
Prætor, ii. 255^{a}, 2^{a}.
Prætorian Guard, i. 518^{b}.
Prætorium, ii. 255^{a}, 118^{b}, 223^{a}.
Praise, ii. 255^{a}.
Prayer, ii. 257^{a}; i. 180^{b}, 303^{b}, 401^{a}; ii. 74^{b}, 116^{a}.
  for the Departed, ii. 258^{a}.
Preaching, ii. 258^{b}, 550^{b}.
Precious, ii. 261^{a}.
Precious Stones, ii. 261^{a}.
Predestination, ii. 262^{a}; i. 153^{a}.
Pre-existence of Christ, ii. 264^{a}; i. 193^{a}, 464^{a}.
Preparation, ii. 266^{b}.
Presbyter, Presbytery, i. 149^{b}, 210^{b}, 325^{b}, 582^{a}; ii. 272^{a}.
Presence, ii. 266^{b}.
Pricks, i. 457^{a}.
Pride, ii. 268^{b}.
Priest, ii. 269^{a}; i. 1^{a}, 535^{a}.
Prince, ii. 272^{b}.
Prince of the Power of the Air, i. 47^{a}.
Principality, Principalities, ii. 273^{a}.
Principles, ii. 274^{b}.
Prisca, Priscilla, i. 87^{a}; ii. 408^{b}.
Prison, ii. 275^{a}.
Prize, ii. 276^{a}.
Prochorus, ii. 277^{a}.
Proconsul, ii. 277^{a}; i. 288^{b}.
Procurator, ii. 277^{a}; i. 277^{b} f.
Profane, ii. 278^{a}.
Profession, ii. 278^{b}.
Profits, ii. 602^{b}.
Promise, ii. 279^{a}.
Property, ii. 674^{b} [Wealth]; i. 235^{b} [Community of Goods].
Prophecy, Prophet, Prophetess, ii. 279^{b}; i. 76^{a}, 615^{a}; ii. 169^{a}.
Propitiation, ii. 281^{b}; i. 116^{a}.
Proportion, ii. 284^{a}.
Proselyte, ii. 284^{a}; i. 260^{a}.
Proseuche, ii. 285^{b}.
Protestantism, ii. 182^{b}.
Protevangelium Jacobi, i. 483^{a}.
Province, ii. 286^{a}.
Psalms, ii. 287^{a}; i. 590^{a}.
  of Solomon, ii. 287^{b}; i. 591^{a}.
Psaltery, i. 525^{a}.
Pseudo-Matthew, Gospel of, i. 488^{a}.
Ptolemais, ii. 289^{b}.
Publius, ii. 290^{a}.
Pudens, ii. 290^{a}.
Punishment, ii. 290^{b}; i. 544^{b}, 700^{a}; ii. 391^{b}.
Purification, ii. 291^{a}.
Purity, i. 570^{a}.
Purple, i. 231^{b}; ii. 577^{b}.
Puteoli, ii. 291^{b}.
Pylon, i. 443^{a}.
Pyrrhus, ii. 292^{a}.
Python, ii. 292^{a}, 215^{b}.

Quartus, ii. 293^{a}.
Quaternion, ii. 293^{b}; i. 518^{b}.
Queen, ii. 293^{b}.
Quicksands, ii. 547^{a}.
Quotations, ii. 293^{b}.

Race, i. 441^{b}; ii. 276^{b}.
Rahab, ii. 297^{a}; i. 523^{a}.
Railing, i. 381^{a}.
Rainbow, ii. 298^{a}.
Ransom, ii. 298^{a}, 302^{b} ff.
Rapture, ii. 299^{a}.
Reading, ii. 299^{b}, 703^{b}.
Rebecca, ii. 300^{b}.
Recompense, ii. 368^{a}.
Reconciliation, ii. 300^{b}; i. 116^{b}, 510^{a}.
Red, i. 231^{b}.
Redemption, ii. 302^{b}; i. 268^{a}, 698^{a}; ii. 633^{a}.
Red Sea, ii. 309^{b}, 463^{b}.
Reed, ii. 309^{b}.

Reformation, ii. 309^{b}.
Regeneration, ii. 310^{a}.
Rejection, ii. 314^{b}.
Religion, ii. 315^{a}.
Re-marriage, ii. 14^{b}.
Remission, i. 414^{b} [Forgiveness].
Remnant, ii. 315^{b}.
Repentance, ii. 316^{a}; i. 247^{b}.
Rephan, ii. 317^{b}.
Reproach, ii. 317^{b}.
Reprobate, ii. 318^{b}.
Reproof, ii. 319^{a}.
Reputation, ii. 319^{b}.
Respect of Persons, ii. 319^{b}.
Rest, ii. 320^{a}.
Restitution, ii. 321^{a}.
Restoration, ii. 321^{a}.
Restoration of Offenders, ii. 322^{a}.
Resurrection, ii. 322^{a}; i. 100^{b}, 340^{a}, 356^{b}, 363^{a}; ii. 571^{b}.
  of Christ, ii. 329^{a}; i. 112^{b}, 183^{a}, 608^{b}; ii. 260^{a}, 324^{a} ff.
Retribution, ii. 635^{b} [Vengeance]; i. 340^{b}.
Revelation, i. 612^{a}.
  Book of, i. 71^{b} [Apocalypse].
Revelling, ii. 367^{b}.
Revenge, ii. 635^{b} [Vengeance].
Reward, ii. 368^{a}, 391^{b}.
Rhegium, ii. 369^{b}.
Rhoda, ii. 370^{a}.
Rhodes, ii. 370^{a}.
Riches, ii. 674^{b}.
Right, ii. 370^{b}.
Righteousness, ii. 370^{b}; i. 115^{a}, 432^{a}, 540^{a}, 671^{a}; ii. 414^{b}.
Ring, ii. 393^{a}.
River, ii. 393^{a}.
Roads and Travel, ii. 393^{b}.
Robbers of Churches, ii. 399^{b}.
Robbery, ii. 400^{a}.
Robe, i. 221^{b}.
Rock, ii. 400^{a}.
Rod, ii. 401^{a}.
Roll, ii. 462^{a}, 701^{a}, 702^{a}.
Roman Church, ii. 181^{a}; i. 604^{a}; ii. 412^{b}.
  Empire, ii. 401^{a}.
  Law in NT, ii. 404^{b}; i. 543^{b}.
Romans, Epistle to the, ii. 408^{a}; i. 281^{a}; ii. 142^{a}.
Rome, ii. 417^{b}, 175^{a}, 178^{b}, 603^{a}.
Roof, i. 587^{a}.
Rooms, i. 587^{b}.
Rudiments, i. 328^{b}.
Rufus, ii. 421^{b}; i. 273^{b}.
Ruler, ii. 422^{a}.
  of the Feast, ii. 14^{a}.

Sabaoth, ii. 422^{a}.
Sabbath, ii. 422^{b}; i. 571^{b}, 708^{b} ff.; ii. 133^{b}.
Sackcloth, ii. 424^{b}.
Sacraments, ii. 425^{a}; i. 364^{a}.
Sacramentum, ii. 50^{b}, 425^{a}.
Sacrifice, ii. 431^{b}; i. 119^{a}, 235^{a}.
Sacrilege, ii. 399^{b} [Robbers of Churches].
Sadducees, ii. 438^{a}, 289^{a}.
Sails, Sailors, ii. 475^{a}.
Saint, ii. 440^{b}; i. 569^{a}.
Salamis, ii. 441^{b}.
Salem, i. 634^{a} [Jerusalem]; ii. 27^{a}.
Salmone, ii. 441^{b}.
Salt, ii. 442^{a}.
Salutations, ii. 442^{b}.
Salvation, ii. 444^{a}; i. 180^{b}, 701^{b} f.; ii. 262^{b}, 266^{a}.
Samaria, ii. 447^{a}.
Samos, ii. 448^{b}.
Samothrace, ii. 448^{b}.
Samson, ii. 449^{a}.
Samuel, ii. 449^{a}.
Sanctification, ii. 449^{a}; i. 510^{a}, 569^{b}; ii. 355^{a}.
Sanctuary, ii. 453^{b}.
Sandal, ii. 476^{b}.
Sanhedrin, ii. 454^{a}.
Sapphira, i. 54^{b}.
Sapphire, ii. 457^{b}.
Sarah, ii. 457^{b}.
Sardis, ii. 457^{b}.
Sardius, ii. 458^{b}.
Sardonyx, ii. 458^{b}.
Satan, i. 293^{b}, 287^{b}, 307^{b}; ii. 472^{a}.
Saul, ii. 459^{a}.
Save, ii. 444^{a}.
Saviour, ii. 444^{a}; i. 179^{b}.
Scarlet, i. 231^{b}.
Sceva, i. 384^{b}.
Schism, i. 560^{b}.
School, i. 321^{a}; ii. 626^{a}.
Schoolmaster, ii. 459^{a}.
Science, ii. 459^{b}.
Scorpion, ii. 459^{b}.
Scourging, ii. 460^{a}.
Scribe, ii. 460^{b}.
Scripture, ii. 460^{b}; i. 577^{b}.
Scroll, ii. 462^{a}.
Scythian, ii. 462^{a}.
Sea, ii. 463^{a}, 398^{a}.
  of Glass, ii. 464^{b}, 464^{a}.
Seal, ii. 465^{b}; i. 129^{a}.
Season, ii. 580^{a}.
Second Adam, i. 40^{a}, 190^{a}; ii. 354^{a}.
Second Advent, Second Coming, ii. 123^{b} [Parousia]; i. 354^{b} [Eschatology].
Second Death, i. 681^{b}, 700^{a}.
Sects, i. 560^{b}; ii. 66^{a}.
Secundus, ii. 466^{a}.
Security, ii. 466^{a}.
Seed, ii. 466^{b}.
Seleucia, ii. 466^{b}.
Self-control, ii. 554^{a} f., 590^{b}.
Self-denial, ii. 467^{a}; i. 385^{b}.
Self-examination, ii. 468^{b}.
Selfishness, i. 725^{a}.
Senate, ii. 454^{a}.
Sentence, ii. 469^{a}.
Sepulchre, ii. 469^{a}.
Sergius Paulus, ii. 471^{a}; i. 277^{a}.
Serjeants, ii. 471^{b}.
Serpent, ii. 472^{a}.
Servant, ii. 38^{a}, 509^{a}.
Seven, ii. 93^{b}, 95^{a}, 96^{b}.
Seven, The, i. 210^{a}, 285^{a}, 640^{a}.
Seven Heavens, i. 101^{a}.
Sewing, ii. 606^{b}.
Shadow, ii. 472^{b}.
Shambles, i. 94^{a}.
Shame, ii. 473^{a}.
Sharon, ii. 473^{b}.
Shaving, i. 520^{b}; ii. 80^{a} [Nazirite].
Shechem, ii. 473^{b}.
Sheol, i. 289^{a,b}, 340^{b}.
Shepherd, ii. 474^{a}, 135^{b}.
  of Hermas, i. 561^{a}.
Shewbread, ii. 474^{b}.
Shield, i. 92^{b}.
Ship, ii. 474^{b}, 602^{b}.
Shoe, ii. 476^{b}.
Sibylline Oracles, ii. 477^{a}; i. 72^{b}.
Sicarii, i. 103^{b}, 639^{a}; ii. 48^{a}.
Sickle, ii. 490^{b}.
Sickness, ii. 491^{a}.
Sidon, ii. 491^{b}.
Sign, ii. 492^{a}, 39^{b}.
Sign of the Cross, i. 132^{a}.
Silas, ii. 492^{a}; i. 19^{b}; ii. 205^{b} f.
Silk, ii. 493^{a}.
Silvanus, ii. 492^{a}.
Silver, ii. 493^{a}.
Simeon, ii. 191^{a}.
Simeon called Niger, ii. 541^{a}.
Simon (the Tanner), ii. 493^{b}.
  of Cyrene, i. 273^{b}.
  Magus, ii. 493^{b}; i. 456^{a}; ii. 199^{a}.
  Peter, ii. 191^{a}.
Simplicity, ii. 498^{b}.
Sin, ii. 498^{b}; i. 192^{b}, 340^{b}, 348^{a}, 358^{a}, 372^{a}, 397^{a}, 421^{a}, 469^{b}; ii. 4^{a}, 151^{b}, 385^{b}, 452^{b}, 631^{a}.
Sinai, ii. 503^{b}, 46^{a}.
Singing, ii. 256^{b}.
Sirach, ii. 503^{b}.
Sister, i. 399^{b} f.
Six, ii. 94^{a}.
Skins, ii. 608^{a}.
Slander, i. 381^{a} [Evil-speaking].
Slave, Slavery, ii. 509^{a}; i. 398^{b}; ii. 10^{a}, 213^{b}, 585^{a}, 604^{b}.
Sleep, ii. 512^{b}.
Smoke, ii. 513^{a}.
Smyrna, ii. 513^{b}.
Soberness, Sobriety, ii. 514^{a}.
Sodom and Gomorrah, ii. 517^{b}.
Soldier, i. 92^{b}, 93^{a}.
Solomon, ii. 517^{b}.
Solomon's Porch, i. 637^{b}; ii. 248^{a}, 556^{b}.

Son of God, i. 180^a, 189^a, 198^a, 462^a, 536^b; ii. 113^a, 350^a.
Sons of God, i. 174^b.
Son of Man, ii. 518^a; i. 179^b, 198^a.
Soothsaying, ii. 518^b.
Sopater, ii. 519^a.
Sorcery, ii. 519^a.
Sorrow, ii. 316^a; i. 516^b.
Sosipater, ii. 520^a.
Sosthenes, ii. 520^b; i. 440^a.
Soul, ii. 521^a.
Spain, ii. 521^b.
Spearman, i. 93^b.
Spice, i. 54^a.
Spinning, i. 94^b.
Spirit, Spiritual, ii. 522^a.
Spirit, Holy, i. 573^a, 218^b, 348^a, 432^b, 465^a, 614^b; ii. 121^a, 162^b, 188^a.
Spirits in Prison, ii. 522^b; i. 289^b f.; ii. 206^b.
Spiritual Gifts.—See Gifts of the Spirit.
Spiritual Songs, ii. 524^a; i. 590^a.
Sponsors, i. 132^a.
Stachys, ii. 524^a.
Staff, ii. 524^a.
Star, ii. 524^a.
Stealing, ii. 524^b.
Stephanas, ii. 525^a.
Stephen, ii. 525^a; i. 243^b, 280^a, 638^a; ii. 18^a, 174^a 529^a, 557^a.
Steward, ii. 526^a.
Stigmata, ii. 10^a.
Stilus, ii. 700^b.
Stocks, ii. 526^b.
Stoics, ii. 526^b; i. 244^a.
Stone-work, i. 95^a.
Stoning, ii. 528^b.
Stranger, ii. 530^a.
Strangled, ii. 532^a.
Street, ii. 532^a.
Strife, ii. 532^b.
Stripes, i. 145^a [Beating]; ii. 460^a.
Stumbling-block, ii. 106^b.
Subordination, i. 465^b.
Substance, ii. 533^a.
Suffering, ii. 533^b.
Suggestion, ii. 252^b.
Sun, ii. 534^b.
Sunday, i. 710^a.
Superstitious, ii. 535^a, 315^a.
Supper, ii. 535^b.
Surname, ii. 536^a.
Swastika, i. 266^a.
Swearing, ii. 97^a.
Sword, i. 92^b.
Sychem, ii. 473^b [Shechem].
Symbols, ii. 429^a, 436^b, 464^b.
Symeon, ii. 191^a.
Symeon called Niger, ii. 541^a.
Synagogue, ii. 541^b; i. 104^a, 211^a.
Syntyche, ii. 545^b; i. 378^a, 398^b; ii. 218^a.
Synzygus, ii. 545^b; i. 378^a; ii. 217^b, 218^a.
Syracuse, ii. 546^a.
Syria, ii. 546^b.
Syrtis, ii. 547^a.

Tabernacle, ii. 547^a.
Tabitha, i. 311^b.
Table, ii. 548^a; i. 588^b.
Tablets, Writing, ii. 700^b.
Tabu, ii. 70^a.
Talent, ii. 548^b.
Tanner, ii. 493^b.
Tanning, i. 94^b; ii. 608^a.
Tarsus, ii. 548^b.
Tartarus, i. 544^b.
Tattlers, ii. 549^b.
Taverns, ii. 576^b.
Teacher, ii. 550^a; i. 322^b.
Teaching, ii. 550^a, 258^b.
Temperance, ii. 553^a.
Temple, ii. 556^b; i. 637^b.
Temple-keeper, i. 296^a.
Temptation, ii. 558^a.
Ten, ii. 94^a.
Tent, Tent-making, ii. 559^a.
Tertius, ii. 559^b.
Tertullus, ii. 559^b; i. 693^b.
Testament, i. 261^a.
Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, ii. 560^a.
Testimony, ii. 17^a [Martyr], 613^b [Trial-at-Law].
Tetrarch, ii. 567^a.
Thanksgiving, ii. 567^b.
Theatre, ii. 568^a.
Theft, ii. 524^b.
Theophilus, ii. 568^a.
Theosophy, i. 680^a.
Thessalonians, Epistles to the, ii. 569^a; i. 280^b; ii. 141^a.
Thessalonica, ii. 574^a.
Theudas, ii. 575^a; i. 440^b.
Thigh, ii. 576^a.
Thistles, ii. 576^a.
Thomas, Acts of, i. 37^a.
  Gospel of, i. 485^b.
Thongs, ii. 576^a.
Thorn in the Flesh, i. 173^b, 295^a; ii. 155^a, 576^b.
Thorns, ii. 576^a.
Thousand Years, i. 78^b, 359^b; ii. 88^a, 326^b.
Three, ii. 93^a, 95^b.
Three and a Half, ii. 93^b, 96^a.
Three Taverns, ii. 576^b.
Throne, ii. 576^b.
Thunder, ii. 577^a.
Thyatira, ii. 577^a.
Thyine Wood, ii. 578^a.
Tiberius, ii. 578^b.
Time, ii. 580^a.
Timon, ii. 582^b.
Timotheus, ii. 582^b.
Timothy, ii. 582^b; i. 19^b; ii. 117^b.
Timothy and Titus, Epistles to, ii. 583^b; i. 281^b; ii. 143^b.
Tithes, ii. 594^a.
Titles, ii. 66^a.
Titus, ii. 595^b; i. 212^a.
  (Emperor), ii. 596^a.
  Justus, ii. 597^a; i. 249^b.
Titus, Epistle to, ii. 583^b.
Token, ii. 597^b.
Tomb, ii. 469^a.
Tongue, ii. 598^a.
Tongues, Gift of, ii. 598^b, and see Glossolalia.
Topaz, ii. 599^b.
Torment, ii. 599^b.
Town-clerk, ii. 600^a.
Trade and Commerce, ii. 600^b; i. 163^b, 322^a.
Trade-gilds, i. 404^a, 418^a, 642^b.
Tradition, ii. 609^b.
Trajan, ii. 610^b, 179^b.
Trance, ii. 611^a.
Transfiguration, ii. 611^b.
Translation, ii. 612^a.
Travel, ii. 393^b, 602^b.
Treasure, Treasurer, Treasury, ii. 612^a.
Tree, ii. 612^b.
  of Life, ii. 612^b.
Trial, ii. 558^a, 533^b [Suffering], 613^b [Trial-at-Law].
Trial-at-Law, ii. 613^b.
Tribes, ii. 617^b.
Tribulation, ii. 618^b.
Tribute, ii. 619^a.
Trinity, i. 100^a, 460^a.
Triumph, ii. 619^b.
Troas, ii. 620^a.
Trogyllium, ii. 620^b.
Trophimus, ii. 620^b.
Trump, Trumpet, ii. 621^a.
Truth, ii. 621^b.
Tryphæna, ii. 622^b.
Tryphosa, ii. 622^b.
Tunic, i. 223^a.
Tutor, ii. 623^a; i. 399^a.
Twelve, ii. 93^b.
Twin Brothers, i. 302^b.
Two, ii. 95^a.
Tychicus, ii. 623^a.
Type, ii. 623^a.
Tyrannus, ii. 626^a.
Tyre, ii. 626^b.

Unbelief, ii. 627^a.
Uncircumcision, i. 211^b [Circumcision].
Unclean, i. 215^a.
Uncorruptness, ii. 628^b.
Unction, i. 65^b [Anointing].
Undergirding, ii. 475^b.
Ungodliness, ii. 629^a.
Union with God, ii. 629^b.

Unity, ii. 632^{a}; i. 466^{a}.
Universalism, i. 354^{b} [Eschatology]; ii. 321^{b}.
Unknown God, ii. 633^{b}.
Unleavened Bread, ii. 131^{b}.
Unrighteousness, ii. 634^{a}.
Upper Room, i. 588^{a}.
Urbanus, ii. 634^{b}.
Urim and Thummim, i. 711^{b}.
Utensils, ii. 608^{b}.
Utterance, ii. 635^{a}.

Vainglory of Life, ii. 696^{a}.
Vanity, ii. 635^{a}.
Vegetables, ii. 605^{b}.
Veil, ii. 635^{a}.
  (=Head-dress), i. 221^{b}, 527^{b}.
Vengeance, ii. 635^{b}.
Vespasian, ii. 636^{a}.
Vessel, ii. 639^{a}.
Vesture, i. 221^{a} [Clothes].
Vial, i. 159^{b}.
Vine, ii. 639^{b}.
Viper, ii. 640^{a}.
Virgin, Virginity, ii. 640^{a}.
Virtue, ii. 642^{a}; i. 371^{a}.
Vision, ii. 643^{a}.
Vitellius, ii. 643^{b}; i. 638^{b}.
Voice, ii. 643^{b}.
Vote, ii. 644^{b}.
Vow, ii. 644^{b}.
Voyage, ii. 398^{a}, 146^{a} ff.
Vulture, i. 315^{a}.

Waiting, ii. 645^{a}.
Walk, i. 246^{a}.
Wall, ii. 645^{b}.
Wandering Stars, ii. 646^{a}.
War, ii. 646^{b}.
Washing, i. 685^{a}.
Watching, ii. 673^{a}.
Water, ii. 673^{b}.
Way, ii. 674^{a}.
Wealth, ii. 674^{b}.
Weaving, i. 94^{b}.
Week, ii. 581^{b}.
Wheat, ii. 675^{a}.
White, i. 231^{a}.
Whore, Whoremonger, i. 523^{a}.
Wicked, ii. 675^{a}.
Widows, ii. 676^{a}; i. 46^{a}; ii. 14^{b}, 584^{b}.
Wife, i. 398^{a}; ii. 11^{a} [Marriage], 639^{a}.
  Spiritual, ii. 641^{b}.
Wild Beasts, ii. 604^{b}.
Wilderness, i. 292^{a}.
Will, ii. 677^{b}.
  (=Testament), ii. 681^{a}; i. 261^{a}.
Window, ii. 681^{b}; i. 587^{a}.
Wine, i. 8^{a}, 314^{a}, 373^{b} [Eucharist]; ii. 556^{a}, 605^{b}.
Wing, ii. 681^{b}.
Wisdom, ii. 682^{a}.
  of Solomon, ii. 685^{a}.
Witchcraft, i. 306^{b} [Divination].
Witness, ii. 689^{a}, 17^{a}.
Woe, ii. 689^{b}.
Woman, ii. 689^{b}; i. 258^{a}; ii. 216^{b}.
Wonder, ii. 39^{b}, 492^{a}.
Wool, ii. 692^{a}, 606^{a}.
Word, ii. 692^{a}.
Work, ii. 693^{a}, 39^{b}.
World, ii. 693^{a}.
World-flight, i. 8^{b}.
Worldliness, ii. 695^{a}.
Wormwood, ii. 697^{a}, 524^{b}.
Worship, ii. 697^{a}; i. 86^{a}, 599^{b}; ii. 315^{a}, 428^{a}.
Wrath, i. 62^{b}.
Writing, ii. 699^{b}.

Year, ii. 581^{a}.
Yokefellow, ii. 545^{b}.
Young Men, ii. 704^{a}.

Zeal, ii. 705^{a}.
Zealots, i. 657^{b}.
Zenas, ii. 706^{a}.
Zeus, i. 665^{b}.
Zion, ii. 706^{b}, 46^{b}.

II. INDEX OF GREEK TERMS

ἀγαθός, i. 468^{b}, 470^{a}.
ἀγαθότης, i. 471^{b}.
ἀγαθωσύνη, i. 471$^{a.b}$, 674^{a}.
ἀγαλλίασις, ἀγαλλιᾶν, i. 654^{a}.
ἀγαπᾶν, i. 713^{b}.
ἀγάπη, i. 147^{a}, 161^{a}, 285^{b}, 604^{b}, 714^{a}.
ἀγαπητός, i. 146^{b}.
ἄγγελος, i. 57^{b}, 62^{a}; ii. 524^{b}.
ἀγένητος, ii. 113^{b}.
ἀγέννητος, ii. 113^{b}.
ἅγια, ii. 453^{b}.
ἁγιασμός, i. 567^{b}; ii. 449^{a}, 451^{b}.
ἅγιον, ii. 453^{b}.
ἅγιος, i. 566^{b}; ii. 440^{b}, 449^{a}.
ἁγιότης, i. 567^{b}.
ἁγνεία, ii. 12^{b}.
ἁγνισμός, ii. 291^{a}.
ἁγνός, i. 570^{b}; ii. 12^{b}.
ἀγών, i. 441^{a}.
ἀγωνίζεσθαι, i. 441^{a}.
ἀδελφή, ii. 232^{b}.
ἀδελφός, i. 159^{b}, 424^{a}.
ἀδίκημα, i. 695^{b}.
ἀδικία, ii. 634^{a}.
ἀδόκιμος, i. 170^{b}; ii. 318^{b}.
ἄδολος, ii. 498^{b}.
ἄζυμα, ii. 131^{b}.
ἄθεσμος, ii. 675^{b}.
ἀθλέω, i. 441^{a}.
ἀΐδιος, i. 369^{b}.
αἰδώς, ii. 473^{b}.
αἷμα ῥαντισμοῦ, ii. 673^{b}.
αἵρεσις, i. 560^{b}.
αἰσχροκερδής, i. 263^{a}.
αἰσχύνη, ii. 473^{a}.
αἴτημα, ii. 257^{b}.
αἰών, i. 44^{b}, 264^{b} n., 369^{b}; ii. 580^{b}.
αἰὼν οὗτος, ii. 693^{b}.
αἰῶνες, i. 44^{b}.
αἰώνιος, i. 369^{b}, 409^{b}.
ἀκαθαρσία, i. 684^{b}.
ἀκάθαρτος, i. 215^{a}, 684^{b}.
ἄκακος, ii. 498^{b}.
ἀκέραιος, ii. 498^{b}.
ἀκρατής, i. 695^{a}.
ἀκριβῶς, ii. 165^{b}.
ἀλαζονεία, i. 154^{b}; ii. 268^{b}.
ἀλαζών, i. 154^{b}.
ἀλίσγημα, ii. 242^{a}.
ἄλυσις, i. 173^{a}.
ἀνάβασις, i. 95^{b}.
ἀναγκάζειν, i. 244^{a}.
ἀναγκαστῶς, i. 244^{a}.
ἀνάκειμαι, i. 588^{b}.
ἀνάληψις, i. 95^{b}.
ἀναλογία, ii. 284^{a}.
ἀνάπαυσις, ii. 320^{b}.
ἀναστρέφεσθαι, ἀναστροφή, i. 246^{a}.
ἄνεσις, ii. 320^{b}.
ἀνόητος, i. 413^{a}.
ἄνομος, ii. 675^{b}.
ἀνοχή, i. 705^{a}.
ἀντίδικος, i. 44^{a}.
ἀντικείμενος, i. 44^{a}.
ἀντιλέγω, i. 66^{b}, 381^{b}.
ἀντίλυτρον, ii. 298^{a}, 303^{a}.
ἀντιμισθία, ii. 368^{a}.
ἀντίτυπα, ii. 138^{a}.

ἀντίτυπος, ii. 623^b.
ἀνώγεον, i. 588^a.
ἀπάθεια, i. 244^b.
ἀπαρχή, i. 190^a, 411^a; ii. 134^a.
ἀπείθεια, ii. 628^a.
ἀπέχω, i. 285^a.
ἀπιστία, ii. 628^a.
ἁπλότης, ii. 498^b.
ἀποβάλλειν, ii. 314^b.
ἀποδίδωμι, i. 285^a; ii. 368^a.
ἀποδοκιμάζω, i. 260^b; ii. 314^b.
ἀποθήκη, i. 588^a.
ἀποκάλυψις, i. 71^b f., 612^a.
ἀποκαραδοκία, ii. 645^a.
ἀποκατάστασις, ii. 321^a.
ἀπόλλυμι, i. 293^a.
ἀπολογία, i. 66^b.
ἀπολύτρωσις, ii. 303^a, 308^a.
ἀποστασία, i. 82^b.
ἀπόστολος, i. 52^b.
ἀπρόσκοπος, ii. 107^a.
ἀπωθεῖσθαι, ii. 314^b.
ἀπώλεια, i. 2^a, 293^a; ii. 165^a.
ἀργύριον, ii. 493^a.
ἀρετή, ii. 642^a.
ἁρπαγμός, i. 194^a.
ἀρσενοκοῖται, i. 11^b.
ἄρτιος, ii. 165^b.
ἀρχή, i. 125^b f.; ii. 2^a, 273^a, 274^b.
ἀρχηγός, i. 125^b; ii. 272^b.
ἄρχων, ii. 2^a, 272^b.
ἀσέβεια, ἀσεβής, i. 467^a; ii. 629^a.
ἀσέλγεια, i. 684^a.
Ἀσιάρχης, i. 102^b.
ἀσκεῖν, i. 8^b.
ἄσκησις, i. 9^a.
ἄσοφος, i. 413^a.
ἀστέρες πλανῆται, ii. 646^a.
ἄστοργος, ii. 77^b.
αὐλή, i. 587^b.
αὐλητής, ii. 39^a.
αὐξάνω, αὔξησις, i. 517^b.
αὐτάρκεια, αὐτάρκης, i. 245^a.
αὐχεῖν, i. 154^b.
ἄφεσις, i. 415^a.
ἀφθαρσία, ii. 326^a, 628^b.
ἄφθαρτος στέφανος, ii. 276^b.
ἀφίημι, i. 414^b.
ἀφορίζω, i. 381^b.
ἄφρων, i. 413^a.
ἀφυστερέω, i. 285^a.

βαπτίζω, i. 128^b, 129^a.
βάπτισμα, βαπτισμός, i. 129^a.
βαπτιστής, i. 129^b.
βασιλεία, i. 675^a.
βασιλεύς, ii. 66^b.
βαστάζω, ii. 10^b.
βεβαιόω, βεβαίωσις, i. 239^b.
βέβηλος, i. 354^a; ii. 278^a.
βῆμα, i. 664^b.
βιβλίον, ii. 462^a, 701^b, 703^a.
βίος, i. 698^b.
βλασφημεῖν, βλασφημία, βλάσφημος,
    i. 151^b, 381^a.
βούλομαι, ii. 678^b.
βραβεῖον, i. 441^b; ii. 276^a.
βωμός, i. 51^b.

γενεά, i. 46^a, 444^b.
γένεσις, ii. 34^a.
γεννητός, ii. 113^b.
γένος, ii. 76^b.
γνῶσις, i. 413^b, 444^a, 453^a ff.; ii.
    459^b.
γογγύζειν, γογγυσμός, ii. 48^a.
γράμμα, ii. 461^a.
γραμματεύς, i. 693^b.
γράφειν τὰ αὐτά, ii. 221^a.
γραφή, ii. 460^b f.
γρηγορέω, ii. 673^a.

δαιμονίζεσθαι, ii. 249^a, 515^b.
δαιμόνιον, i. 287^b.
δαίμων, i. 287^b; ii. 249^a.
δέησις, ii. 257^b.
δειλία, i. 403^b.
δεισιδαιμονέστερος, ii. 535^a.
δεισιδαιμονία, i. 287^b; ii. 315^a.
δεισιδαίμων, i. 287^b; ii. 315^a, 535^a.
δέρω, i. 145^b.
δεσμά, δεσμοί, i. 173^a.
δεσμωτήριον, ii. 275^a.
δεσπότης, i. 705^b; ii. 19^b.
δῆμος, ii. 164^b n.
δηνάριον, ii. 160^b.
διαβεβαιοῦσθαι, i. 239^a.
διάβολος, i. 287^b, 293^a, 381^a.
διάδημα, i. 269^a.
διαθήκη, i. 261^a f., 285^b.
διακονεῖν, i. 284^b; ii. 38^a, 39^a.
διακονία, i. 41^a, 224^a, 284^b; ii. 38^a,
    39^a.
διάκονος, i. 284^b; ii. 38^a, 232^b.
διαταγή, ii. 114^a.
διδάσκαλος, ii. 459^a.
διέρχομαι, i. 272^b.
διθάλασσος, ii. 28^b.
δικαιοπράγημα, ii. 375^b.
δίκαιος, i. 182^a, 470^b, 568^b; ii. 370^b,
    375^b.
δικαιοσύνη, i. 665^b; ii. 371^a, 375^b.
δικαίωμα, ii. 114^a, 375^b.
δικαίωσις, ii. 375^b.
διόρθωσις, ii. 310^a.
δόγμα, i. 233^b; ii. 114^a.
δοκιμάζω, i. 660^b; ii. 468^b.
δοκοῦντες, ii. 319^b.
δόμα, i. 449^b.
δόξα, i. 451^b, 583^a.
δόσις, i. 449^b.
δουλεία, i. 157^b.
δουλεύειν, ii. 38^a.
δοῦλος, i. 193^a, 194^a, 416^a; ii. 10^b, 38^a.
δράκων, i. 293^b.
δρᾶν, ii. 685^b.
δυνάμενος, ii. 255^a.
δύναμις, i. 126^a; ii. 39^b, 254^b, 255^a,
    273^a.
δυνατόν, ii. 255^a.
δυσφημία, i. 381^b.
δῶμα, i. 587^a.
δωρεά, δώρημα, δῶρον, i. 449^b.

ἐγγαστρίμυθοι, ii. 215^b, 292^b.
ἔγγυος, i. 285^b.
ἐγκαίνια, i. 243^a.
ἐγκαινίζω, i. 242^b.
ἐγκεντρίζω, i. 513^a.
ἐγκράτεια, ii. 553^a.
ἐθνάρχης, i. 373^a.
ἔθνη, i. 445^a, 529^b.
ἐθνικοί, i. 529^b.
ἔθνος, ii. 76^b.
ἔθος, i. 271^a.
εἰδωλόθυτα, i. 258^a.
εἰλικρίνεια, εἰλικρινής, i. 570^b.
εἰρήνη, ii. 159^a.
ἐκδύσασθαι, ii. 126^b.
ἐκκλησία, i. 104^a, 204^b, 239^b.
ἐκλεκτοί, i. 167^b, 326^a.
ἐκνήφω, ii. 514^b.
ἔκστασις, ii. 299^a, 611^a.
ἐλεεῖν, ii. 240^a.
ἔλεος, ii. 29^b, 241^a.
Ἕλληνες, i. 514^b.
Ἑλληνισταί, i. 514^b.
ἐλλογέω, i. 285^a.
ἐμβατεύω, ii. 24^b.
ἔνδειγμα, ii. 597^b.
ἔνδειξις, ii. 598^a.
ἐνδυναμόω, i. 517^b.
ἔντευξις, i. 618^a; ii. 257^b.
ἐντολαί, i. 233^b.
ἐντρέπειν, ἐντροπή, ii. 473^b.
ἐξίσταμαι, ii. 299^a.
ἐξορκίζω, ἐξορκισμός, i. 384^a.
ἐξουθενέω, i. 260^b.
ἐξουσία, i. 125^b; ii. 2^a, 254^b, 255^a,
    273^a, 370^b.
ἐπαγγελία, ἐπάγγελμα, ii. 279^a.
ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι, ii. 278^b, 279^a.
ἐπενδύσασθαι, ii. 126^b.
ἐπιβουλή, i. 243^a.
ἐπιθυμεῖν, ἐπιθυμία, i. 723^a; ii. 678^b.
ἐπίληψις, ii. 249^a.
ἐπιποθεῖν, i. 723^a; ii. 679^a.
ἐπίσκοπος, i. 150^b, 219^a.
ἐπίτροπος, i. 399^a, 507^a; ii. 277^a,
    526^a.
ἐπουράνια, i. 46^b.
ἐρᾶν, i. 713^b.
ἔργον, ii. 39^b, 693^a.
ἐρημία, ἔρημος, i. 292^b.
ἐριθεία, i. 388^b.
ἔρις, i. 388^b.
ἑρμηνεία, i. 619^b.
ἑτοιμασία, ii. 266^b.
εὐαγγελίζειν, ii. 258^b.
εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, i. 379^a.
εὐαγγέλιον, i. 379^a, 471^b.
εὐγενής, ii. 92^a.
εὐεργούμενοι, ii. 253^a.
εὐθυμεῖν, εὔθυμος, εὐθύμως, i. 654^a.
εὐθύς, ii. 370^b.

εὐλάβεια, i. 403^{b}.
εὐλογέομαι, i. 152^{a}.
εὐσέβεια, i. 467^{a} ; ii. 590^{a}.
εὔσπλαγχνος, ii. 240^{a}.
εὐσχημόνως, i. 582^{b}.
εὐτραπελία, i. 640^{b}.
εὐφραίνειν, i. 654^{a}.
εὐφροσύνη, i. 654^{a}.
εὐχή, ii. 257^{b}, 644^{b}.

ζῆλος, i. 341^{a}, 633^{b} ; ii. 705^{a}.
ζηλωτής, ii. 705^{a}.
ζωή, i. 698^{b}.

ἡγεμών, i. 506^{b}.
ἡδονή, i. 724^{a}.
ἡλικία, i. 46^{a}.

θάνατος, i. 293^{a}, 699^{b}.
θανατοῦν, ii. 43^{b}.
θαρρεῖν, θάρσος, i. 156^{b}, 239^{a}.
θεατρίζεσθαι, i. 442^{a}.
θέατρον, i. 442^{a}.
θεῖον, i. 160^{a} n.
θέλω, ii. 678^{b}.
θεμέλιος, i. 418^{b}.
θεός, ii. 67^{a}.
θεραπεία, θεραπεύειν, θεράπων, ii. 38^{a}.
θερίζω, i. 525^{b}.
θησαυρός, ii. 612^{a}.
θλῖψις, ii. 618^{b}.
θράσος, θρασύτης, i. 156^{b}.
θρησκεία, i. 416^{b} ; ii. 315^{a}.
θυμιατήριον, i. 172^{a}.
θυσιαστήριον, i. 51^{b}.

ἱερεύς, ii. 269^{a}.
ἱερόδουλοι, i. 249^{a} ; ii. 10^{a}.
ἱερός, i. 566^{b}.
ἱερόσυλοι, ii. 399^{b}.
ἱκετηρία, ii. 257^{b}.
ἱλάσκεσθαι, ii. 281^{b}, 283^{b}.
ἱλασμός, ii. 281^{b}, 283^{a}.
ἱλαστήριον, ii. 23^{b}, 29^{b}, 281^{b}, 282^{b}, 388^{b}.
ἱμάτιον, i. 221^{b}.
Ἰουδαϊσμός, ii. 315^{a}.
ἶρις, ii. 298^{a}.
ἰσχύς, ii. 255^{a}.

καθαρισμός, ii. 291^{a}.
καθαρός, i. 215^{a}, 570^{b}.
καιρός, ii. 580^{a}.
κακία, ii. 2^{b} f.
κακοήθεια, ii. 3^{a}.
κακολογεἰν, i. 381^{b}.
κακός, i. 695^{a} ; ii. 675^{b}.
κάλαμος, ii. 309^{b}, 702^{a}.
καλεῖν, i. 167^{b} f.
καλός, i. 468^{b}, 582^{b}.
καταβολή, i. 418^{b}.
κατάδεσις, ii. 69^{a}.
καταλαλεῖν, καταλαλιαί, κατάλαλοι, i. 381^{a}.
κατάλυμα, i. 588^{a}.
καταρτίζειν, ii. 165^{b}, 322^{a}.
κατατομή, i. 212^{b}.
καταχράομαι, i. 11^{a}.
καυχᾶσθαι, καύχημα, καύχησις, i. 154^{a}, 654^{a} ; ii. 269^{a}.
κένωσις, ii. 226^{a} f.
κῆνσος, i. 164^{a}.
κηρύσσειν, ii. 258^{b}.
κιθάρα, i. 524^{b} ; ii. 256^{b}.
κιθαρίζειν, κιθαρῳδός, i. 524^{b}.
κινύρα, i. 525^{a}.
κληρονομέω, κληρονομία, κληρονόμος, κλῆρος, i. 543^{a}, 712^{a}.
κλῆσις, i. 168^{a}.
κλητοί, i. 167^{b} f., 326^{b}.
κλινάριον, i. 145^{b}, 588^{a}.
κλίνη, i. 145^{b}, 588^{a}.
κλινίδιον, i. 588^{a}.
κοινός, i. 215^{a}.
κοινωνία, i. 161^{b} f., 184^{a}, 224^{a}, 225^{b}, 234^{b}, 245^{b} f.
κοίτη, i. 145^{b}.
κοιτών, i. 587^{b}.
κόλασις, ii. 290^{b}.
κολαφίζω, i. 162^{b}.
κολοβοδάκτυλος, ii. 8^{b}.
κοπετόν, ii. 47^{a}.
Κορινθιάζεσθαι, i. 249^{a}.
κόσμος, i. 264^{b} n.; ii. 693^{b}.
κράβαττος, i. 145^{b}, 588^{a}.
κράτιστος, ii. 92^{a}.
κράτος, i. 309^{a} ; ii. 254^{b}.
κρέας, i. 411^{b}.
Κρητίζειν, i. 266^{a}.
κρίνω, i. 661^{a}.
κριτήρια, i. 664^{b}.
κρύσταλλος, i. 269^{b}.
κτίσις, κτίσμα, i. 264^{b} n. ; ii. 114^{a}.
κυβερνήσεις, i. 506^{b}, 507^{a}.
κυκεών, ii. 54^{a}.
κυνάρια, i. 529^{b}.
κυριακή, i. 708^{a}.
κύριος, i. 178^{b}, 180^{a}, 462^{b}, 705^{b} ; ii. 19^{b}, 66^{a}, 67^{a}.
κυριότης, i. 309^{b} ; ii. 273^{a}.
κυρόω, i. 239^{b}.
κῶμοι, i. 403^{b} ; ii. 367^{b}.

λαμπάς, i. 683^{a}.
λαός, i. 445^{a} ; ii. 164^{a}.
λαὸς θεοῦ, ii. 164^{b}.
λεῖμμα, ii. 315^{b}.
λειτουργία, i. 224^{a}, 449^{b} ; ii. 38^{a}.
λειτουργός, ii. 38^{a}, 271^{b}.
λιβανωτός, i. 172^{b}.
λίνον, i. 702^{b}.
λογεία, λογία, i. 224^{a}.
λόγιον, ii. 113^{b}.
λόγος, ii. 692^{a}.
λοιδορεῖν, i. 381^{b}.
λουτρόν, i. 685^{a}.
λύτρον, λυτροῦσθαι, λύτρωσις, λυτρωτής, i. 286^{a} ; ii. 298^{a}, 303^{a}, 308^{a}.
λυχνία, i. 588^{b}, 683^{a}.
λύχνος, i. 683^{a}.

μακάριος, μακαρισμός, i. 152^{a}.
μακροθυμεῖν, μακρόθυμος, i. 704^{b}.
μακροθυμία, i. 704^{b} ; ii. 136^{b}.
μαρτυρεῖν, μαρτυρία, ii. 17^{b}, 689^{a}.
μάρτυς, ii. 17^{a}, 689^{a}.
ματαιότης, ii. 635^{a}.
μεγαλειότης, ii. 2^{b}.
μεγαλωσύνη, ii. 2^{b}.
μεμβράνα, ii. 701^{b}.
μεμύημαι, i. 245^{a}.
μεσιτεύω, i. 239^{b}.
μεσίτης, i. 262^{a}.
μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ, ii. 646^{a}.
μεταμέλομαι, ii. 316^{a}.
μετάνοια, μετανοεῖν, ii. 316^{a}.
μετριοπαθεῖν, ii. 240^{b}.
μισθαποδοσία, μισθαποδότης, ii. 368^{a}.
μισθός, i. 285^{a} ; ii. 276^{a}, 368^{a}.
μίσθωμα, i. 285^{a}, 588^{a}.
μνῆμα, μνημεῖον, ii. 469^{a}.
μοιχεία, i. 417^{a} ; ii. 16^{b}.
μονογενής, ii. 112^{b} f.
μορφή, i. 193^{a} f., 415^{b} f. ; ii. 226^{b}.
μορφὴ θεοῦ, ii. 264^{b}.
μορφόω, i. 416^{a}.
μόρφωσις, i. 415^{b}.
μῦθος, i. 388^{a}.
μυστήριον, ii. 49^{a}, 425^{a}.

νάβλα, i. 525^{a}.
νεκροί, ii. 523^{a}.
νεκροῦν, ii. 43^{b}.
νεομηνία, ii. 89^{a}.
νεόφυτος, ii. 92^{b}.
νεωκόρος, i. 296^{a}.
νεώτερος, ii. 705^{a}.
νηστεία, i. 402^{a}.
νηφάλιος, ii. 514^{b}.
νήφω, ii. 514^{b}, 673^{a}.
νομικοί, i. 693^{b}.
νομοδιδάσκαλοι, i. 693^{b}.
νόμος, i. 687^{b}.
νουθεσία, i. 41^{a}, 174^{a}.
νουθετέω, i. 41^{a}.
νουμηνία, ii. 89^{a}.
νοῦς, ii. 37^{a}.

ξενία, i. 588^{a}.
ξένοι, ii. 531^{b}.
ξύλον, ii. 526^{b}, 612^{b}.

οἰκεῖοι, οἰκέται, οἰκέτεια, i. 399^{a}.
οἴκημα, ii. 275^{a}.
οἰκία, i. 164^{b}, 397^{b}.
οἰκιακοί, i. 398^{b}, 399^{a}.
οἰκοδομή, i. 162^{b}, 320$^{a.\,b}$.
οἰκονομεῖν, i. 399^{a}.
οἰκονόμος, i. 399^{a} ; ii. 526^{a}.
οἶκος, i. 397^{b}, 581^{b} ; ii. 33^{b}.
οἰκουμένη, ii. 693^{a}.
οἰκουργοί, οἰκουροί, i. 581^{b}.

οἰκτείρειν, ii. 240^{b}.
οἰκτιρμός, ii. 29^{b}, 240^{b}.
ὄλεθρος, i. 293^{a}.
ὄλυνθος, i. 407^{a}.
ὁμοιοπαθής, ii. 131^{b}.
ὁμοίωμα, i. 192^{b}.
ὁμολογεῖν, *ὁμολογία*, ii. 278^{b}.
ὀμφαλός, ii. 702^{b}.
ὀνειδισμός, ii. 318^{a}.
ὄνομα ἄῤῥητον, ii. 71^{a}.
ὀπτασία, ii. 643^{a}.
ὅραμα, ii. 643^{a}.
ὀργή, i. 293^{a}.
ὀργυιά, i. 402^{b}.
ὄρεξις, i. 724^{a}.
ὁρίζειν, ii. 262^{a}.
ὁρκίζειν, *ὅρκος*, i. 383^{b}.
ὅσιος, i. 568^{b}.
οὖς, i. 316^{b}.
ὀφείλειν, i. 285^{a}.
ὀφειλέτης, *ὀφειλή*, i. 285^{b}.
ὀψώνια, ii. 654^{a}, 655^{b}.

παθεῖν, ii. 131^{a}.
πάθημα, ii. 533^{b}.
παθήματα, *παθητός*, ii. 131^{a}.
πάθος, i. 724^{a} ; ii. 678^{b}.
παιδαγωγός, i. 399^{a} ; ii. 459^{a}.
παιδεία, *παιδεύω*, i. 173^{b}.
παιδευτής, ii. 459^{a}.
παιδονόμος, ii. 459^{a}.
παλιγγενεσία, *παλινγενεσία*, i. 135^{b} ; ii. 311^{b}, 321^{a}.
πανήγυρις, i. 104^{b}.
πανουργία, i. 379^{b}.
παραβιάζομαι, i. 244^{a}.
παραβολή, ii. 30^{b}.
παραγγελίαι, i. 233^{b}.
παραδόσεις, i. 233^{b}.
παραινέω, i. 41^{a}.
παρακαλέω, i. 383^{a}.
παρακληθῆναι, ii. 316^{a}.
παράκλησις, i. 232^{a}, 383^{a}.
παράκλητος, i. 232^{a}, 646^{b}.
παραμυθία, *παραμύθιον*, i. 232^{a}.
παράπτωμα, i. 394^{a} ; ii. 106^{b}.
παραπτῶσις, ii. 107^{a}.
παρατίθημι, i. 234^{a}.
παρεμβολή, i. 170^{b}.
πάρεσις, i. 415^{b}.
παρίστημι, i. 234^{a}.
πάροικοι, ii. 531^{b}.
παροξύνομαι, i. 110^{a} n.
παρουσία, i. 257^{b}, 258^{a}.
παρρησία, i. 156^{b}, 239^{a}.
παρρησιάζεσθαι, i. 156^{b}.
πάσχα, ii. 131^{b}.
πάσχα ἡμῶν, ii. 134^{a}.
πάσχω, ii. 533^{b}.
πατριά, i. 397^{b}.
πατριάρχης, ii. 137^{b}.
πείθειν, i. 107^{b}.
πειράζειν, ii. 468^{b}.
πεποιθέναι, *πεποίθησις*, i. 239^{a}.
περιπατεῖν, i. 246^{a}.
περισσεύω, i. 4^{a}, 517^{b}.
πίστις, i. 107^{b}.
πλατεῖα, ii. 532^{a}.
πλεονάζω, i. 4^{a}, 517^{b}.
πλεονέκτης, i. 263^{a}.
πλεονεξία, i. 263^{a}, 417^{b}, 684^{b}.
πληγή, ii. 241^{b}.
πληροφορεῖν, *πληροφορεῖσθαι*, *πληροφορία*, i. 107^{b} f.
πλήρωμα, i. 425^{b}.
πλησίον, ii. 82^{b}.
πνεῦμα, ii. 312^{a}, 522^{a}.
πνεύματα, ii. 523^{a}.
πνευματικός, i. 576^{b} ; ii. 521^{a}, 522^{a}.
ποδήρης, i. 221^{b}.
ποιμαίνειν, ii. 135^{b}.
ποιμήν, ii. 135^{b}, 474^{a}.
ποίμνιον, i. 412^{b}.
πόλις, i. 581^{b}.
πολιτεύεσθαι, *πολίτευμα*, i. 246^{a}.
πολύσπλαγχνος, ii. 240^{a}.
πονηρός, i. 293^{b}, 695^{a} ; ii. 675^{b}.
πορεύεσθαι, i. 246^{a}.
πορνεία, i. 417^{a} f. ; ii. 16^{b}.
πόρνη, *πόρνος*, i. 523^{a}.
πράττειν, ii. 685^{b}.
πραΰτης, ii. 27^{a}.
πρεσβεύω, i. 52^{a}.
πρεσβύτερος, i. 150^{b}, 219^{a} ; ii. 269^{a}, 705^{a}.
πρεσβύτης, i. 46^{b} ; ii. 213^{a} n.
πρόδρομος, i. 414^{b}.
πρόθεσις, i. 286^{a}.
προκόπτω, i. 517^{b}.
προκυρόω, i. 239^{b}.
προορίζειν, ii. 262^{a}.
προσαγωγή, i. 13^{a}.
προσευχή, ii. 257^{b}, 285^{b}.
προσήλυτος, ii. 284^{a}.
πρόσκομμα, ii. 107^{a}.
προσκοπή, ii. 107^{a}.
προστάτις, ii. 232^{b}.
προσωποληψία, ii. 319^{b}.
πρῶτος, ii. 29^{a}.
πρωτότοκος, i. 410^{b}.
πτῶμα, i. 154^{b}.
Πυθία, ii. 292^{b}.
Πύθων, ii. 292^{b}.
πύλη, *πυλών*, i. 443^{a}, 587^{b}.

ῥαβδίζω, i. 145^{b} ; ii. 401^{a}.
ῥάβδος, ii. 524^{a}.
ῥᾳδιούργημα, i. 695^{b}.
ῥαντισμός, i. 571^{a}.
ῥῆμα, ii. 692^{a}.
ῥύεσθαι, i. 286^{b}.

σαββατισμός, ii. 320^{b}.
σανδάλια, ii. 476^{b}.
σαργάνη, i. 144^{b}.
σαρκικός, *σάρκινος*, i. 169^{b} f.
σάρξ, i. 154^{b}, 193^{a}, 411^{b} ; ii. 312^{a}.
Σεβαστός, i. 124^{b}.
σεβόμενοι, i. 110^{b}.
σεμνός, *σεμνότης*, i. 513^{b}, 582^{b} ; ii. 590^{b}.
σημεῖον, ii. 39^{b}, 492^{a}, 598^{a}.
σιμικίνθια, i. 87^{a}.
σκάνδαλον, ii. 106^{b}.
σκεπάσματα, i. 221^{b}.
σκεῦος, ii. 475^{a}, 639^{a}.
σκηνή, ii. 547^{a}, 559^{a}.
σκῆνος, ii. 32^{b}.
σκόλοψ, ii. 576^{b}.
σμάραγδος, i. 330^{a} ; ii. 298^{a}.
σουδάριον, i. 521^{b}.
σοφία, ii. 683^{a}.
σπεκουλάτωρ, ii. 665^{b}.
σπερμολόγος, i. 110^{a}, 126^{b}.
σπλάγχνα, *σπλαγχνίζειν*, *σπλαγχνίζεσθαι*, ii. 240^{b}.
σπυρίς, i. 144^{b}.
σταυρός, i. 266^{a}.
στέγη, i. 587^{a}.
στενάζω, i. 517^{a}.
στέφανος, i. 221^{b}, 269^{a}, 441^{b}, 442^{b} ; ii. 276^{b}.
στηρίζω, i. 239^{b}.
στοὰ ἀνατολική, ii. 248^{a}.
στοὰ βασιλική, ii. 248^{a}.
στοιχεῖα, i. 328^{a} ; ii. 33^{b}.
στρατηγός, ii. 255^{a}.
συμβιβάζω, i. 107^{b}.
συμφέρει, *συμφέρον*, i. 385^{a}.
συναγωγή, i. 104^{a}, 204^{b}, 239^{b} ; ii. 541^{b}.
συνείδησις, i. 239^{b}.
συνείσακτοι, ii. 641^{b}.
συνέχειν, i. 244^{a}.
συνέχομαι, i. 249^{b}.
συνίστημι, i. 234^{b}.
συνωμοσία, i. 243^{a}.
σφραγίς, i. 129^{a} ; ii. 465^{b}.
σφυρίς, i. 144^{b}.
σχῆμα, i. 193^{a} f., 415^{b}.
σχίσμα, i. 560^{b}.
σώζειν, ii. 444^{a}.
σῶμα, i. 154^{b}.
σωματικὴ γυμνασία, i. 9^{a}.
σωτήρ, i. 180^{a} ; ii. 66^{b}, 444^{a}.
σωτηρία, *σωτήριον*, *σωτήριος*, ii. 444^{a}.
σωφρονέω, ii. 515^{b}.
σωφρόνως, ii. 516^{a}.
σωφροσύνη, ii. 516^{a}, 590^{b}.

ταμεῖον (*ταμιεῖον*), i. 588^{a}.
τάφος, ii. 469^{a}.
τεῖχος, ii. 646^{a}.
τέλειος, i. 46^{a}, 333^{a} ; ii. 166^{a}.
τελειόω, *τελείωσις*, i. 242^{b}.
τέλος, i. 242^{b}, 271^{b}, 285^{b}.
τέρας, ii. 39^{b}.
τετελειωμένος, i. 242^{b}, 532^{a}.
τήρησις, ii. 275^{a}.
τιμή, i. 583^{a}.
τιμωρία, ii. 290^{b}.
τοῖχος, ii. 646^{a}.
τολμᾶν, *τολμηρῶς*, i. 156^{b}.

τρόπος, i. 246^{a}.
τύπος, i. 416^{a}; ii. 138^{a}, 623^{a}.
τύπτω, i. 145^{b}.
τυφόω, ii. 268^{b}.

ὕβρις, ii. 268^{b}.
ὕδωρ ῥαντισμοῦ, i. 542^{b}; ii. 673^{b}.
υἱοθεσία, i. 41^{b}.
υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ii. 518^{a}.
υἱὸς ὑψίστου, ii. 540^{b}.
ὑπακοή, ii. 99^{b}.
ὕπαρξις, ii. 533^{a}.
ὑπεναντίος, i. 44^{a}.
ὑπερηφανία, ii. 268^{b}.
ὑπερφρονεῖν, ii. 516^{b}.
ὑπερῷον, i. 588^{a}.
ὑπηρετεῖν, ii. 38^{a}.
ὑπηρέτης, ii. 38^{a}, 107^{b}.
ὑπόδειγμα, ii. 138^{a}.
ὑποδήματα, ii. 476^{b}.
ὑποκρίνεσθαι, *ὑπόκρισις*, i. 591^{b}.
ὑπόλειμμα, ii. 315^{b}.
ὑπομονή, i. 705^{a}; ii. 136^{a}.
ὑπόστασις, i. 107^{b}, 460^{b}; ii. 533^{a}.
ὑποταγή, *ὑποτάσσεσθαι*, ii. 99^{b}.
ὑποτύπωσις, i. 416^{a}; ii. 138^{a}.
ὑπωπιάζω, i. 162^{b}.

φαιλόνης, *φαινόλης*, i. 221^{a}; ii. 703^{a}.
φαρμακεία, *φάρμακον*, *φαρμακός*, ii. 519^{b}.
φάσκειν, ii. 278^{b}.
φελόνης, *φενόλης*, i. 221^{a}; ii. 703^{a}.
φθείρω, *φθορά*, i. 293^{a}.
φθόνος, i. 341^{a}.
φιάλη, i. 159^{b}.
φιλαδελφία, i. 160^{b}.
φιλανθρωπία, i. 716^{a}.
φιλαργυρία, i. 263^{a}.
φιλεῖν, i. 713^{b}.
φλύαροι, ii. 549^{b}.
φόρος, i. 164^{a}, 285^{b}.
φρονεῖν, ii. 37^{b}.
φυλακή, ii. 275^{a}, 523^{a}.
φυσικός, ii. 77^{a}.

χαίρειν, i. 654^{a}.
χαλκεύς, i. 248^{b}.
χαρά, i. 654^{a}.
χαρίζεσθαι, i. 415^{b}.
χαρίσματα, i. 320^{b}, 450^{a}.
χάρτης, *χαρτίον*, ii. 701^{a}.
χειρόγραφον, i. 157^{a}.
χειροτονεῖν, i. 599^{b}; ii. 114^{b}.
χιτών, i. 221^{b}, 223^{a}.
χρηματίζω, i. 41^{a}.
χρηστός, i. 674^{a}, 695^{a}.
χρηστότης, i. 674^{a}.
χρῖσμα, i. 3^{b}, 568^{a}.
χριστός, i. 21^{a}, 178^{a}; ii. 66^{a}, 540^{b}.
χρώς, i. 154^{b}.

ψυχή, i. 698^{b}; ii. 521^{a}.
ψυχικός, ii. 77^{a}, 521^{a}.

III. INDEX OF SCRIPTURE TEXTS

GENESIS.

5^{24} i. 334^{a}.
14^{17b-20} ii. 27^{b}.
47^{31} i. 625^{a}.

LEVITICUS.

11$^{44f.}$ i. 567^{a}.

NUMBERS.

6$^{1-21}$ ii. 80^{a}.

PSALMS.

16 i. 283^{a}.
41^{9} i. 658^{a}.
69^{25} i. 658^{a}.
109^{8} i. 658^{a}.

HOSEA.

2^{23} i. 586^{a}.

MATTHEW.

3^{12} i. 129^{b}.
5^{32} ii. 16^{a}.
5$^{33-37}$ ii. 97^{a}.
6$^{1-8}$ i. 567^{a}.
7$^{1ff.}$ i. 660^{a}.
14^{15} i. 553^{b}.

MATTHEW—*continued.*

17^{11} ii. 321^{a}.
19^{28} ii. 321^{a}.
23^{15} ii. 285^{a}.
23$^{16-22}$ ii. 97^{a}.
24$^{10-12}$ ii. 647^{b}.
26$^{52-54}$ ii. 648^{a}.
26$^{63-65}$ ii. 98^{b}.
27$^{3ff.}$ i. 658^{a}.
28^{19} i. 134^{a}, 575^{a}; ii. 74$^{a, b}$.

MARK.

7^{19} i. 553^{b}.
7^{22} i. 684^{b}.
7^{37} i. 529^{b} f.
8^{12} ii. 99^{a}.
10^{12} ii. 17^{a}.
14^{36} i. 2$^{a, b}$.
14$^{61f.}$ ii. 98^{b}.

LUKE

1^{68} ii. 307^{a}.
2^{38} ii. 307^{a}.
3^{14} ii. 648^{b}.
6^{37} i. 660^{a}.
12^{58} ii. 2^{a}.
14$^{31-32}$ ii. 648^{b}

LUKE—*continued.*

18$^{7f.}$ ii. 650^{b}.
19$^{39-44}$ ii. 648^{b}.
21^{28} ii. 306^{b}.
22$^{35-38}$ ii. 649^{a}.
22$^{67f.}$ ii. 98^{b}.
23^{43} ii. 123^{b}.
24^{21} ii. 307^{a}.

JOHN.

6$^{36f.}$ i. 610^{b}.
6$^{40. 44. 54}$ i. 590^{a}.
12^{32} ii. 321^{b}.

ACTS.

1^{5} ii. 673^{b}.
1$^{16-20}$ i. 657^{b} f.
1$^{23ff.}$ ii. 20^{a}.
2$^{9-11}$ ii. 76^{b}.
2^{10} ii. 285^{a}.
2^{29} ii. 470^{a}.
4^{11} i. 260^{a}.
5^{6} ii. 705^{b}.
6^{9} i. 695^{b} f.
7^{16} ii. 470^{b}.
7^{38} ii. 36^{a}.
8^{26} i. 443^{b}.

ACTS—*continued.*
8^{27} ii. 285^{a}.
8^{37} i. 237^{a}.
9^{23-25} i. 274^{a}.
$10^{2.\ 22.\ 35}$ ii. 285^{a}.
10^{34} ii. 320^{a}.
11^{20} i. 272^{b}.
12^{8} i. 146^{a}.
13^{1-3} ii. 117^{a}.
13^{5} ii. 38^{b}.
13^{29} ii. 470^{b}.
13^{43} ii. 285^{a}.
14^{23} ii. 115^{b}, 116^{b}.
15^{19-21} ii. 45^{a}.
15^{20} i. 417^{b}.
16^{6} i. 434^{b} f.
16^{12} ii. 1^{b}.
16^{14} ii. 285^{a}.
$17^{4.\ 17}$ ii. 285^{a}.
17^{5} i. 695^{a}.
17^{23} ii. 633^{b}.
17^{31} ii. 324^{b}.
18^{7} ii. 285^{a}.
18^{14} i. 695^{b}.
18^{18} ii. 81^{b}.
18^{23} i. 435^{a}.
$20^{6\text{f.}}$ ii. 132^{b}.
20^{28} ii. 116^{b}.
21^{23-26} ii. 82^{a}.
$23^{13\text{ff.}}$ i. 243^{a}.
24^{5} ii. 78^{b}.
24^{25} ii. 374^{a}.
$27^{9\text{ff.}}$ i. 401^{b}.
27^{29} ii. 400^{b}.
$28^{2\text{ff.}}$ i. 137^{a}.

ROMANS.
1–8 ii. 387^{b}.
$1^{3\text{f.}}$ ii. 324^{b}.
1^{4} i. 192^{b}, 568^{b}.
1^{8-12} ii. 257^{b}.
1^{14} i. 137^{a}.
1^{28} ii. 318^{b}.
3^{13} ii. 470^{b}.
$3^{20\text{f.}}$ ii. 388^{a}.
3^{21-31} ii. 23^{b}.
3^{24} ii. 305^{b}.
4^{13} i. 544^{a}.
5 ii. 5^{a}.
5^{10} i. 527^{a}.
5^{12} ii. 33^{a}.
5^{12-21} i. 395^{b} ; ii. 4^{b}.
6 ii. 452^{b}.
6–8 ii. 312^{a}.
6^{17} i. 416^{a}.
7 ii. 4^{a}.

ROMANS—*continued.*
$7^{23.\ 25}$ ii. 37^{a}.
8^{1-30} ii. 325^{a}.
8^{3} i. 192^{b}.
8^{6} ii. 37^{a}.
$8^{9\text{f.}}$ i. 614^{b}.
8^{10} ii. 372^{b}.
$8^{14\text{f.}}$ i. 614^{b}.
8^{15} i. 2^{a}.
8^{18-25} i. 380^{b}.
8^{19} ii. 645^{a}.
8^{21} i. 158^{a}.
8^{23} ii. 306^{b}.
8^{23-25} ii. 645^{a}.
8^{29} i. 411^{a}.
8^{38} ii. 32^{b}.
$8^{38.\ 39}$ ii. 274^{b}.
9–11 i. 380^{b}.
9^{4} i. 262^{b}.
9^{5} i. 312^{b}.
9^{10-13} i. 354^{a}.
9^{11} i. 624^{a}.
9^{13} i. 527^{a}.
9^{21-23} ii. 319^{a}.
$9^{25\text{f.}}$ i. 586^{a}.
9^{27} ii. 315^{b}.
9^{33} ii. 400^{b}.
10^{9} i. 237^{a}.
10^{10} i. 390^{b}.
11^{5} ii. 315^{b}.
11^{16} i. 411^{a}, 569^{b}.
11^{17-24} i. $513^{a,\ b}$.
11^{32} ii. 321^{b}.
11^{36} i. 312^{a}.
12^{1-8} ii. 516^{b}.
13^{8} i. 285^{b}.
14^{4} i. 660^{b}.
$14^{5\text{f.}}$ i. $572^{a,\ b}$.
14^{13} i. 661^{a}.
14^{22} i. 660^{b}.
15^{3} ii. 318^{a}.
15^{10} ii. 318^{a}.
15^{20} i 418^{b}.
16 ii. 76^{a}.
16^{5} i. 411^{b}.
16^{15} i. 400^{b}.
16^{27} i. 312^{a}.

1 CORINTHIANS.
1^{14-16} ii. 98^{b}.
1^{30} ii. 308^{a}.
2^{1-4} i. 615^{b}.
2^{7-16} i. 613^{b}.
2^{9} i. 590^{b}.
3^{9} i. 162^{b}.
$3^{10\text{f.}}$ i. 418^{b}.

1 CORINTHIANS—*continued.*
4^{5} i. 701^{b}.
$5^{1-5.\ 13}$ ii. 15^{a}.
5^{5} i. 294^{b}.
5^{6-8} ii. 133^{b}.
6^{2} i. 661^{a}.
6^{9} i. 11^{b}.
6^{9-11} ii. 449^{b}.
7^{14} i. 569^{b}.
7^{20-24} ii. 511^{a}.
7^{25-38} ii. 641^{a}.
7^{31} i. 11^{a}.
7^{34} i. 569^{b}.
9^{16} i. 244^{a}.
9^{18} i. 11^{b}.
9^{24-27} i. 7^{b} ; ii. 276^{b}.
9^{27} ii. 318^{b}.
10 i. 374^{b} f.
10^{4} ii. 33^{a}, 400^{b}.
10^{9} ii. 472^{a}.
$11^{4\text{ff.}}$ i. 221^{b}.
$11^{9\text{f.}}$ i. 39^{b}.
11^{18-34} i. 717^{b} f.
$11^{20.\ 21}$ ii. 535^{b}.
$11^{28.\ 29}$ ii. 468^{b}.
12^{3} i. 237^{a}.
12^{4-11} i. 616^{b}.
12^{28} i. 450^{b}, ii. 459^{a}.
13^{1} i. 271^{b}.
14^{1-19} ii. 644^{a}.
14^{7} i. 524^{b}.
14^{11} i. 137^{a}.
$14^{14.\ 15.\ 19}$ ii. 37^{a}.
15 ii. 324^{b}.
15^{20} i. 411^{b}.
$15^{21\text{ff.}}$ i. 395^{a}.
15^{22} ii. 321^{b}.
15^{23} i. 411^{b}.
$15^{23\text{f.}}$ ii. 651^{b}.
15^{29} i. 128^{b}.
15^{37} ii. 675^{a}.
15^{54} ii. 33^{a}.

2 CORINTHIANS.
1^{12} i. 567^{b}.
1^{21} i. 129^{a} ; ii. 107^{b}.
1^{22} i. 129^{a}.
2^{5-11} i. 254^{b} ; ii. 322^{a}.
3–5 ii. 325^{a}.
3^{6} i. 262^{b}.
3^{17-18} ii. 453^{b}.
4^{4} i. 606^{b}.
4^{11-14} ii. 325^{a}.
5^{1} i. 163^{a}.
5^{4} i. 244^{a} ; ii. 32^{b}.
5^{14} ii. 22^{b}.

2 CORINTHIANS—*continued.*
5^{14-21} ii. 302^{a}.
5^{21} ii. 387^{b}.
$6^{7.\ 14}$ ii. 371^{b}.
7^{12} i. 254^{b} ; ii. 15^{a}.
9^{9} ii. 371^{a}.
$10^{3f.}$ ii. 654^{a}.
11^{3} ii. 472^{a}.
11^{32} i. 274^{a}, 373^{b}.
12^{4} ii. 123^{b}.
12^{7} ii. 576^{b}.

GALATIANS.
1^{1} ii. 117^{a}.
1^{5} i. 312^{a}.
1^{19} i. 83^{b}.
2^{6} ii. 319^{b}.
2^{11-14} i. 591^{b}.
2^{20} ii. 324^{b}.
3^{10-18} i. 271^{a}.
3^{13} ii. 23^{a}.
3^{15} ii. 681^{a}.
3^{15-17} i. 262^{b}, 543^{a}.
4^{3} i. 328^{b}.
4^{4} ii. 33^{a}.
4^{6} i. 2^{a}.
4^{9} ii. 33^{a}.
4^{10} i. 572^{a}.
4^{24} i. 262^{b}, 519^{b} f.
5^{17} i. 722^{b}.
5^{22} i. 425^{b}.
6^{7} i. 525^{b}.
6^{12} i. 244^{a}.

EPHESIANS.
1^{10} ii. 321^{b}.
1^{14} ii. 306^{b}.
1^{15-19} ii. 257^{b}.
2^{12} i. 262^{b}.
2^{20} i. 260^{b}, 419^{a}.
2^{21} i. 163^{a}.
3^{1} i. 618^{b}.
$3^{14ff.}$ i. 618^{b} ; ii. 257^{b}.
3^{15} i. 397^{b}.
3^{21} i. 312^{a}.
4^{11} i. 450^{b}.
4^{13} i. 46^{a}.
5^{14} i. 590^{b}.
5^{26} i. 128^{a}, 685^{a} ; ii. 673^{b}.
6^{9} ii. 320^{a}.
$6^{10f.}$ ii. 654^{b}.
6^{18} ii. 257^{b}.

PHILIPPIANS.
1^{9-11} ii. 257^{b}.
1^{22} i. 425^{a}.

PHILIPPIANS—*continued.*
1^{28} ii. 598^{a}.
2^{5-11} i. 192^{b} f. ; ii. 226^{a}.
2^{6-8} i. 463^{b}.
$2^{10f.}$ ii. 321^{b}.
3^{4-14} ii. 467^{a}.
4^{3} i. 342^{b}.
4^{20} i. 312^{b}.

COLOSSIANS.
$1^{9ff.}$ ii. 257^{b}.
$1^{12f.}$ i. 701^{b}.
1^{15} i. 410^{b}, 606^{b}.
1^{18} i. 411^{a}.
1^{20} ii. 321^{b}.
2^{8} i. 328^{b} f. ; ii. 33^{b}.
2^{14} i. $157^{a.\ b}$.
2^{15} ii. 274^{a}.
2^{16} i. 572^{b}, 661^{a}.
$2^{18f.}$ ii. 33^{b}.
2^{20} i. 328^{b} f.
2^{23} i. 583^{b}.
3^{5} i. 263^{b}.
3^{11} i. 137^{a}.
3^{25} ii. 320^{a}.
4^{17} i. 89^{a}.

1 THESSALONIANS.
1^{2-3} ii. 257^{b}.
2^{13} i. 615^{b}.
$4^{3ff.}$ i. 417^{a}.
4^{6} i. 263^{b}.
4^{13}–5^{10} ii. 571^{b}.
4^{13}–5^{11} ii. 124^{b}.
4^{16} ii. 36^{a}.
5^{8} ii. 654^{b}.

2 THESSALONIANS.
1^{5} ii. 597^{b}.
2 ii. 125^{a}.
2^{1-12} ii. 7^{a}, 572^{a}.
2^{6-7} ii. 125^{b}.
3^{17} ii. 598^{a}.

1 TIMOTHY.
1^{10} i. 11^{b}.
1^{17} i. 312^{b}.
1^{18} ii. 655^{a}.
1^{20} i. 294^{b}.
$2^{5f.}$ ii. 24^{b}.
$2^{13f.}$ i. 39^{b}, 379^{b}.
2^{15} ii. 517^{a}.
3^{7} ii. 318^{a}.
3^{16} i. 590^{b}.
5^{1} ii. 705^{a}.
5^{3-16} ii. 676^{b}.

1 TIMOTHY—*continued.*
5^{9} i. 46^{a}.
5^{17} i. 583^{a}.
5^{22} ii. 115^{b}.
6^{19} i. 419^{a}.

2 TIMOTHY.
1^{6} ii. 117^{b}.
1^{13} i. 416^{a}.
$2^{3f.}$ ii. 655^{a}.
2^{19} i. 419^{a}.
4^{17} i. 703^{a}.
4^{18} i. 312^{b}.

TITUS.
2^{12} ii. 516^{b}.
3^{1} ii. 2^{a}.
3^{5} i. 685^{a} ; ii. 310^{b}.

HEBREWS.
$1^{1f.}$ i. 615^{b}.
1^{3} ii. $533^{a.\ b}$.
$1^{3ff.}$ i. 463^{a}.
1^{9} ii. 107^{b}.
3^{1} i. 237^{a}.
3^{14} ii. 533^{a}.
4^{1-11} ii. 320^{b}.
5^{7} ii. 258^{a}.
5^{12} ii. 274^{b}.
5^{13} ii. 374^{a}.
6^{1} i. 419^{b}.
6^{1-5} i. 333^{a}.
6^{2} i. 128^{a}.
6^{4} i. 128^{a}.
6^{6} ii. 316^{b}.
6^{8} ii. 318^{b}, 576^{a}
$6^{13f.}$ ii. 99^{a}.
6^{19} i. 56^{b}.
7^{11} i. 695^{a}.
$7^{20f.}$ ii. 99^{a}.
7^{28} i. 242^{b}.
$8^{6ff.}$ i. 262^{a}.
9^{10} ii. 309^{b}.
9^{11} i. $163^{a.\ b}$.
$9^{16.\ 17}$ ii. 681^{a}.
9^{16-18} i. 262^{a}.
9^{19} ii. 673^{b}.
10^{10} ii. 449^{b}.
10^{20} i. 242^{b} f.
10^{22} i. 128^{a}.
10^{32} i. 333^{a}.
10^{33} ii. 318^{a}.
11^{1} ii. 533^{b}.
11^{2} ii. 92^{a}.
11^{5} i. 334^{a}.

Hebrews—*continued.*

11^{7} ii. 374^{a}.
11^{21} i. 146^{a}.
11^{26} ii. 318^{a}.
11^{33} ii. 374^{a}.
11^{35} ii. 308^{a}.
12^{2} i. 125^{b}.
12^{10} i. 567^{b}.
12^{11} ii. 373^{b}.
12^{23} i. 104^{a}, 411^{a}.
13^{13} ii. 318^{b}.
13^{21} i. 312^{b}.
13^{24} i. 624^{b}.

James.

2^{1} ii. 320^{a}.
2^{12} i. 661^{a}.
2^{14-26} i. 416^{b}, 630^{b}.
2^{23} ii. 373^{b}.
3^{5-12} ii. 34^{a}.
3^{6} i. 544^{b}.
$3^{11.\,12}$ ii. 674^{a}.
3^{12} i. 407^{a}.
4^{5} i. 341^{a}, 723^{a}.
$4^{11f.}$ i. 660^{b}.
5^{4} i. 285^{a}, 525^{b}.
5^{12} ii. 97^{a}.
5^{14} ii. 107^{b}.

1 Peter.

$1^{4f.}$ i. 544^{b}.
$1^{15f.}$ i. 567^{a}.
1^{17} ii. 320^{a}, 374^{a}.
1^{19} i. 681^{b}.
2^{7} i. $583^{a.\,b}$.
2^{8} ii. 400^{b}.
2^{23} ii. 374^{a}.
3^{18-20} i. $609^{a.\,b}$.
3^{20} ii. 92^{a}, 674^{a}.
3^{21} i. 128^{b}.
4^{3} i. 684^{b}.
4^{6} i. 609^{b}.

1 Peter—*continued.*

4^{9} ii. 48^{b}.
4^{11} i. 312^{b}.
5^{2} i. 244^{a}.
5^{5} ii. 705^{a}.
5^{11} i. 312^{b}.

2 Peter.

1^{1} ii. 374^{b}.
$1^{16ff.}$ ii. 611^{b}.
1^{20} i. 619^{b}.
2^{1} i. 560^{b}.
2^{5} ii. 92^{a}, 374^{b}.
2^{13} i. 404^{b}, 718^{a}.
2^{19} i. 158^{a}.
3^{10} i. 329^{b}.
3^{12} i. 329^{b}.
3^{13} ii. 374^{b}.
3^{18} i. 312^{b}.

1 John.

2^{16} ii. 696^{a}.
2^{20} ii. 107^{b}.
5^{6} ii. 674^{a}.

Jude.

v.^{7} i. 409^{b}.
v.^{9} ii. 35^{b}.
v.^{11} i. 166^{b}.
v.^{12} i. 404^{b}, 718^{a}.
vv.$^{12.\,13}$ ii. 646^{a}.
v.^{25} i. 312^{b}.

Revelation.

1^{5-6} i. 312^{b}.
1^{7} ii. 47^{a}.
1^{15} ii. 674^{a}.
2^{7} ii. 123^{b}.
2^{20} i. 642^{a}.
3^{7} i. 283^{b}.
4^{7} i. 316^{a}.
4^{8} i. 567^{a}, 590^{b}; ii. 681^{b}.
5^{5} i. 703^{a}.

Revelation—*continued.*

5^{6} i. 585^{a}.
5^{12} i. 590^{b}.
5^{13} i. 312^{b}.
6^{13} i. 407^{a}.
7^{12} i. 312^{b}.
8^{11} ii. 674^{a}, 697^{a}.
8^{13} i. 316^{a}.
9^{9} ii. 682^{a}.
9^{11} i. 2^{a}.
9^{13} i. 585^{a}.
$10^{5f.}$ ii. 99^{a}.
11^{9} ii. 471^{a}.
11^{15-18} i. 590^{b}.
12^{1} i. 292^{b}.
12^{7} ii. 35^{b}.
12^{14} i. 316^{a}; ii. 682^{a}.
13^{1} i. 585^{a}.
13^{8} i. 158^{a}.
13^{9-10} ii. 652^{a}.
13^{11} i. 585^{a}.
14^{2} ii. 674^{a}.
15^{3} i. 590^{b}.
16^{4} ii. 674^{a}.
16^{12} ii. 674^{a}.
$17^{1.\,15}$ ii. 674^{a}.
17^{3} i. 585^{a}.
17^{16} i. 585^{a}.
19^{6} ii. 674^{a}.
19^{8} ii. 374^{a}.
19^{9} ii. 536^{a}.
$19^{17.\,18}$ ii. 536^{a}.
$20^{5f.}$ i. 590^{a}.
20^{12} i. 158^{b}.
21^{9}–22^{5} ii. 88^{a}.
21^{17} i. 270^{a}.
21^{18} i. 163^{b}.
21^{18-21} ii. 88^{b}.
$21^{22.\,23}$ ii. 88^{b}.
21^{24-27} ii. 88^{b}.
$22^{1.\,2}$ ii. 89^{a}.
22^{3-5} ii. 89^{a}.
22^{21} i. 148^{a}.